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Definition of terms

Manager- an individual, who directs the activities of other people in an organization.

Household- A group of family members consisting of the nuclear family

Manyatta – A homestead in a pastoral community consisting of related households.

Outcome- Benefits that are achieved from a project, program or policy. It entails behavioral or organization change.

Millennium Development Goals – Set of development goals of the international community to meet by 2030 as a result of active participation of developed and developing countries alike.

Poverty – state of being deprived of a valuable thing that a person can do or be.

Non Governmental Organizations – independent development organizations existing apart from governments and corporations operating on a non-profit basis with emphasis on voluntarism in providing development services.

Organization – It is a systematic arrangement of people brought together to accomplish some specific purpose

Effectiveness – The degree to which objectives are achieved and the extent to which targeted problems are solved.

Empowerment – Is the process of increasing capacity of individuals or groups to make choices and to transform these choices into desired actions and outcomes.

Development – It is the use of scientific and technical knowledge to meet specific objectives or requirement.
Abstract

Governmental as well as non-governmental organizations have put and are putting a lot of efforts in poverty eradication projects globally in general and Kenya in particular. This is aimed at reducing poverty, improving the quality of people’s lives, ensuring environmental sustainability and building partnership to ensure that globalization becomes a positive force to all world people (UNDP, 2003). The implementation of these projects therefore becomes complete with realization of set goals and objectives. Pastoral Integrated Support Programme (PISP) is one of the many non-governmental organizations that work in Marsabit district. It seeks to strengthen resource management and pastoral economic system by promoting community empowerment and strengthening social wellbeing. It is from this goal that PISP started implementing water and sanitation project from 2003 in Maikona and Kargi areas aimed at providing safe drinking water for humans and livestock as well as building latrines to enhance sanitation.

This study therefore aimed at investigation of challenges affecting effective implementation of poverty alleviation projects by PISP in Marsabit district. The specific objectives of the study were; to determine the influence of participation of stakeholders to effective implementation of water and sanitation project, to find out the extent that community awareness of project goals and implementation procedures affect effective implementation of the project, to establish the effect of pastoralism to effective implementation of water and sanitation project and to examine the relationship between project sustainability and its effects in implementation of poverty alleviation projects.

Descriptive research was used for the study with both primary and secondary data being collected. This was done by use of two sets of questionnaires; one for the project implementing agency and the other for the beneficiaries. Data was then analyzed by use of descriptive statistical methods then presented by use of tables, charts and graphs. It was found out that the following factors affected effective implementation of poverty eradication projects by Pastoral Integration Support Programme; participation of stakeholders’ in project implementation, community awareness of project goals, pastoral nature of the community and the sustainability of the project.

Due to PISP putting into consideration these factors, there was effective implementation of poverty eradication projects. This was because stakeholders were involved in project implementation after being made aware of project goals. Also, the community pastoral nature was considered which made project sustainable. Further research should be carried out on similar projects carried out by PISP to find out if are affected by the above factors and also reasons that inhibit more stakeholder participation in projects.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.0: Overview

This chapter encompasses the background information, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study and the scope. It also covers the study assumptions and limitations.

1.1: Background information

Individuals, governments, non-governmental organizations, corporations, policy-makers, multinational organizations have a role in transforming the potential of global resources for poverty reduction. According to UN Human Development Report (2006), poverty is a denial of choices and opportunities, the lack of basic capacity to participate effectively in society. It is not having enough to feed and clothe a family, not having a school or clinic to go to; not having the land on which to grow one’s food or job to earn one’s living. It also includes insecurity, powerlessness of households and communities, and susceptibility to violence and living in marginal or fragile environments without access to clean water or sanitation. The report also explains that poverty is hindrance to human development. It concerns health, life expectancy, diet, shelter, education, security, access to vital resources and other aspects of living standards.

