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Operational Definition of Terms

Projects Sustainability
In the context of donor-funded development programs and projects, sustainability can be defined as: the continuation of benefits after major assistance from a donor has been completed / withdrawn. Financial sustainability means prolonging assured inflow of financial resources.

Financial systems
Accounting records and financial statements and investment policies used to report financial performance and to project cash flows that determine project sustainability.

Technology
This is the technical means people use to improve their surroundings. It is also knowledge of using tools and machines to do tasks efficiently. Technology involves people using knowledge, tools, and systems to make their lives easier and better.

Product
Kotler (2006) defined product as anything that can be offered to satisfy a need or want. A product can consist of as many as three components; physical good(s), service(s) and idea(s).
Abstract

The role played by donor agencies in improving living standards of families/households, groups and individuals in any country especially in arid and semi-arid areas cannot be underestimated. There has been a significant increase in activities from donor agencies such as Community-Based Organizations (CBO), Faith-Based Organizations (FBO) and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) among others with regards to funding of various projects especially in arid and semi-arid areas where the government has failed to deliver services to its people. However development projects, initiated and/or funded by these donor agencies, perform poorly and many become non-operational on termination of donor support. Despite this problem, no study has been done to establish the cause of the termination of these donor funded projects especially on withdrawal of donor support. This poses a gap that this study sought to fill through an investigation of the factors that affect the sustainability of the donor funded projects in arid and semi-arid areas in Kenya.

The study adopted a descriptive research design. The target population included all the employees working with donor funded project in Marsabit Central District. Data was collected from the sampled respondents using questionnaires as the principal data collection instrument. Stratified and purposive sampling techniques were used to come up with a representative sample size. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to aid in generation of results. The data was presented in form of pie charts, Bar graphs and frequency tables, percentages and cross-tabulation among others.

The study established that most donors funded project in Marsabit were unsustainable after the withdrawal of the donor funding. The key factors that were found to affect the sustainability of donor funded projects were mainly the existing donor policies and the management systems adopted by the project. The study recommended that adoption of succession planning was necessary to ensure that the target beneficially and the stakeholders are well prepared to effectively run the projects after withdrawal of donor support.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Sustainability is the ability of an organization to develop a strategy of growth and
development that continues to function indefinitely. This implies that organizations
need to have proper strategies covering advocacy, foundations and fundraising,
governance, management and leadership among others (Dorothy, 2007). Donors play
a significant role in the social development process in all regions of the world. They
are particularly critical in circumstances where State funds are limited, political
situations are fluid, natural disasters resulting from both predictable and unpredictable
environmental circumstances occur, ethnic strife is rampant, and the level of per
capita income severely restricts the ability to purchase needed goods and services –
social, educational and economic.

From a global perspective, the donor funded development projects are involved in a
wide range of activities and programmes at national and regional levels all aimed at
improving the well-being of poor people. Donor agencies such as Faith-Based
Organizations (FBOs), NGOs such as United Nations Education, Science and Cultural
Organization(UNESCO), United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) , World Food
Programme (WFP), United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), Food for the
Hungary International(FHI), Red Cross International project (RCI), Pastoral Initiative
(PISP) and Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) have historically provided vital
services to needy populations and contributed significantly to the strengthening of
many individuals’ lives, families and communities (Vidal,2001). FBOs and CBOs are
often located in regions and neighbourhoods where especially needy populations live. These organizations tend to have scarce resources, yet tend to make large contributions to society. Conceptually, development projects undertaken by donor agencies are “asset building” that improves the quality of life among residents of low-to-moderate income communities (Vidal, 2001).

The donor funded development projects are involved in various activities which includes; integrated Food Security Programmes, transportation, marketing and processing of agricultural and livestock production. Availability of safe drinking water for human and livestock, plus the conservation of soil, water, wildlife and the environment form part and parcel of the Integrated Rural Development Programmes implemented by donor agencies at community level. Health Programmes for disease prevention and treatment often with mobile health clinics form a common feature in high population density locations. The HIV/AIDS pandemic has had far reaching impact on the social, cultural, economic, health and religious life of many individuals, families and communities. The fight against the HIV/AIDS scourge is stronger and the donors’ focus is on information sharing, de-stigmatization and appropriate counseling and coping skills.

The focus on Capacity Building at national and regional level ensures a workforce with appropriate skills to promote participatory and sustainable community development, while at the same time empowering the community to be more analytical about their situations, resources and develop appropriate interventions, to address their challenges. Their capacities are further enhanced through Gender, Justice and Equity, Conflict Resolution and Civic Education and Advocacy Programmes.
Kenya’s land area comprises nearly 80% arid and semi-arid lands commonly referred to as ASALs and also known as rangelands (GoK, 2002a, GoK, 1994b). Marsabit central District is the second largest district in Kenya and the largest of the thirteen districts in Eastern Province of Kenya. It is found in the arid and semi-arid lands of northern Kenya that are characterized by poor rainfall (<500mm), high temperature 30° – 35° C), strong winds, sandy brackish soils and generally sparse vegetation (Ngutu et al, 2003). The area generally experiences frequent droughts that disrupt normal livelihood. In its current size, Marsabit District had a population of 65,523 people in 1979 which, had nearly doubled to 127,560 people by 1999 census (GoK, 2002). The population is predominantly Boran (32%), Gabra (24%) and Rendille (21%). The rest of the population comprises smaller ethnic groups that include Burji, Samburu, Turkana, and Sakuye. Whereas the Burji are almost 100 percent farmers but practicing agro-pastoralism, the Rendille are predominantly pastoralists who have significantly taken to crop farming. The Borans are involved in serious crop production while the Gabra remain a predominantly pastoral community but with a significant proportion practicing crop production.

Having Sustainable development projects in this arid and semi-arid areas goes hand in hand with promotion of skills and investment enterprises for the benefit of local communities. The donor agencies are therefore involved in funding a range of Micro-enterprise Development, small-scale business, home improvement and cottage industries aimed at improving living standards of families/households, groups and individuals.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Donors usually have the objective of helping to improve the livelihood of the locals either through direct participation or providing funding to supplement government's budgetary allocation to the various sectors. Unfortunately, the funds provided by most of these donors are project-driven short-term funds, which do not factor into the whole funding mechanism policies that will ensure that such projects become sustainable after donor funds have been withdrawn (Heeks and Baark, 1998). The presence of a well thought out strategy that not only looks at how a donor funded project is completed, but also the means to continue with the project after donor funds have been withdrawn is critical to the project's sustainability (Young and Hampshire, 2000). Two examples of projects that have been closed after donor support in Marsabit Central District are the Integrated Project for Arid Lands (IPAL) funded by UNESCO and Marsabit Land Degradation project funded by UNEP.

The national policies on poverty eradication as stated in Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) places emphasis on efficient management initiatives supporting improvements on socio-economic, political and legal environments. However, the question of effectiveness or efficiency of implementation of donor funded project remains a significant policy and management concern to be investigated. Some of factors that might influence the sustainability of the projects include; financial systems, technology adoption, stakeholders and target groups involvement and participation, donor policies and management structures. Evaluation studies done by Agevi (2002), Muttagi (1998), Ashley and Barney (1999) and Cedric (1992) widely linked poor management of community projects to the increase in the cycle of poverty and failure of many donor funded projects in developing countries such as Kenya.
This situation is even worse in arid and semi-arid areas (ASAL). There has been a significant increase in activities from donor agencies in arid and semi-arid areas especially in areas where the government has failed to deliver services to its people. Despite this problem, little has been done to establish the cause of the termination of these donor funded projects in the ASAL. This poses a gap which this study sought to fill through an investigation of the factors that affects the sustainability of the donor funded projects in arid and semi-arid areas in Kenya.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 The Broad Objective

The broad objective of the study was to investigate the factors affecting sustainability of donor funded projects in Marsabit Central District in Kenya.

1.3.2 The Specific Objectives

The study was based on the following specific objectives;

1. To find out the extent to which the existing project financial systems affect sustainability of donor funded projects.

2. To establish the effect of technology adoption on the sustainability of donor funded projects.

3. To determine the effects of stakeholders and target groups involvement and participation on the sustainability of donor funded projects.

4. To find out the extent to which donor policies affect the sustainability of donor funded projects.

5. To establish how the management structures in place affect the sustainability of donor funded projects.
1.4 Research Questions

The study sought to answer the following research questions;

1. How do the existing project financial systems affect sustainability of donor funded projects?

2. What is the effect of technology adoption on the sustainability of donor funded projects?

3. What is the effect of stakeholders and target groups involvement on the sustainability of donor funded projects?

4. What is the effect of stakeholders and target groups participation on the sustainability of donor funded projects?

5. How do donor policies affect the sustainability of donor funded projects?

6. How do the management structures in place affect the sustainability of donor funded projects?

1.5 Significance of the Study

Donors play a crucial role in the society; they are a vehicle to which government and other agencies channel their resources to help the community and the poor of the poor. “They diffuse political anger and dole out as aid or benevolence what people ought to have by right” (Roy, 2003). With a lot of funds going into projects and with increased need of interventions especially in the social aspects of life including health, education and food security it is important to study and determine the factors that affect the sustainability of these projects. This project report will therefore be of great use to the following groups:

1. The donor fraternity and more specifically in Kenya. They will benefit from the findings of this study by gaining an insight on how well the donor can manage their development projects to ensure their sustainability.
2. The NGO Council will also benefit from the findings of this study as it will know how best to support the NGO sector in an attempt to fulfil its mission of providing efficient services, coordination and facilitation to the sector in order to enhance the contribution to the socio-economic development and improvement of the welfare of the people.

3. The Government of Kenya, the findings of this study will enable them to offer assistance to the donors as they implement development projects which promote poverty reduction.

4. Future researchers and academicians will also gain from this study as it will provide them with reference information for further studies.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study was based in Marsabit Central District which is the second largest district in Kenya and the largest of the thirteen districts in Eastern Province of Kenya. It is found in the arid and semi arid lands of Northern Kenya. The area generally experiences frequent droughts that disrupt normal livelihood. This region has a number of development projects which are funded by various donor agencies. Most projects in the region experience similar or different sustainability problems which is the primary focus for this study. The study was limited to the employees of the various donor funded projects in the region who were expected to give insights on the various sustainability related problems faced by the projects in the region. The study covered projects which are on-going and those which have been closed.
1.7 Limitation of the study
The study was limited to the donor projects in Marsabit Central District due to financial, time constraints and other logistics which affected the scope of the study making it not possible to take a census.

1.8 Assumptions of the Study

1. The study assumed that all respondents were honest and that the information given can be depended upon to make conclusions and deduction for the future.

2. The study assumed that the sample selected was representative and hence the findings can be generalized to represent the entire target population.

1.9 Chapter Summary
This chapter has highlighted the areas of the intended study with emphasis on the understanding of project sustainability. The next chapter considered the literature review according to the research objectives.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter presents a review of the related literature on the subject under study presented by various researchers, scholars, analysts and authors. The review has covered the various issues related to the subject of interest. The researcher has drawn materials from several sources which are closely related to the theme and the objectives of the study.

2.2 Project Management
A project is a finite endeavor (having specific start and completion dates) undertaken to create a unique product or service which brings about beneficial change or added value. This finite characteristic of projects stands in sharp contrast to processes, or operations, which are permanent or semi-permanent functional work to repetitively produce the same product or service. A successful project management is the tie that binds services to results (Wayne Peal, 2000).

2.3 Concept of Project Sustainability

2.3.1 Sustainability
The concept of sustainability is used in many contexts and with widely different meanings. Perhaps the most popular definition of sustainability is drawn from U.N. report (1987) on World Commission on Environment and Development (also known as the Bruntland Commission) which defined it as "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."

Some popular applications of the concept of sustainability are listed includes; Global
sustainability, Sustainability of the environment, Sustainable agriculture, Economic sustainability, Sustainable development and Sustainable benefits. Global sustainability refers to factors of worldwide importance such as the shrinking ozone layer, nuclear proliferation, and high population growth. Environmental sustainability is applied to the functioning of plant and animal ecosystems, including human ones. Agricultural sustainability refers to maintaining crop yields from various farming operations without harming soils. "Sustainable" means to endure, to last, and to keep in being. Sustainable development is about marshalling resources to ensure that some measure of human well-being is sustained over time. According to Pearce and Robinson, (2003), the objective is to take actions to strategize in order to avoid impairing future generations from living at least as well as the present and hopefully better. To do this, each generation must leave the next generation a stock of capital no smaller than the present one. Three forms of capital are recognized; natural, infrastructure, and human. Natural capital includes natural resources such as water, soils, forests, wildlife, and oil. Infrastructure includes machines, roads, dams, and cities. Human capital encompasses the stock of knowledge and skills exhibited by citizens. Together the various forms of capital comprise the aggregate capital stock of a nation. Sustainability can be viewed as the ability of a project to initiate a process by which benefits are maintained. The word "project" is used in different ways by different stakeholders. In some circumstances, it is viewed as a temporally administrative arrangement, a budget, the physical infrastructure, a period of time, and even as some combination of all four.

In the context of donor-funded development programs and projects, sustainability can be defined as: the continuation of benefits after major assistance from a donor has
been completed / withdrawn. Key points to note in this definition are; the focus is on sustaining the flow of benefits into the future rather than on sustainable programs or projects. Projects are by definition not sustainable as they are a defined investment with a start and finish date. The concept of sustainable benefits does not necessarily mean the continuation of AID-funded activities. For example, an education sector project may assist in the re-structuring of in-service teacher training, sustainability does not necessarily mean that the activities required to develop new structures be sustained but rather that the new structures are appropriate, owned by the stakeholders and supported on an ongoing basis with locally available resources. They will therefore be maintained after major assistance from donors has been completed up to the time they are no longer required or relevant. Managing sustainability is a process aimed at maximizing the flow of sustainable benefits. It should be an ongoing process and needs to be reviewed and updated as circumstances change and lessons are learned from experience. Without being too risk averse with the initial selection of programs and projects, all bilateral and regional aid activities should be designed and managed with the aim of achieving sustainable benefits; with the possible exception of one-off emergency and humanitarian relief activities. Because there is no one single way to achieve sustainability, country, sector, and program/project specific circumstances need to be taken into account. Each individual program or project should define its own sustainability strategy on a case-by-case basis.

Maintaining benefit flows after major external funding is completed assumes that the stakeholders (government, community groups, or private sector) will provide an appropriate level of financial, technical and managerial resources. However, AID providers may need to provide some limited follow-on assistance, such as intermittent
technical support (including sector adviser visits), or supplementary financial support to enhance the prospects for sustainability and to consolidate achievements.

2.3.2 Sustainability Analysis

Sustainability analysis is the identification and analysis of the key factors that are likely to impact, either positively or negatively, on the likelihood of delivering sustainable benefits. It is closely allied to risk analysis and although there are differences, sustainability analysis can be considered to be an extension of risk analysis. A broad sustainability analysis should be incorporated into the Country Strategy; the level of relevant detail should be expanded and refined at each stage of the activity cycle, starting from identification through to completion. It should be appraised and reviewed at least annually during implementation and it should be evaluated in order to learn lessons.

2.3.3 Sustainability Strategy

The sustainability analysis will lead to the development of a sustainability strategy. The aim of the sustainability strategy is to define the benefits to be sustained and specify how each of the main constraints to sustainability will be addressed in implementation. The main elements of the strategy should be fed into the design so that sustainability will be strengthened in a systematic and comprehensive way. Hence the sustainability strategy will be reflected in the log frame and risk management; the activity, resource and cost schedules; plus position descriptions, organizational plans and training plans. The strategy should also be reflected in the Scope of Services and Basis of Payment, and the Memorandum of Understanding (or Subsidiary Agreement) with the Partner Government. The design team should prepare a sustainability strategy matrix in a participatory way with the major stake holders. This should be done just
after a hierarchy of objectives has been created and the risks to the achievement of the objectives have been identified.

The matrix is a summary of the sustainability strategy that can then be expanded into a separate section of the design document, under the heading of ‘Sustainability Strategy.’ The matrix can also be inserted into the design document as an attachment. Like the sustainability analysis, the sustainability strategy ought to be appraised and then reviewed and refined at least annually during implementation through the annual planning process, mid-term reviews and the updating of phase-out strategies. It should also be evaluated in order to learn lessons.

2.4 Factors Affecting Project Sustainability

2.4.1 Project Financial Systems

Projects financial systems refer to accounting records and financial statements showing performance and cash flow projections that determine financial sustainability of donor funded projects. Nturibi (2004) states that for a development project to be financially sustainable, it requires a sound financial base arising from reliable sources of funding, financial systems to facilitate accountability and cash flow projections and development of marketable products to generate excess income over the expenditure of the project. Project financial analysis should be undertaken in conjunction with project economic analysis. Financial prices influence the decisions of project participants; economic prices record the consequences of those decisions for the national economy. Financial prices help determine the level of demand for project outputs and the level of supply of project inputs. Prices or user charges, demand, and the scale of investment all need to be considered simultaneously. Financial prices provide the incentive for investment. For example, the extent to which traffic will...
divert to a new expressway, and the return to the expressway investor, will vary with
the projected level of toll. The consequences of these responses for the economy as a
whole are calculated in economic prices (Francis, 2001).