According to Millennium Development Goals global monitoring report (2007), poverty is wide spread. By the one-dollar standard, 1.2 billion people in developing countries live in poverty. More than a billion live in inadequate housing and about 100 million are estimated to be homeless. About a third of children under five years die every year from communicable diseases, 90 million children who have attained the age of school going have not yet accessed primary education while 232 million have not yet accessed secondary education. At the end of 1999, nearly 34 million people were infected with HIV and AIDS with 23 million living in sub-Saharan Africa.
According to the ministry of Finance and Planning Kenya (2000), the poor are those members of society who are unable to afford a minimum basic need comprising of food and non food items. It is the inability of an individual or household to afford basic necessities such as food, clothing, health and education for children. Despite being the most developed economy and having the highest per capita income in East Africa, Kenya faces the highest poverty rate. According to Kimunyi et al (2002), 52.3% of Kenyans live in poverty while less than 45% have access to safe drinking water (Ministry of Finance and Planning (2000).

It is such a scenario that has led to governments all over the world to initiate various poverty-alleviation projects by themselves or in collaboration with multilateral and bilateral development partners as well as NGOs (NALEP 2006). Various organizations have also continued to channel resources in poverty alleviation projects (Mulwa 2004, and UNDP 2004). Global conferences have also identified poverty alleviation as a major goal, reflected in national plans, policies and strategies and one hundred and forty two countries have ratified the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Fowler, 2000). Kenya as a country has come up with various strategies to combat poverty. Kenya’s Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (IPRSP) 2000-2003 clearly recognized poverty as a multi-dimensional problem which would not be resolved by only improving statistics but through low income growth, improvement of governance and security, increased ability of the poor to raise their incomes, improvement of the quality of life of the poor through equity and participation (Kenya IPRSP, 2000). Another strategy was the Economic Recovery Strategy of Wealth and Employment Creation (Republic of Kenya 2003) which aimed at creating 500,000 jobs annually, achieving high real GDP growth rate of 7% by 2006 and reducing poverty level by at least 5%. This was created by NARC government as an economic recovery strategy. Finally is the vision 2030. This is the country’s new development blue print covering the period 2008 to 2030. It aims to transform Kenya into a newly industrializing middle income country providing a high quality life to all the citizens by 2030. It is based on three pillars; the economic, the social and the political (GOK, 2007).
1.1.1: Marsabit District

Marsabit district is found in Eastern province and covers an approximate area of 61,296 sq km, making it one of the largest districts in the country with a population density of 2.0 persons per sq km (central Bureau of Statistics 2001). It consisted of Laisamis, North Horr and Saku constituencies before it was divided in 2008 to only remain with Saku and part of Laisamis constituencies. Its population consists predominantly of Gabbra, Rendile, Borana, Samburu and Turkana ethnic communities. These inhabitants are predominantly nomadic pastoralist communities with a small population being sedentarised. This is mainly so due to 98% of the land being arid and semi-arid thus being classified as rangeland (Kariuki and Mango 2003) Livestock production is their main economic mainstay with the government rating them among the poorest and the most vulnerable communities in Kenya (GOK, 2002). Kargi and Maikona locations are found in the district and are among the beneficiaries of projects implemented by PISP.

The Human Poverty Index (HPI), introduced by the Human Development Report (1997), defined poverty as lack of options rather than income. Marsabit population therefore can be regarded as poor especially due to the fact that they exist below the food poverty line; they are unable to meet the basic food requirement depending solely on food aid from the government and other organizations (Robinson, 2009). More than 60% of the district population is more than an hour from the nearest doctor. More so, 45% do not go for any kind of treatment due to financial constraints. Dispensaries are a distance of fifteen km apart, poorly equipped and run by volunteers.