For a project to move towards sustainable approaches to service delivery new models
and prototypes need to be developed, tested, accepted and implemented. Aid therefore
should be part of the process of change and donors should ensure that their assistance
is not delaying progress towards sustainability but actually supporting it. Financial
and economic analysis is crucial for any sustainable project. If a program or project
does not deliver clear and equitable financial or economic benefits, which are
apparent to the stakeholders, it is most unlikely to be sustained after donor funding
finishes. For example, health service users will not pay for government health services
(either directly or through other taxes) if the service is poor or their expectations of
benefits are extremely limited. Benefits are not sustainable if the net benefit arising is
negative or very small when all the costs are considered. Better financial analysis is
often required, particularly in the formulation of programs and projects’ activities.

2.4.2 Technology Adoption

Technology is the technical means people use to improve their surroundings. It is also
knowledge of using tools and machines to do tasks efficiently. We use technology to
control the world in which we live. Technology involves people using knowledge,
tools, and systems to make their lives easier and better. Technology involves
application of knowledge, tools and skills to solve problems and extend human
capacity (Johnson, 1989:3). On the other hand, Larkin (1992:23) defines technology
as a "... body of knowledge and actions about applying resources, developing,
producing, using, assessing, and extending the human potential, controlling and
modifying the environment”. People use technology to improve their ability to do work. Through technology, people communicate better. Yes, technology is everywhere and can make life better. The term technology thus often characterizes inventions and gadgets using recently discovered scientific principles and processes. However, even very old inventions such as the wheel exemplify technology. Another definition used by economists, sees technology as the current state of our knowledge of how to combine resources to produce desired products (and our knowledge of what can be produced). Thus, we can see technological change when our technical knowledge increases.

Appropriate quality of technology is crucial to the success of any project. To promote sustainability the technology to be transferred must be selected on the basis of its appropriateness in terms of technical and financial criteria, plus social, gender and cultural acceptability. The quality of any asset or piece of infrastructure will have direct bearing on its economic life. The longer it lasts, the more sustainable the resulting benefits. However, the appropriate level of quality must be assessed against a number of criteria. Considerations should include: user expectations and acceptance; costs and benefits, including how investment and maintenance costs will be financed; reliability of supply or delivery systems; and local capacity to maintain the asset including access to spare parts. Stakeholder participation in the selection, testing and operation of new technology is a clear strategy for promoting its sustainable use. Demand-responsive approaches are widely accepted as being more sustainable than supply-led.
Training to support the introduction of new technology is usually an essential component of a sustainability strategy. Training must be relevant and appropriate, and the continuity of the training itself (including refresher and follow-up training) must also be considered. In many cases, one-off externally funded training activities will be inadequate. Building on (and actively supporting) existing local capacity to deliver training, provided by either public or private sector agencies, may be part of a sustainable strategy.

2.4.3 Stakeholders and Target Groups Involvement and Participation

According to Pomeroy and Carlos (1997), one of the critical factors in promoting sustainability of any project is the role played by the stakeholders and target groups and their participation in the project activities. Stakeholders and target groups are those directly concerned with the program or project, especially the Partner Government and the implementing agency, and those who stand to benefit. Sustainability cannot be achieved without their involvement and support. Stakeholders, both men and women, should actively participate which means having the opportunity to influence the direction and detail of design and implementation. Allocating adequate time and resources for participatory analysis and responding to demand-led approaches are important ways to improve participation.

According to Pollnac and Pomeroy (2005), donor-led and top-down projects generally fail to bring sustainable benefits because they do not lead to stakeholder ownership and commitment. Genuine participation (and ownership) is not adequately addressed if the main strategy consists of simply running workshops or briefings to let ‘them’ know what ‘you’ are doing. Pollnac and Pomeroy outlines some practical steps to
achieve more effective participation which includes: ensuring that the ideas for programs/projects are demand-led; ensuring that the design phase is thought of as an investment in a successful outcome and thus given adequate time and other resources; ensuring that the design incorporates specific activities and resources needed to implement participatory strategies; clearly defining who/which groups are expected to participate and who will benefit (a stakeholder analysis and a gender analysis); clearly defining what type and level of participation is to be achieved (from simple consultation through to full ownership of decision-making); and ensuring that key team members are appropriately skilled in participatory approaches.

2.4.4 Donor Policies

Donor policies can be important because they influence how contracts are prepared, the duration of funding, and what is funded. OECD report (1989) identified important donor policies related factors that affect project sustainability. These included:

Planning horizon, delivery and contracting mechanisms and operation and maintenance costs

1. Planning Horizon

It is now widely recognized that the usual three to five year planning horizon for development programs and projects is often inadequate in terms of promoting sustainable benefits, particularly when behavioural and institutional change are included in the objectives or if there are multiple local agencies involved or a wide geographical spread. Open-ended commitments are not appropriate; however, phasing implementation over a longer period is a management strategy which may support sustainable benefits. Phasing requires that goals and objectives are clear from the beginning and that there are clear decision points at the end of each phase. Where there is uncertainty about local policy, capacity or commitment then an initial pilot
phase, which may lead on to a number of subsequent phases, should be more the rule than the exception (White, Salamanca and Courtney 2002).

2. Delivery and Contracting Mechanisms

A strong sense of local ownership and genuine participation in design by both men and women are critical to successful implementation and sustainable benefits. However, donor policies on how their aid program is designed and delivered can work against this. According to Francis (2001), the key concerns include: i) Design process; Designs which are expected to result in sustainable benefits should build on local demand and initiatives. This requires that the stakeholders (that is; the beneficiaries and local personnel) play a core role in the identification and design process. Hence, adequate time must be given for all stakeholders to meaningfully participate. Design missions should therefore be appropriately phased over an extended time-line (that is; one mission of three to four weeks is not usually adequate for larger more complex projects). More ‘up front’ time for design is not the only answer; an extended inception phase and allowance for a ‘progressive design’ process during implementation (using annual planning procedures to restructure the program/project scope) are practical responses to this issue. ii) Team selection; the professionalism and inter-personal skills (expatriate or locally engaged) is an important factor in sustainability. Selection policies and criteria should therefore ensure that as broad a labour market as possible is tapped and that the best consultants are selected. Position descriptions and team composition should not be overly restrictive and thus exclude potential candidates with other highly desirable professional or inter-personal skills. iii) Contract structures; Contracts that focus on the detail of the contractor’s outputs and inputs rather than on the purpose or outcome can impede efforts to achieve sustainability. Development is a dynamic and often
high-risk activity, it is therefore important that designs have flexibility and can lead to contracting approaches that allow field-level managers to respond quickly to changing circumstances and which encourages them to keep sustainable benefits in mind. iv) monitoring and reporting; Monitoring and reporting frameworks based on log-frames should look beyond the contracted activity and output levels and incorporate regular assessment of the movement towards achieving sustainable outcomes. v) Partner selection; The government-to-government nature of bilateral aid programs requires that high-level (national) aid coordination mechanisms be put in place. However, when programs and projects are being implemented in partnership with provincial or district agencies or communities, it is important for sustainability that donors have agreements with this level of government that documents their roles and responsibilities, and that there are appropriate channels for delivering resources and receiving feedback. This is particularly important when national level agency capacity is weak and is a bottleneck to effective communication and timely action on the ground.

3. Operation and Maintenance costs

Donor funding policies often focus on new capital investments to the exclusion of supporting operation and maintenance budgets. This can have adverse effects on sustainability, particularly in economies undergoing severe internal budget deficit problems. New capital projects require additional operation and maintenance funds that have to be drawn from the same limited pool of funds that finance other ongoing programs. As a consequence, either the new investment is not maintained or existing infrastructure or services suffer funding cuts. A longer-term and more transitional approach to operation and maintenance cost funding is required, based on a rigorous and realistic assessment of the local capacity to meet these costs. The project
managements need to consider whether or not some assets should be maintained or replaced (i.e. computers which rapidly become obsolete), and whether project-specific depreciation funds should be set up. This would help a great deal in cost maintenance and this would ensure the project become sustainable in the long run.

2.4.5 Management Structures of the Projects

1. Management Structures and Local Capacity

According to Natasha (2003), programs and projects which integrate with, and build on, local management structures have better prospects for promoting sustainability of benefits than those which establish new or parallel structures. The capacity of local agencies to manage (or absorb) new structures, systems, ideas and funds is often not adequately assessed, and over-optimistic assumptions can be made. Getting the management structure ‘right’ requires an adequate institutional analysis during the project design phase and this requires specific knowledge, skills and field time.