Water facilities are far away from households with distance requiring almost a whole day to fetch. This has reduced the population of those who have access to safe drinking water to 40%. Education is also a symptom of poverty with schools in the district being very far, sparsely distributed and poorly furnished (Robinson, 2009). Due to its vulnerability, Marsabit district faces such problems as marginalization, recurring droughts, land threats, mono culture, conflicts over natural resources, poor infrastructure, high illiteracy levels, poor and low manpower development, low development resource allocation by the government due to lower population densities, gender inequality as well as isolation and general backwardness (Robinson, 2009). There is also the growing threat of HIV/AIDS.
epidemic, increasing powerlessness, poverty and insecure livelihoods amongst those communities (Diocese of Marsabit, Catholic Justice and Peace 2010). It is because of such a background that the district has attracted many non-governmental organizations to work in poverty eradication projects. According to the district records (2003), twenty five NGOs including PISP are currently involved in such projects.

1.1.2: Pastoral Integrated Support Program

Pastoral Integrated Support Program (PISP) is one of the main non-governmental organizations present in the larger Marsabit district. The organization was initiated in 1996 working with Gabbra community and their traditional Yaa councils (which govern the social/cultural aspects of wider Gabbra community). In recent years, it has extended its work to other ethnic groups within Marsabit including the Rendile, Turkana, Borana and Samburu. (PISP 2003) Its vision is to reduce nomadic household poverty by establishing sustainable water projects. PISP, together with the local communities seek to strengthen resource management and pastoral economic system by providing community empowerment which is enhancing livelihood and strengthening social well-being. Over the years, water related activities supported by PISP have included construction of sand dams, improvement and rehabilitation of shallow wells, construction of rainwater harvesting tanks, emergency water tracking during drought and building and training in hygiene and sanitation (Robinson, 2009).

Efficient project implementation has and is, in most governments and non-governmental organizations a challenge. This has led to various cycles of poverty with some projects being replicated over and over. Thus, the success of any strategy or initiative to address poverty will depend on a large extent on how well the needs of the poor are understood, including their likely responses to various interventions.
1.2: Statement of the problem

To achieve poverty reduction, various components have been put into place by different non-organizations as well as the government in Marsabit district. Such elements include enough finances for use by different organizations, qualified working personnel, infrastructural development that would enhance project implementation and motivate community participation. PISP has been able to build twenty latrines for use by community members in Kargi and Maikona, build four reservoir tanks for pumping and supplying water to the different general collection areas and carried out community awareness campaigns on sanitation in these areas (Robinson, 2009) The government also through the ministry of special programs has offered a water buzzer to supply water to the community members during the drought (District Statistics, 2010).

Despite such efforts, access to safe water sources is still severely limited and lack of latrines has led to higher incidence of diseases while treatment is hardly possible or only possible in remote health facilities. Moreover, these facilities are very difficult to access owing to low mobility and poor infrastructure. Women are obliged to spend most of their day collecting water using donkeys while at the same time sacrificing their education (Robinson, 2009).

It is thus against such background that the purpose of the study was to investigate the challenges affecting the implementation of the poverty alleviation projects by PISP in Kargi and Maikona locations in Marsabit district.

1.3: Objectives of the study

The general objective of the study was investigation of the challenges affecting the implementation of the poverty alleviation projects by PISP in Kargi and Maikona locations in Marsabit district.

Specific objectives were

i) To determine the influence of participation of stakeholders to effective implementation of water and sanitation project.
ii) To find out the extent that community awareness of project goals and implementation procedures affect effective implementation of the water and sanitation project

iii) To examine the relationship between project sustainability and its effects in implementation of water and sanitation project.

iv) To establish the effects of community’s pastoralistic nature to effective implementation of water and sanitation project.

1.4: Research Questions

i. To what extent is effective project implementation affected by stakeholders’ participation?

ii. How does community’s awareness of a project’s goals and implementation procedure affect effective project implementation?

iii. What is the relationship between project’s sustainability and its effects in implementation of poverty alleviation project?

iv. Does pastoral nature of a community affect the effective implementation of poverty alleviation project?

1.5: Significance of the study

The results of this study will benefit the government and other non-governmental organizations involved in implementation of poverty alleviation projects in Kenya’s pastoralistic community in general and Marsabit district in particular because it will provide viable information required in implementing the specified projects in the area.