Expatriate technical assistance (ETA) is a common input of the aid programs and projects; how expatriate TA work with their counterparts and colleagues can have a major influence on the prospects for sustainability. Their departure should not presage any significant weakening of key program/project supported benefits. Practical strategies to avoid weakening include: locating counterpart and expatriate team members in the same office; emphasizing teamwork approaches; having specific sustainability strategies in place, including a phase-out strategy, well before the completion of donor funded assistance; clearly defining ‘advisory’ and ‘executive’ roles; limiting the number of expatriates to the necessary minimum; ensuring that short-term TA is not conducted on a ‘hit and run’ basis; if possible, identifying multiple counterparts per expatriate rather than only one or two; and working with
counterparts who are in existing line positions rather than in newly created ‘project’ positions.

2. Administrative systems

Program and project designs must take adequate account of the capacity of local administrative systems to support staff and service delivery. For example: if local staff are not getting paid regularly, are not paid a living wage, travel allowances are not available, and their performance is not rewarded in any way, then their ability and willingness to work on program/project activities must be assessed accordingly. While projects may then ‘intervene’ by providing special incentives, sustainable outcomes are unlikely in such situations. Programs and project can only set realistic objectives in light of such practical constraints.

3. Flexibility in, and phasing of, implementation

Competent managerial leadership should be encouraged to guide adaptations and achieve sustainable outcomes. Donor supported programs and projects must be designed and managed so that they permit some flexibility in implementation. Designs must sometimes be phased and allowed to evolve as lessons are learnt, field-level managers must be able to respond quickly to changing needs and priorities, and administrative or financial management procedures must not be made burdensome.

4. Awareness and Training

The provision of appropriate training for identified target groups (government, NGOs, communities or private sector) is often a key strategy for achieving sustainable benefits. To improve the prospects for sustainability it should start at the right time (i.e. not near the end), be conducted throughout the program or project, and allow for repetition. While the most appropriate type of training will depend partly on the nature of individual programs and projects, experience indicates that certain
approaches are more likely to achieve sustainable benefits than others. Effective training should not only ‘educate’ but also motivate; trainees must be selected on merit, include both men and women, and be of direct relevance to their work. Trainees must also be given the opportunity to apply newly acquired skills on completion of training. In-country training, such as on-the job training, mentoring and short-course competency based training are more likely to support more sustainable benefits than overseas courses or long-term ‘academic’ training for a few. In cases where counterparts are transferred or leave over time, training must also be repeated and refresher courses given if the required skill base is to be sustained throughout.

5. Information Dissemination and Networking

Generating an understanding of, and support for, a program or project’s objectives among a wide group of stakeholders should be a component of any sustainability strategy. Such awareness needs to start early in the design phase. During implementation it can include the use of many types of different media and group events. Workshops, seminars, newsletters, personal contacts/lobbying, community meetings and the use of electronic media (radio, TV and web-sites) can all play a role in mobilizing political, administrative and community support. Establishing more formal institutional linkages with various agencies (e.g. medical or teacher training colleges) can also form part of an effective sustainability Strategy.

2.5 Review of Previous Studies

Rono (2008) in her study on financial sustainability of NGOs projects in Nairobi revealed that dependence on donor funding was high with low utilization of internal resources, with use of the services offered to provide a descent return lacking.
Khan and Hare (2005) pointed out that for an NGO funded project to be sustainable it has to develop a sound institutional base, a strong programmatic approach, and sufficient funds. At the institutional level, the NGO needs to establish the internal systems, structure, and work culture that promote strong leadership and positive organizational image, foster the belief that people are willing to support products and services they find valuable, and facilitate the development plans for sustainability. At the program level, the NGO needs to carefully analyze the market and encourage community participation at all stages from design through implementation to evaluation of the program in order to offer quality service at reasonable prices. At the financial level, the NGO needs to have systems and strategies for generating adequate levels of finance and managing these resources well. It requires a good grasp of the nature and level of its costs and preparedness to sustain its programs through a combination of cost reduction, cost recovery, and leveraging support from the community and donors.

They noted that for the NGO to be financially sustainable, it must have financial systems and procedures that provide clear and timely accounts of the financial position of the organization, reduce the costs of providing services, recover costs of service provision from clients and community, raise resources through institutional earnings and use assets to attract and leverage resources from the community, the government, and divers donors.

Nturibi (2004), in his study of family programmes promotion services on Integrated Community Care and Support Project in Kenya established that the level of sustainability of income generating activities often depends on perceived and actual
returns to the beneficiaries i.e. orphans, grandparents giving care, project implementers community health workers and committee members. He established that although the proceeds are primarily meant to assist the first group, all the others also expect to benefit. Unfortunately the magnitude of the projects initiated mostly does not allow for this, due to the fact that the products are sold in fairly poor neighbourhoods. Kotler (2006) defined product as anything that can be offered to satisfy a need or want. A product can consist of as many as three components; physical good(s), service(s) and idea(s).

According to Asian Development Bank (ADB, 2004), there are three aspects of financial sustainability. These are the availability of adequate funds to finance project expenditures, especially funds drawn from the government budget, the recovery of some of the project costs from the project beneficiaries, and the financial incentive necessary to ensure participation in the project. Consequently, a financial plan at constant financial prices is necessary to ensure there will be adequate funds to finance project expenditures. This applies to the implementation period to ensure capital funds are available to cover investment and working capital requirements, and to the operating period to ensure sufficient funds to cover operating expenditures. For indirectly productive projects that do not generate sufficient funds to cover operating expenditures, the full fiscal impact of the project for each year of its life should be calculated. The financial requirement becomes a fiscal requirement, and steps should be taken to ensure that the government commits adequate funds for operational purposes. Directly productive projects will also impact on the government budget, through tax revenues and concessions, and the net budget effect also can be
calculated. The fiscal impact calculations should be linked to policy discussions over the extent and scale of user charges, operators' fees, and tax revenues.

According to Amott, (2003) foundations that receive funds from a single donor, especially when they're not in the form of an endowment, can leave a foundation highly vulnerable. Foundations and NGOs are increasingly recognizing that earned income from the sale of products, services, or intellectual property can be an additional source of operational funding that complements other fundraising tactics while helping to build organizational sustainability. Having discretionary funds from earned income allows a foundation to invest in programs for which it is otherwise difficult to raise donor funds. These may be activities that potential donors perceive to be higher risk. Moreover, simply earning income does not guarantee financial sustainability for an organization. It is perhaps not surprising then that few foundations around the world have taken significant advantage of market approaches to earning income, which provides an excellent overview of the considerations involved in practicing earned income as a fundraising strategy (Schneider and Gilson 1997).

International donors can support capacity building by allocating part of their resources to institutional development of the foundations they're seeking to support or channel funds through. Natasha (2003) makes a plea for this in Indonesia, arguing that donors need to "support the building of both management and delivery capacities of civil society organizations, but in a judicious and targeted manner". The result of this complex reality is that emerging and existing indigenous foundations in developing
countries will have to continue exploring new paths to building financial sustainability.

In Kenya the sharp deterioration in economic performance worsened the poverty situation in the country as outlined in the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ERSWEC) report 2003-2007. The number of people living in poverty was estimated to have risen from 11 million or 48 per cent of the population in 1990 to 17 million or 56 per cent of the population in 2002 (GoK, 2003). This called for a concerted effort aimed at poverty alleviation. This was in form of private-public partnerships geared at improving the standards of living of the locals manly through rural projects initiation (GoK, 2001). The need for sustaining the initiated projects is therefore inherent.

2.6 Conceptual Framework

This section discusses the conceptual framework for analyzing the factors affecting sustainability of donor funded development projects in Kenya. These factors are as follows; project financial systems, technology adoption, level of stakeholders and target groups involvement, donor policies and management structures which are the indicators of sustainability. These formed the independent variables of the study. The conceptual model is a conceptualization in functional form of how the independent variables affect the dependent variable which is sustainability of donor funded projects as shown in figure 2.1.
2.7 Chapter Summary

Despite the existing challenges, the donor agencies are involved in a lot of development-oriented work in all parts of the country. In arid and semi-arid areas, most of the projects have mainly been of the welfare type, feeding the hungry in Northern Kenya, providing food and blankets to victims of fire and tribal clashes, handicrafts, training, water and health projects, where these facilities are not available. A close scrutiny of these projects, however, shows that very little attention has gone into questioning the root causes of the problems they attempt to alleviate and the sustainability of the projects meant to help the poor to continue with their day to day life. Past studies on development projects have not sufficiently addressed the factors affecting the sustainability of the donor funded projects especially in arid and semi-arid areas. The government in its current economic recovery strategy expects donors to help in raising the economic growth rate by about 7% yet there are many projects
started by donors which have close down like the World Concerns (WC) micro-credit program in 2007 for lack of sustainability. Therefore, this situation poses a gap hence the need for further research. There is, therefore, need to devise ways and means of maintaining and improving donor funded development projects for the sake of the target beneficially. This study aims at generating new knowledge to guide the donor agencies, stakeholders and target beneficiaries to achieve sustainability of the donor funded development projects.