To PISP, it shall provide insights into challenges that may be affecting project implementation in Kargi and Maikona. This will enable the organization to note their
strengths and weaknesses, consequently coming up with strategies to enhance their project implementation.

To the community in general and Marsabit in particular, it will enhance the role played by stakeholders especially the beneficiaries of the projects in ensuring its successful implementation.

Finally to the researchers, it will provide an insight into the challenges that are yet to be generalized but are affecting project implementation.

1.6: Scope of study

This study covered beneficiaries of water and sanitation project being implemented by PISP in the pastoral Kargi and Maikona areas of Marsabit District. It covered areas where water reservoir tanks were being built for collection and supply of water to community members. It also covered latrines built as part of enhancing sanitation of the community members.

1.7: Study limitations

The study covered Kargi and Maikona water and sanitation project. This is just among the many poverty alleviation projects like community empowerment and facilitation of education, livelihood development and governance related programmes. This thus limited its generalization. This was overcome by increasing the sample size and using stratified random sampling to enhance representation which increased accuracy of generalization.

The study was also carried out within a limited time to fulfill the requirement of the degree of Masters in Business Administration. This made it time bound to be completed within the allocated time frame. This was overcome by the use of more research assistants to collect the required data faster and more efficiently within a limited time.

Due to the research being carried out in a hardship area, it also faced budgetary constrains due to traveling costs in data collection. This was overcome through sourcing for more funds to carry out the research.
1:8: Study assumption

It was assumed that the respondents would be ready to give genuine responses and trustworthy answers to all questions. This was enhanced by reassuring the respondents that all data shall be treated with confidentiality.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0: Introduction

This section covered an overview to project management, the need for the water and sanitation project and the expected project outputs. It also covered stakeholders’ participation, community awareness, pastoralism and development and sustainability. It also gave a summary of the literature review and identified gaps for the study and completed with the conceptual frame work.

2.1.1: Overview to project management

Projects are designed to promote change and innovation. A project can be defined as a planned undertaking. The Association of project managers (UK), says a project is a set of interrelated tasks that are undertaken by an organization to meet defined objectives, that has an agreed start and finish time, is constrained by cost, and has specified performance requirements and resources (Mwangi, 2006). He continues to say that according to PMBK, a project is a temporary endeavor undertaken to accomplish a unique product or service with a defined start and end point and specific objectives that when attained, signify completion.

Management is the organization and coordination of the activities of an organization or enterprise in accordance with certain policies and in achievement of defined goals (Klieman, 2010). It is the act of getting people together to accomplish desired goals and objectives using available resources efficiently and effectively. It comprises planning, organizing, staffing, leading or directing and controlling. Project management therefore is the discipline of planning, organizing, securing and managing resources to bring about the successful completion of specific goals and objectives (Sebastian, 2007).

Project Management Book of Knowledge (PMBOK) defines project management as the application of knowledge, skills, tools and techniques applied to project activities in order to meet or exceed stakeholder’s needs and expectations from a project (Mwangi, 2006).
He continues to say it is a process of successfully completing a project within specified time, resources and using specified requirements.

According to Westland (2003), project management is the skills, tools and management process required to undertake a process successfully. It comprises a set of skills; specialized knowledge, skills and experience required to reduce the level of risk within a project. A suite of tools are used to improve their chances of success such as documents templates, registers and planning software. It also includes a series of processes that are various techniques and processes required to monitor and control time, cost, quality and scope on projects such as time management, cost management, quality and risk management.

The justification for undertaking project management in any organization lies at two levels, namely the macro and micro levels. On the broader or macro level, an organization is motivated to implement project management techniques to ensure that what is undertaken, small or major, is delivered on time, within budget and specified standards. On the micro level, it makes the project workplace conducive to teamwork, ensuring that deadlines are met, reducing cost and operating costs. It also ensures that important documents and information is shared among members of the team (Modesto et al 2009).

Project management includes developing a project plan which includes defining and confining the project goals and objectives, identifying tasks and how goals will be achieved, quantifying the resources needed and determining budgets and time lines for completion (Mulwa, 2007). He continues to say that for this to happen, there is need for a project manager who must be both a manager and a leader. The authority conferred on him is what makes him accountable for the performance of the job.

In carrying out his or her duties, a project manager is expected to meet some draw backs in project implementation. Implementation is the carrying out, execution or practice of a plan, a method or any design for doing something (Mwangi, 2006). According to Manchini (2003), she or he faces the project technical design, meeting the quality or reliability specifications, selected performance, workload increase over time, and other
projects may get priority and thus competition for resources support and even a change in the market may make the original objective obsolete and new legislation may prohibit a planned course of action. It is some of these challenges that may affect implementation of projects by project managers.

Project management has basically three methods; those which specify what has to be done; those that specify who is responsible for getting the work done; and those for controlling project work so that the project manager can deliver the project successfully (Mwangi, 2006). The outcome of the project is dependent on the skills with which the forecasting, planning, budgeting, scheduling, resource allocation, risk management and control are handled, and that attention must be given to checking on the way these tasks were accomplished (Meredith, 2003).

A project as a strategy of development can only work well if it is logical. According to Mwangi (2005), for a project manager to succeed in the implementation processes, he or she requires to have understood the project goal(s), identified the purpose(s), established the required outputs, then the activities, allocate the resources, develop a work schedule and lastly establish the management and operational arrangements with the key responsibilities and working procedures. Project implementation requires the project to have staff that can put their skills needed to allocate resources and the technical skills required to do what needs to be done. According to Mwangi (2006), it is the role of project managers to integrate all these for the project to succeed.

2:1:2: Why the water and sanitation project

Human poverty according to UNDP (2002) is measured using the Human Poverty Index (HPI). This is a multi-dimensional measure of poverty that brings together in one composite index the deprivation in four dimensions of human life—a long and healthy life, knowledge, economic provisioning and social inclusion (Human Development Report, 1999).

For there to be a long and healthy life, water and sanitation becomes an important public provision. According to the same report, in developing countries lack of access to health
services and safe water and the level of malnutrition capture the deprivation in economic provisioning more practically than any other variables.

According to Kimenyi et al (2002), less than 45% of Kenya’s population has access to safe drinking water. In most rural areas, women are obliged to spend most of their day collecting water using donkeys. Kimenyi et al (2002), continues to explain that unsafe drinking water and lack of latrines leads to higher incidences of disease while treatment is hardly possible or only possible in remote health facilities. This thus creates a vicious cycle of poverty in most parts of Kenya. This has made the government as well as non-governmental organizations to put emphasis on water and sanitation projects in rural areas.

2:1:3: Project outputs

The expected project outputs on completion are to have a steady provision of safe water to the pastoral community of Kargi and Maikona especially during the dry spells for themselves and animals. It is also to ensure availability of pit latrines for the use by the community members as well as a strong and autonomous committee for running the project for better sustainability when the agency withdraws. The project is also expected to reduce the mobility of the Kargi and Maikona communities in search for water for their animals.

2.2: Challenges affecting implementation of projects

2.2.1: Stakeholders participation

According to Jenkins (2010), stakeholders are an integral part of projects. They are the end users or clients, the people from whom requirements will be drawn, the people who will influence the design and ultimately, the people who will reap the benefits of the completed project. They are those who are affected by an intervention either during its life time or in the subsequent years.
Davis (1998), saw stakeholder participation to mean the collective, active and democratic examination of the project progress towards and achievement of locally determined results and the subsequent use of knowledge they generated. This should not only be at project implementation but also monitoring and evaluation.

The first stage thus in stakeholders participation is identifying who the real stake holders are through stake holder’s analysis. According to Jenkins (2010), stakeholder analysis is the technique used to identify the key people who have to be won over. It requires a person, a group or organization that has direct or indirect stake in an organization because it can affect or be affected by the organization actions, objectives and policies. Jenkins further suggests three steps in stakeholder’s analysis;

The first step is to identify stakeholders- think of all the people who are affected by the work, who have influence or power over it or have an interest in its successful or unsuccessful conclusion.