1.1 Research Objectives

The study objectives are presented in the following way:

1. To determine the major factors that resulted in the failure of donor funded development programs.
2. To establish the role of the stakeholders in donor funded development programs.
3. To suggest ways and means for sustained donor funded development projects.

1.2 Target Population

The target population for this study is the stakeholders of the donor funded development programs. This includes donors, target beneficiaries and the local communities.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter addresses the research methodology that was employed in the study. This includes research design, sampling methodology, target population, data collection, and data analysis.

3.2 Research Design
The study adopted a descriptive research design. According to Cooper and Emory (1995), the objective of the descriptive study is to describe phenomena as it exists at present. A descriptive design was appropriate for this study as it enabled the researcher to investigate the target population and establish the factors under investigation. The study adopted both qualitative and quantitative research approaches.

3.3 Target Population
The target population of this study included all the 11 projects with 206 employees working in all the donor funded projects in Marsabit central district. These will include; UNESCO project, UNEP project, UNICEF project, WFP project, Food for the Hungary International (FH) project, Farm Africa funded project, Red Cross International project, Pastoral Initiative (PISP) project and Central Institute of Freshwater Aquaculture (CIFA) project. Representative samples were drawn from each of these projects.
3.4 Sampling Strategy

Stratified and purposive sampling techniques were used in this study. In stratified sampling, the donor funded projects were treated as strata from which a sample was drawn using purposive sampling method. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) purposive sampling is a sampling technique that allows a researcher to get cases that have the required information with respect to the objectives of the study. This was appropriate due to the non-homogeneity of the donor funded projects in terms of Management sizes, number of staff in each project and nature of products offered by the projects. Through purposive sampling, the study focused on the following personnel in each project: project managers, finance managers, project accountants, technical staff and IT staff where applicable. These helped the study to achieve the needed information. A purposive sample of 46 respondents was drawn from all strata/categories which represented 22% of the target population. The sample size is summarized in table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONOR FUNDED PROJECTS</th>
<th>Number of projects</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sampling proportion</th>
<th>Targeted Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food for the Hungary International (FH) Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsabit Catholic Diocese Development Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross International Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Initiative (PISP) funded Projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Institute of Freshwater Aquaculture (CIFA) funded Projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>206</strong></td>
<td><strong>22%</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Data Collection Tools and Techniques

3.5.1 Data Types and Instruments

The study utilized primary data which was both qualitative and quantitative data. This data was collected through administration of questionnaires. A questionnaire was designed to capture the various variables of the study. The questionnaire had both open-ended and closed questions covering issues on the project sustainability. Open-ended questions permitted free responses from the respondents, without providing or suggesting any structure for the replies. The closed questions enabled the researcher to analyze data easily using the stated alternatives. These alternatives were designed in such a way as to be simple for the respondents to understand. Questionnaires was chosen because they helped the researcher to collect large amount of information in a large area within a short period of time (Orodho, 2003). The questionnaire was self-administered. In some cases it was dropped and picked latter or where the respondents were available it was dropped and picked immediately.

3.5.2 Data Collection Techniques

The researcher collected primary data through field research. An introductory letter from Kenyatta University and permission to carry out research in the target projects was obtained to enable the researcher to administer questionnaires to the target respondents. The researcher re-assured the respondents about the confidentiality of their feedback. This encouraged the respondents to be honest. Brief follow-up interviews were also held with the respondents in order to elicit more information or clarifications on data submitted in the questionnaire. This ensured the validity of the data collected.
3.6 Data Processing and Analysis

The data was analyzed using both qualitative and quantitative techniques. This involved generation of descriptive statistics such as percentages, and measures of central tendency. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) aided in generating descriptive statistics and to establish the relationship between the dependent and the independent variables of study. The scaled types of questions were analyzed descriptively through the likert scale based on the various attributes provided in the questions. The research findings were presented using frequency tables, percentages, cross-tabulations, pie charts and bar graphs.

3.7 Chapter Summary

The chapter highlighted the methodology that was adopted in the study. Key section of the chapter included; research design, target population, sampling strategy, data collection tools and techniques and data analysis techniques.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to establish the factors affecting sustainability of donor funded projects in Marsabit Central District in Kenya. Among the factors investigated included; project financial systems, technology adoption, level of stakeholders and target groups involvement, donor policies and management structures. The study targeted all the employee working in donor funded projects in Marsabit Central District whereby a sample of 41 respondents were selected based on the sampling matrix presented in the previous chapter. The data was presented in form of frequency tables, pie-charts, and percentages where applicable.

4.2 Demographic Information

4.2.1 Response Rate

This study had targeted a total of 46 respondents which was computed as shown in the sampling matrix in table 3.1. However, due to the study limitations, only 41 responses were achieved which represents 89.1% response rate. This formed the basis for the analysis presented in this chapter. This is shown in table 4.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1: Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2009)
4.2.2 Respondents Position against Gender

Table 4.2 shows a cross tabulation of respondents position versus Gender. The finding show that majority of the respondents (39.0%) were Project Managers with most of them being females as accounted by 24.4% of the respondents. Male project managers accounted for 14.6% as show in table 4.2. Table 4.2 also shows that male respondents were 63.4% and female respondents were 36.6%.

Table 4.2: Respondents Position versus Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Position</th>
<th>Gender of the respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Administrator</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2009)

4.2.3 Respondents Position and Age Category

Majority of the respondents (39.0%) were Project Managers within the age category of 30 to 39 years as accounted by 17.1% of the respondents. These were followed by Accountants who accounted for 24.4% of the respondents. Other details are as shown in table 4.3. Table 4.3 also shows that majority of the respondents were between the ages of 30 to 49 years as accounted by 85.4% of the respondents and few were in the age category of 20 to 29 years and above 50 years as accounted by 14.6% of the respondents.
### Table 4.3: Respondents Position versus Age category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Position</th>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29 years</td>
<td>30 to 39 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Data, (2009)

### 4.2.4 Respondents Position and Duration of work

Most of the respondents (39%) were project managers who had worked in the donor funded projects for between 3 to 5 years as accounted by 17.1% of the respondents. Those project managers who had worked for above 5 years accounted for 12.2% as shown in table 4.4. This shows that most of the key staff were experienced with the donor funded projects since they have been in these projects for more than three years. Table 4.4 also shows that majority of the had worked with the projects for more than 3 years as accounted by 58.6% of the respondents and few had worked for less than three years as accounted by 41.4% of the respondents.
Table 4.4: Respondents Position versus Duration of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Position</th>
<th>Duration of work</th>
<th>Less than 6 months</th>
<th>Between 6 months to 1 years</th>
<th>Between 1 to 3 years</th>
<th>Between 3 to 5 years</th>
<th>Above 5 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Administrator</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2009)

4.2.5 Respondents Position and Highest Level of Education

Majority of the respondents had attained undergraduate level of education as accounted 36.6% of the respondents. However most of the project managers had attained tertiary collage education as accounted by 22.0% of the respondents. This is shown in table 4.5. This shows that most of the key personnel in the donor funded project had attained a high level of education (that is; tertiary and university levels) as accounted by 95.2% of respondents and few had primary level of education as accounted by 4.9% of the respondents.
Table 4.5: Respondents Position versus level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Position</th>
<th>Highest level of education</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Tertiary college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Administrator</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the Total</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2009)

4.3 Project Sustainability

4.3.1 Donor Funded Project Sustainability

The findings presented in table 4.6 show that majority of the respondents (95.1%) had a long-term vision and goals for the project and its partners only 4.9% of the respondents had no long-term vision and goals for the project. According to 95.1% of the respondents, most projects had strategies in place to obtain additional funding and support. In addition, the findings showed that majority of the respondents had project promotion and marketing plan for raising awareness of the project and updating and disseminating its products as accounted for by 82.9%. This shows that most projects had strategies in place for project promotion and marketing plan to raise awareness of the project activities as well as update and disseminate its products. This was a step...
forward towards enhancing donor funded project sustainability. However, these findings were consistent with the study by Khan and Hare (2005) as reviewed in the literature. Khan and Hare (2005) study pointed out that for a funded project to be sustainable it has to develop a sound institutional base, a strong programmatic approach, and sufficient funds. This study established the most donor funded projects had strategies in place to obtain additional funding and support which was geared towards establishing sound financial base for their operation.

Table 4.6: Project Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency (N=41)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long term vision for the partners</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding and support strategies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project promotions and marketing plans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2009)

4.3.2 Major Source of Income

The study established that the major source of income for the project was mainly NGO/CBOs funding as accounted for by 41.5%. Other sources of additional funding are shown in table 4.7. This shows that most projects had strategies in place to obtain additional funding which was also a reinforcement of the Khan and Hare (2005) study as explained in the above sub section 4.3.1.
Table 4.7: Major Source of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major source of income</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local fund raising</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO/CBOs funding</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self sustenance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government funded</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International organizations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Project Financial Systems

The study sought to establish the extent to which the existing project financial systems affect sustainability of donor funded projects. Among the issues captured in this objective included; financial reporting, Auditing of the books of accounts, frequency of Auditing and the effect of financial systems on sustainability.