The second step is to prioritize the stakeholders – put them in order of which they affect the project. Some may have the power either to block or advance. Some may be interested in project activities.

Lastly, is to understand the stakeholder- the implementing agencies need to know more about the stakeholders. They need to know how stakeholders are likely to feel about and react to the project. They also need to know how well to engage them in project and how best to communicate with them.

Mulwa also adds the need for stakeholder management (Mulwa 2007). This according to him is the process of managing the expectations of everyone that has an interest in a project or will be affected by its deliverables or outputs. Manzuri et al (2004), emphasizes that there is need for stakeholders management during participation in projects. This is because the use of participation should have a clear purpose since it is not a means in itself but a means to achieve an objective. The specific form of participation may vary depending on the particular needs and objectives as well as local conditions in the project areas. They also note that project designers should keep in mind that these stakeholders
have their own agendas, which may differ substantially from the objectives of the project. In spite of their different motivations, however, they may contribute to the realization of project objectives if appropriate incentives are offered so that their best interest is to achieve the objectives of the project. UNDP (2004), emphasizes that stakeholder participation should be focused with a feeling of ownership. Information needs of the project should thus be directed not only to the implementers but also to the stakeholders. This enables efficient project implementation since it gives a chance to stakeholders through the received information to come up with homemade corrective measures in areas where the project may not be acquiring the set goals. They are also able to enhance continuity of the project as well as replicate similar future projects in their areas.

What then is the importance of stakeholder participation? Jenkins (2010), notes that experience shows that their involvement in the project significantly increase chances of success by building in a self-corrective feedback loop. Also involving them in project builds confidence in your product and will greatly ease its acceptance in target audience.

UNDP noted that there are various benefits of stakeholder participation. One can use the opinions of the most powerful stakeholders to shape your projects at an early stage (UNDP, 2003). Not only does this make it more likely that they will support the project, their input also improves the quality of the project. Furthermore, USAID also notes that getting the stakeholders early and frequently can ensure that they fully understand what is being done and understand the benefits of the project. This means they can support the project actively when necessary.

A review by Manzuri et al (2004), also showed to some extent, participation of stakeholders in community projects creates effective community infrastructure and improves welfare outcomes. In relation to monitoring and evaluation, Ray (2009), notes that engaging key stakeholders early enough in the evaluation gives the evaluator a better understanding of the intervention, what the project was intended to accomplish and the challenges it faced.

It was also noted that the decision making process for projects needs to be embedded in the beneficiary communities (stakeholders). If the communities do not make project
decisions, their ownership of the project facilities will be weak, jeopardizing sustainability (Nair 2001).

Fowler also says that the more involvement communities have in project development, implementation and decision making, the more likely they will either refuse outright projects that do not meet their needs, or maintain projects once the overseeing NGO has pulled out (Fowler 2000). Kleemiero (2000), summarized some of the arguments for the increasing community participation as a means of ensuring the sustainability of development projects. Getting beneficiaries involved would lower costs, better target people’s needs, incorporate local knowledge and create grassroots capacity to undertake other development projects and to maintain benefits particularly in the case of physical infrastructure.

UNDP (2006) emphasizes that such stakeholder participation should be gender sensitive and include even the women. Women should be a special target group who has a critical contribution to economic development. Also having stakeholders set vision and prioritize results will make them have the best ideas during planning in the best way how the results would continue to remain relevant to them. They must therefore be involved in identifying the information that is needed during implementation.

2.2.2: Community awareness

Communities are groups of people that may or may not be partially connected but who share common interests, concerns or identities (Laveck, 2008). Awareness according to him is the process by which people gain knowledge about their surroundings. It enables them to gain control over the factors and decisions that shape their lives. It is the process by which they increase their assets and attributes and build capacity to gain access, partners and networks.

It is community awareness that creates empowerment according to Bauman (2008). This he says is more than involvement, participation or engagement of communities. It implies communities gaining knowledge for ownership and action that explicitly aims at social
and political change. It recognizes that some people are going to be empowered then others will be sharing their existing power and giving some.

Espinosa (1998) defines community awareness as a process that respects, values and enhances people’s ability to have control over their lives is put into practice. It encourages people to know their needs and aspirations in self-aware and informed way which takes advantage of their local skills, experience and potential, change and growth occurs through informing and empowering individuals.

For UNDP (2004) creating community awareness of project goals is a learning experience. It’s not just a method of enhancing project success but also a process of knowledge creation, a social and political influential process that enables stakeholders to gain valuable knowledge in development activities.

Creating community awareness plays an important role in project implementation. Human Rights report (2000) recognizes giving information and statistics through community awareness as a powerful tool for creating a culture of accountability and for realization of human rights. This, the report notes will lead to empowerment through building capacities such as being knowledgeable with intrinsic value of well being. These will generate evidence that can break down barriers of disbelief and mobilize changes in policy and behavior in development. Stern (2001), says for there to be pro-poor growth, there needs to be improvement in investment climate and from empowering and investing in the poor through awareness creation.

This awareness encourages the community members to emerge as new leaders and thus serves to weaken the influence of traditional top-bottom approach to development. He continues to note that it creates confidence in stakeholders to take control of the different roles they can play in proper project implementation. This enables the community members’ voices being heard in policy formation for future projects. This will change the scenario whereby people have little information about decision by the government or larger businesses that have profound effects on their lives about building schools, roads, water supply and irrigation, a system that plays an important role in poverty eradication.
Community awareness is also important not only to the project beneficiaries but also the implementing agents. Mulwa (2007) says capacity in the workforce is needed to develop, support and sustain development systems. This has led to many aid agencies to revamp up their efforts to build institutional capacity. He also suggests that assistance to developing countries in producing country led poverty reduction strategies may also help build such capacity.

2.2.3: Pastoralism and development

Pastoralists are communities that fend their food and livelihoods from rearing livestock. Due to their livelihood being based on livestock, they may move around in search of pastures and water (Ellis 1987). According to Aki1is (2002), pastoral livelihood in East Africa includes livestock-based livelihoods, agro-pastoral livelihood, sedentary farming and ex-pastoral (drop outs). Livestock-based livelihoods are the most common of strategy, where households rely on rearing camels, cattle, sheep and goats. Mobility (usually within traditional migration routes) and the ability to access natural resources such as pasture and water are fundamental to the continuation of this livelihood.

According to Devereaux (2006), development in pastoral areas needs to combat their main cause of vulnerability. He says, while drought is a major risk factor affecting livestock-based livelihoods, the main source of vulnerability derives from inability of pastoralism and related livelihoods to cope with drought, that is, it is not drought as such that makes pastoralists vulnerable but factors that constrain highly evolved pastoral-drought response mechanisms, especially mobility of the people and animals, for instance, conflict and legal restrictions. This was also supported by Davis (Mulwa 2006), who says that any emergency livelihood responses- other than responses to rapid onset crisis- suggests a failure of actors to adequately address underlying causes of vulnerability. Addressing underlying causes of pastoralists’ vulnerability should be tackled using long term mechanisms and with a combination of state-led planning and strategic interventions. He says the reliance for instance on food based assistance
interventions over a period has contributed to pastoral communities increasing dependence on external support, not sustainability.

Fratkin et al (1999), on the other hand says that projects that enhance settling pastoralists are unlikely to reduce their vulnerability and therefore poverty but rather a project that supports the subsistence base of mixed-species pastoralism is superior to sedentary. Also policy responses such as the fencing off traditional pastoral grazing lands and categorizing them as protected areas like national packs and reserves undermine mobility and access to grazing land. Such projects according to Elias (2007), become suspicious to the pastoralists because they fear losing grazing and water resources to non-pastoral users.