4.4.1 Financial Reporting

The study sought to establish the status of financial reporting as well as the errors experienced during financial reporting. According to majority of the respondents, most projects followed Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) as accounted by 75.6% and 56.1% of the respondents respectively. More than half of the respondent (53.7%) acknowledged that they did not encounter some errors in their financial reporting and those who experienced errors accounted for 46.3%, as shown in table 4.8. This show that despite the fact that GAAP and IFRS were followed when preparing financial statements, some errors were however inherent in their reporting hence the need for accuracy in project financial reporting. Some of the sources of errors cited by the respondents included; errors in data capture, different uses of accounting concepts
such as historical cost and present value cost, adoption of different methods of depreciation among others.

Table 4.8: Financial Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally Accepted Accounting Principles</td>
<td>31 75.6%</td>
<td>10 24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Financial Reporting Standards</td>
<td>23 56.1%</td>
<td>18 43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience error during Financial Reporting</td>
<td>19 46.3%</td>
<td>22 53.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2009)

4.4.2 Audit of the Books of Accounts

The findings in table 4.9 showed that majority of the projects' books of accounts were audited as accounted by 95.1%, only 4.9% of the respondents said their projects books of accounts were not audited at all. In addition, the study sought to establish how frequent the books of accounts were audited. The findings showed that majority of the projects were audited annually as accounted for by 53.8%. Those audited Monthly, Quarterly, Semi-Annually and occasionally accounted for 7.7%, 12.8% 20.5% and 5.1% respectively. This shows that most of the projects' books of accounts were audited but the frequency of audit was quite low since it was done once a year. This low frequency of audit is attributed to the dynamics of the projects and the duration of different project activities conducted as well as the structure of the donor funds which are released in specified intervals based on the activities hence making accounting and auditing process difficult during implementation time.
Table 4.9: Auditing of Books of Accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditing of Books of Accounts (N=41)</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (N)</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Auditing (N=39)</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi Annually</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (N)</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2009)

4.4.3 Financial Systems and Project Sustainability

The study sought to establish the extent to which the respondent agreed or disagreed with the fact that financial systems affect the sustainability of the project. The findings showed that majority of the respondents (56.1%) disagreed with the fact that financial systems affect the sustainability of the projects. Neutral, strongly disagree and strongly agree responses accounted for 22%, 12.2% and 9.8% respectively as shown in figure 4.1. This shows that financial systems in the existing donor funded projects was not a major factor affecting the sustainability of the projects. These finding were however consistent with Nturibi (2004) as reviewed in the literature review. He stated that for a development project to be financially sustainable, it requires reliable sources of funding, financial systems to facilitate accountability and cash flow projections and development of marketable products to generate excess income over the expenditure of the project.
4.5 Technology Adoption

The study sought to establish the effect of technology adoption on the sustainability of donor funded projects in Marsabit Central District.

4.5.1 Computerization of Project Operations

The study sought to establish the project operations that were computerized at the time of the study. The study established that most of the projects’ operations were computerized. These included; Accounting system (78.0%), Record Management (63.4%), Communication (63.4%), Administration (66.7%) and Technical Operation (60.6%). This is shown in table 4.10. Those who responded otherwise did not give the reasons as to why some of the operations were not computerized.
Table 4.10: Computerized Project Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Computerized</th>
<th>Not Computerized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting system (N=41)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Management (N =41)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (N = 41)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (N =33)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Operation (N =33)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2009)

4.5.2 Adequacy of Information system

The study further sought to establish the adequacy of the existing information systems in the donor funded projects. The findings showed that majority of the respondents (63.4%) rated the existing project information system as adequate. Very adequate, very inadequate and inadequate responses accounted for 26.8%, 4.9% and 4.9% respectively as shown in figure 4.2. This shows that the existing information systems in the donor funded projects were adequate. However the inadequate rating was attributed to the nature of the information system which was blamed for its slow speed, inadequate computers in the projects and unreliable power supply in the region. The slow speed of the information system was as a result of the geographical nature/remoteness of the projects site. The projects locations were not properly served by adequate telecommunication network hence slow speeds of the information systems.
Figure 4.2: Adequacy of Information System

Adequacy of Information System

- Very Inadequate: 4.9%
- Inadequate: 4.9%
- Adequate: 63.4%
- Very Adequate: 26.8%

Source: Field Data, (2009)

4.5.2 Effect of Technology Adoption on Project Sustainability

The respondents rated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the fact that technology adoption affect sustainability of the donor funded projects. The findings in figure 4.3 showed that majority of the respondents disagreed with the fact that technology adoption affect sustainability of the project as accounted for by 82.9% (strongly disagree and disagree) cumulative responses. Agree and Neutral responses accounted for 9.8% and 7.3% respectively. This shows that technology adoption was not a major factor affected sustainability of the donor funded project in Marsabit Central District. These findings were attributed to the realization by the present day donors on the need and the importance of technology in project implementation process. However they were faced by environmental challenges such as inadequate power supply as well as poor telecommunication networks.
4.6 Stakeholders and Target Groups Involvement

The study sought to determine the effects of stakeholders and target groups involvement and participation on the sustainability of donor funded projects. Major issues captured included; Level of participation and involvement of stakeholder and target beneficiaries, project ownership, level of commitment of stakeholder and target beneficiaries and effects of withdrawal of donor funding.

4.6.1 Level of Participation and Involvement

The respondents were asked to rate the level of involvement and participation of various stakeholders and target beneficiaries in the projects. A five-point likert scale (comprising of greatly, fairly, low, very low, not involved at all) was used and the findings are as presented in the table 4.11. The findings showed that the Government (40.0%) and community groups (67.5%) were greatly involved in the projects while the private sector was fairly (45.0%) involved in the project. This shows that the
donor funded projects in Marsabit Central District have mostly involved the Government and community groups.

Table 4.11: Level of Participation and Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Greatly %</th>
<th>Fairly %</th>
<th>low %</th>
<th>Very low %</th>
<th>Not Involved at all %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community groups</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2009)

4.6.2 Project Ownership and Decision Making

The respondent were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the various stated statement as relate to stakeholders and target groups involvement and participation in the project. A five-point likert scale (comprising of Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly Disagree) was used and the findings are as presented in the table 4.12. The findings showed that majority of the respondents agreed with the following statements; The project is owned by Beneficiaries, the project is owned by Stakeholders, Target beneficiaries are involved in decision making and stakeholders are involved in decision making as accounted by 77%, 74.4%, 79.2%, 76.9% (strongly agree and agree) cumulative responses. This show that the project is owned by both the target beneficiaries and Stakeholders and that they are also involved in decision making process. This was a step forward toward enhancing project sustainability. These findings are in line with the literature review especially the study done by Pomeroy and Carlos (1997), who identified the role played by the stakeholders and target groups and their participation in the project activities as one of the critical factors in promoting sustainability of the project.
Table 4.12: Project Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is owned by Beneficiaries</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is owned by Stakeholders</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target beneficiaries are involved in decision making</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders are involved in decision making</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2009)

The respondent outlines the various effects of stakeholders and target groups involvement and participation on the sustainability of the target projects. According to the respondents, involvement and participation of stakeholders and target beneficiaries does the following; promotes ownership of the project, enhance resources mobilization, ensures planning is participatory, provides oversight and feedback mechanism to the project, ensure success and failure are shared together and enhance smooth take over and maintenance of the projects operation.

4.6.3 Level of Commitment of Stakeholder and Target Beneficiaries

The study sought to assess the level of commitment of stakeholder and target beneficiaries in the project. The findings presented in figure 4.4 shows that the stakeholder and target beneficiaries committed in the project implementation accounted for 63.4 % of the respondents. Very committed and less committed responses accounted for 31.7% and 4.9% respectively. This shows that most stakeholder and target beneficiaries are committed in the project implementation. This is in line Pollnac and Pomeroy (2005), study reviewed in the literature who asserted
that donor-led and top-down projects generally fail to bring sustainable benefits because they do not lead to stakeholder ownership and commitment.

**Figure 4.4: Level of Commitment**
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Source: Field Data, (2009)

### 4.6.4 Effects of Withdrawal of Donor Funding

The study sought to assess the effect of withdrawal of donor funding to the donor funded project in the study region. According to majority of the respondents (68.3%), withdrawal of donor funding would affect significantly the running of project. Continue normally and cease operation responses accounted for 19.5% and 12.2% respectively as shown in figure 4.5. This showed that most project were not self-sustaining after the withdrawal of the donor funding hence the need to design mechanisms to enhance project sustainability.
4.7 Donor Policies

The study sought to find out the extent to which donor policies affected the sustainability of donor funded projects in the target region. Key issues addressed in this section included; Effectiveness of various donor policies and effect of donor policies on the project sustainability.

4.7.1 Effectiveness of Various Donor Policies

The respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of the stated donor policies in enhancing sustainability of the projects. A five-point Likert scale (comprising of very effective, effective, ineffective, very ineffective, do not know) was used and the findings are as shown in table 4.13. The findings show that contracts preparation, duration of funding, donor planning horizon and operation and maintenance costs policies were rated as ineffective by majority of the respondents as accounted by 52.5%, 65%, 61.5% and 61.6% (ineffective and very ineffective) cumulative responses. This showed that most of the donor policies in place were ineffective hence...
not supportive to project sustainability. These findings are consistent with the literature review since this study found out that the contracts preparation and donor planning horizon were ineffective. In the literature review, Francis (2001) identified one of the key concerns in the donor policies as the Contract structures which he supposes should focus on the detail of the contractor’s outputs and inputs rather than on the purpose or outcome since these can impede efforts to achieve sustainability.

Table 4.13: Effectiveness of Various Donor Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Policies</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracts Preparation</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of funding</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Planning horizon</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance costs</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2009)

4.7.2 Effect of Donor Policies on the Project Sustainability

The respondent rated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the fact that donor policies affect the sustainability of the project. A five point likert scale showed that majority of the respondents agreed with the fact that donor policies affected the sustainability of the project as showed in table 4.14. This shows that the existing donor policies hindered the sustainability of the projects. The literature review did don’t establish any study that was addressing the issue of effect of donor Policies and project sustainability for the donor funded project hence this study filled this gap.
Table 4.14: Effect of Donor Policies on the Project Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Neutral %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor policies affect the sustainability of this project</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2009)

4.8 Management Structures

The study sought to establish how the management structures in place affect the sustainability of donor funded projects. Key issues addressed included: Management Styles adopted and their effectiveness, Project Staffing and Staff competency.

4.8.1 Management Styles Adopted and their Effectiveness

The findings presented in figure 4.6 shows that majority of the projects managers (58.5%) adopted a lassier faire management style which means that most employees worked with minimum interference from the management. Democratic, Open door policies and a combination of both lassier faire and democratic responses accounted for 9.8%, 19.5% and 12.2%. This show that most manager adopted lassier faire management style. In addition, the study assessed the effectiveness of the management style adopted by the project managers in the various donor funded projects. The findings presented in figure 4.7 shows that the Management Style Adopted was ineffective to the running of the project as accounted by 63.4% of the respondents. This shows that the style adopted was not effective hence not sustainable for the project.
4.8.2 Effects of Management styles on Project Sustainability

The findings in figure 4.8 show that majority of the respondents agreed with the fact that management styles adopted in the project affect the project sustainability after...
withdrawal of donor support as accounted by 83% (strongly agree and agree) cumulative responses. Those who disagreed accounted for 12.2% cumulative responses. This shows that the management styles adopted in the project has an effect on the project sustainability after withdrawal of donor support.

According to the respondents the adoption of laisser faire management style was mainly abused by most employees since they were involved in doing their own business at the expense of the project. The employees also misused the management style since there were no internal controls to govern the project implementation.

**Figure 4.8: Effects of Management styles on Sustainability**
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**Source:** Field Data, (2009)

### 4.8.3 Project Staffing

The findings showed that most of the staff had acquired training related to their job and that the training acquired was adequate for job effectiveness as accounted for by 90.2% and 80.5% respectively. However, depth chart that lists individuals who can
step in and/or contingency plans for key personnel were found missing in most of the projects as accounted by 65.9%. This is shown in table 4.10.

Table 4.15: Staff Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended any Training related to the job</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of training for job Effectiveness</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depth chart that lists individuals who can step in and/or contingency plans for key personnel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2009)

4.8.4 Staff Competency

The respondents rated the overall staff competency in the project. The findings show that most project staffs were competent in their work as accounted for by 56.1% cumulative responses. Incompetent response accounted for 43.9% as shown in figure 4.9. This shows that most project employees in the donor funded projects were competent in their jobs.

Figure 4.9: Overall Staff Competency

Source: Field Data, (2009)
Staff Training and Project Sustainability

The respondent rated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the fact that staff training affected the sustainability of donor funded projects. A five point likert scale showed that majority of the respondents (87.8% disagree and strongly disagree cumulative) disagreed with the fact that staff training affected the sustainability of donor funded projects. Those who agreed with the fact that staff training affected the sustainability of donor funded projects accounted for 12.2% as shown in table 4.16. This shows that staff training is not a major factor affecting the sustainability of donor funded projects in Marsabit Central District.

The respondents' comments were that most management of donors funded projects employed staff who were educated and that they had relevant training on their fields of operation. This has helped to increase the efficiency and effectiveness in the project operations. Other respondents were of the view that hiring well trained staff saves the projects time and cost hence increases overall performance therefore making the project sustainable in the long run.

Table 4.16: Effects of Staff Training on Project Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Data, (2009)*
4.9 Chapter Summary

The chapter has presented the analysis and results of the study. The chapter has captured various variables of the study as it sought to answer research questions. Key area of the chapter included; introduction, demographic information, project financial systems, technology adoption, stakeholders and target groups involvement, donor policies and management structures.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
The purpose of this study was to establish the factors affecting sustainability of donor funded projects in Marsabit Central District in Kenya. Among the issues contained in this chapter includes; summary of the findings and conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of the Findings
This study aimed at establishing the factors affecting sustainability of donor funded projects in Marsabit Central District in Kenya. Among the factors investigated included; project financial systems, technology adoption, level of stakeholders and target groups involvement, donor policies and management structures. The study established that majority of the respondents (95.1%) had a long-term vision and goals for the project and its partners. Most projects were however found to have strategies in place to obtain additional funding and support. In addition, the findings showed that majority of the respondents had project promotion and marketing plan for raising awareness of the project and updating and disseminating its products (82.9%). The study established that the major source of income for most projects was mainly NGO/CBOs funding. This shows that most projects had strategies in place to obtain additional funding and support as well as project promotion and marketing plan for raising awareness of the project and updating and disseminating its products. This was a step forward towards enhancing donor funded project sustainability.
5.2.1 Project Financial Systems
The study established that most projects had proper financial system since they followed the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) (75.6%) and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) (56.1%). More than half of the respondent (53.7%) acknowledged that they did not encounter some errors in their financial reporting. Majority of the projects kept proper books of accounts however the frequency of the audit of these books of accounts was low since it was done annually (53.8%). The errors experienced in the project financial reporting could be attributed to the low frequency of the audit of the books of accounts of the project.

5.2.2 Technology Adoption
The study established that most of the projects had adopted the information technology in their operations. Among the key sections that were found computerized in most projects included; Accounting system (78.0%), Record Management (63.4%), Communication (63.4%), Administration (66.7%) and Technical Operation (60.6%) among others. The existing project information system was found to be adequate. technology adoption was therefore not a factor that affected sustainability of the donor funded project in Marsabit Central District.

5.2.3 Stakeholders and Target groups Involvement
The study established that the Government (40.0%) and community groups (67.5%) were greatly involved in the activities of the donor funded projects. the private sector was fairly (45.0%) involved in the project. The projects were found to be owned by Beneficiaries and Stakeholders. In addition, target beneficiaries and stakeholders were directly involved in decision making processes of the projects. The stakeholder and target beneficiaries were found to be committed in the project implementation. This was a step forward toward enhancing project sustainability.
5.2.4 Donor Policies

The respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of the stated donor policies in enhancing sustainability of the projects. The findings showed that contracts preparation, duration of funding, donor planning horizon and operation and maintenance costs policies were ineffective as rated by majority of the respondents which showed that most of the donor policies in place were ineffective hence not supportive to project sustainability.

5.2.5 Management Structures

The findings shown that the management of the most donor funded projects adopted a laissez faire management style (58.5%) which means that most employees worked with minimum interference from the management. In addition, the study assessed the effectiveness of the management style adopted by the project managers in the various donor funded projects. The findings showed that the Management Style adopted by the management was ineffective to the running of the project hence not sustainable for donor funded project. However the findings further shown that most project staff were competent in their work (56.1%) and had acquired the necessary skills needed for effective performance.

5.3 Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to establish the factors affecting sustainability of donor funded projects in Marsabit Central District in Kenya. The study established that most projects had proper financial systems in place since they followed the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). The projects kept proper books of accounts however the frequency of the audit of these books of accounts was low since it was done annually. The errors encountered during financial reporting were however minimal.
The study established that most of the projects had adopted the information technology in their operations. Key sections that were computerized in most projects included; Accounting system, Record Management, Communication, Administration and Technical Operation. However the existing project information systems were found to be adequate.

The study established that the Government (and community groups were greatly involved in the activities of the donor funded projects. The private sector was however fairly involved in the project. In addition, target beneficiaries and stakeholders were directly involved in decision making processes of the projects. The study further established that the projects were owned by Beneficiaries and Stakeholders which was a step forward toward enhancing donor funded project sustainability.

The study established that the existing donor policies were a hindrance to the project sustainability. Among the donor policies that were found to affect most of the projects included; contracts preparation, duration of funding, donor planning horizon and operation and maintenance costs policies. These were very ineffective in enhancing project sustainability.

The study further established that the major management style adopted by most of the management of the projects was laisser faire management style. This meant that employees worked with minimum interference from the management. This style was
however found to ineffective since it was prone to abuse by most of the employees hence not sustainable in the long run.

Finally, the key factors that were found to affect the sustainability of donor funded projects were donor policies and the management systems adopted. The existing financial systems, technology adopted and participation and involvement of target beneficiaries and stakeholders were not key factors that affected the sustainability of the donor funded project in Marsabit Central District.

5.4 Recommendations

From the findings of the study, the following recommendations can be made;

1. There is need to educate and empower the local communities on the sustainability of the project to ensure that they are able to articulate the goals and objectives of the project and push them forward after withdrawal of donor funding. To this regards, the beneficiaries must be consulted during project conception, preparation and implementation processes.

2. Succession planning is however necessary to ensure that the target beneficiaries and the stakeholders are well prepared to effectively run the project after withdrawal of donor support.

3. The project donors need to amend the donor policies to make them user friendly and enhance project sustainability.

4. The donor should assess the target beneficiaries and stakeholder capacity to handle and continue running of the projects. The project handing over should only be done once the donor is fully convinced beyond reasonable doubt that the target beneficiaries and stakeholder have adequate capacity, knowledge
and skills to effectively run the project. This will ensure sustainability of the projects.

5. The frequency of auditing of the projects' books of account need to be increased to either monthly or quarterly. This will ensure rectification of the errors that were found inherent in the projects' financial reports.

5.5 Limitations of the Study

The study faced concealment of information from the respondent since they considered the information sought to be strictly confidential. However the introductory letter plus the permission sought from the relevant authority helped to mitigate this constraint.

5.6 Suggestions for Further Research

A further studies need to focus of the various ways in which the locally available funds such as Constituency Development Fund (CDF) and Local Authority Transfer Fund (LATF) can be utilized to start sustainable projects in the region. Use of locally available funds would reduce overdependence of external donors who have very stringent policies that have to be followed by the local beneficiaries and stakeholders.

The researcher also recommends that similar studies be conducted in other parts of the country to assess the factors affecting sustainability of the donor funded projects and compare the results of other parts of the country with the Marsabit Central District's results.
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Appendix I: Questionnaire for Project Staff

The questionnaire is meant to collect information on the factors affecting sustainability of donor funded projects in Arid and Semi-Arid Areas in Kenya. A case study of Marsabit Central District. Kindly answer the questions by writing a brief statement or ticking in the boxes provided as will be applicable. The information provided will be treated as strictly confidential and at no instance will your name be mentioned in this research.

SECTION ONE: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Gender of the respondent?
   1) Male
   2) Female

2. Respondents position:
   1) Project Manager
   2) Administrator
   3) Accountant
   4) System Administrator
   5) Others (specify)

3. Indicate your Age Category.
   1) Below 20 years
   2) 20-29 years
   3) 30-39 years
   4) 40-49 years
   5) Above 50 years
4. How long have you been working on this project?
   1) Less than 6 months
   2) Between 6 months - 1 years
   3) Between 1-3 years
   4) Between 3-5 years
   5) Above 5 years

5. What is your highest level of education?
   1) Primary
   2) Secondary
   3) Tertiary College
   4) Undergraduate
   5) Postgraduate
   6) Other (specify) ...................

6. Do you have a long-term vision and goals for the project and its partners?
   1) Yes
   2) No

7. Do you have strategies to obtain additional funding and support for the project beyond the time of the original grant?
   1) Yes
   2) No

8. Do you have a project promotion and marketing plan for raising awareness of the project and updating and disseminating its products?
   1) Yes
   2) No
9. Who are the major sources of income for this project?

1) Local fund raising
2) NGO/CBOs funding
3) Self sustenance
4) Government funded
5) Church funding
6) Others (Specify)

Section Two: Factors Affecting Donor Funded Project Sustainability

A) Project Financial Systems

10. Are the following followed during preparation and presentation of financial statements for this project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a GAAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b IFRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Do you experience errors during financial reporting?

1) Yes
2) No

12. If yes above, what are your main sources errors during financial reporting?


13. Are the books of accounts for this project audited?

1) Yes
2) No
14. If yes, how often does the auditing take place?

1) Monthly
2) Quarterly
3) Semi-annually
4) Annually
5) Occasionally

15. To what extent would you agree or disagree with the fact that financial systems affect the sustainability of this project?

1) Strongly agree
2) Agree
3) Neutral
4) Disagree
5) Strongly disagree

B) Technology Adoption

16. How would you rate the adequacy of information system in this project?

1) Very adequate
2) Adequate
3) Inadequate
4) Very inadequate

17. Which of these operations are computerized in this project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>computerized</th>
<th>Not computerized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Accounting system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Record management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Technical operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. (a) To what extent would you agree or disagree technology adoption affect sustainability of this project?

1) Strongly agree 
2) Agree 
3) Neutral 
4) Disagree 
5) Strongly disagree 

(b) Comment on your answer.

______________________________

______________________________

C) Stakeholders and Target groups Involvement and Participation

19. How would you rate the level of involvement and participation of following in this project? Rate as follows: 1 = greatly, 2 = fairly, 3 = low, 4 = very low, 5 = Not involved at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Community groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. To what extent would you agree or disagree with the following statement as relate to stakeholders and target groups involvement and participation in this project? Rate as follows; 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) This project is fully owned by the target beneficiaries of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) This project is fully owned by the stakeholder of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The target beneficiaries of the project are involved in key decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) The project stakeholder are involved in key decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. How would you describe the level of commitment of stakeholder and target beneficiaries to the project?

1) Very committed
2) Committed
3) Less committed
4) Not committed at all

22. What do you think would be the effect of withdrawal of donor funding to this project? The project will..........................

1) Continue normally
2) Cease operations
3) Will be affected significantly
4) No effect at all

23. In your view, what are the effects of stakeholders and target groups involvement and participation on the sustainability of this project?

D) Donor Policies

24. How would you rate the effectiveness of the following donor policies in enhancing sustainability of this project? Rate as follows: 1 = Very effective, 2 = Effective, 3 = ineffective, 4 = very ineffective, 5 = Do not know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Contracts preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Duration of funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Donor Planning horizon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Operation and maintenance costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. To what extent would you agree or disagree with the fact that donor policies affect the sustainability of this project?

1) Strongly agree
2) Agree
3) Neutral
4) Disagree
5) Strongly disagree

E) Management Structures

26. What kind of management styles does the management of this project adopt?

1) Autocratic (dictatorial)
2) Democratic (Employee driven/ Participative)
3) Laisser-faire (minimum interference from mgt.)
4) Open door policy (Freedom of Access)
5) Any other(s) specify ................................................

27. To what extent would you agree or disagree with the fact that management styles adopted in this project will affect the project sustainability after withdrawal of donor support?

1) Strongly agree
2) Agree
3) Neutral
4) Disagree
5) Strongly disagree

28. How would you rate the effectiveness of the management systems adopted in this project?

1) Very effective
2) Effective
3) Ineffective
4) Very ineffective
29. Have you undergone any training related to the job you do in this project?
   1) Yes [ ]
   2) No [ ]

30. Do you think the training you have is adequate to effectively do your job?
   1) Yes [ ]
   2) No [ ]

31. How would you rate the overall level of competency of the staff working in this project?
   1) Very competent [ ]
   2) Competent [ ]
   3) Incompetent [ ]
   4) Not able to rate [ ]

32. Do you have a depth chart that lists individuals who can step in and/or contingency plans for key personnel and partnership changes?
   1) Yes [ ]
   2) No [ ]

33. (a) To what extent would you agree or disagree with the fact that the current levels of staff training affect the sustainability of this project?
   1) Strongly agree [ ]
   2) Agree [ ]
   3) Neutral [ ]
   4) Disagree [ ]
   5) Strongly disagree [ ]
(b) Comment on your answer above.

34. What recommendations would you make to help improve the sustainability of donor funded projects in arid and semi arid areas in Kenya?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR RESPONSES