Concentration of certain projects in one area also brings undesired consequences. According to Hadgson (Devereux 2006), concentration of water and dips in one area causes acute overgrazing since all herds are concentrated in one area. There is therefore need for spreading projects to enable movement of the pastoralist. She also notes that non involvement of pastoralists coming up with specific projects leads to them not feeling responsible for project maintenance, repair or even expansion. This usually ends in a high intensity of suspicion of the projects objectives especially if there is disparity between their felt needs and the implementing agency.

There is also need to involve both genders in project implementation. The pastoralists, according to Devereux (2006), though married men and women operate in separate yet overlapping spheres in the task of daily life, they share both roles and rights in the care and management of livestock. Men however make the broad management decisions about the timing and location of grazing and watering the herds.

For pastoral populations, better designed, more innovative and efficient implementation of social and economic protection is vital, not just to provide a safety net in times of crisis but also to provide reassurance that it will be there when needed.
2.2.4: Sustainability of the project

According to Robinson (2009), sustainability is the resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time. It is the fact whether the benefits of an activity or program are likely to continue after donor funding is withdrawn. He sees sustainability in the field of development as the preservation of benefits of and commitment to development activities over time. This is quite different from World Commission on Environment (Mulwa 2007) that defines sustainable development in relation to environment as being development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future to meet their own needs.

Brinkerhoff et al (1992), note that project sustainability in development should not be seen as the continued existence of the project but also its continued relevance, efficiency and benefit to the beneficiaries. This sustainability is vital as was noted by Stockman (1997), who says it has been integrated wholesale into the development canon. He goes ahead to say that for all concepts of self help and all forms of technical, personnel-based or financial assistance, sustainability is at least implicitly an object of overriding importance. One would be hardly-pressed to find any development initiative today which did not find its approval, renewal or success rating related to its sustainability.

This sustainability for project implementers can be either internal or external. Internal is the project seeking greater organization sustainability within the structure on its continued running and implementing, of project to community members. For this structural sustainability to be achieved in community projects, Erade (1997), notes that there is always need for beneficiary awareness and capacity building. This capacity building can be targeted at all community or beneficiaries or the chosen beneficiaries as staff to continue running the projects.

Externally, project implementers can seek to achieve sustainability of their projects of these projects to the communities which they work. They are, thus, the transmitters of sustainability while the community members, the objects of sustainability. These is achieved according to Taccon et al (1997), if lessons, effects, impacts and the benefits of development projects continue to be disseminated and diffused after their completion.
In their strategy framework for promoting the sustainability of development institutions and projects, Brinkerhoff et al (1992), proposes that institutions and project sustainability depends upon maintaining responsive output flows (high quality and valued goods and services), cost effective goods and service delivery mechanisms and resource flows. They emphasize that external project sustainability can be achieved if there is capacity for quick responsiveness of the project running committee to continuous changes of the surrounding, the continued relevance of the project, the quality of services it offers, the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the project and management structure and the security of the project resource base for continued maintenance of the project.

Brinkerhoff et al (1992), emphasize the significance of sustainability with relation to performance. They say performance acts as the “sales pitch” for gaining support and marketing the output of the project. On the contrary, failure to fulfill a function can have exactly the opposite effect, especially if expectations are high among stakeholders.

2.3: Summary of Literature Review

Projects are said to be designed in order to promote change and innovation. Project management as a discipline has evolved because of the need to coordinate resources to secure predictable results. The project objectives require the project capacity to be sufficient in order to convert plans into the desired outputs. This has to be done through unifying factors of management which are planning, organizing, security and managing resources. Studies have indicated the need to consider different challenges in implementing projects especially in community based projects.

The first is stakeholder participation. Project implementation and sustainability suffers when project is remote from the community and when the community climate is not favorable for project success. By involving the community from project onset, project activities could be effectively planned and implemented.

Second is community awareness. This process enables communities to increase control over their lives. It enables the community to gain ownership of the project actions that aims at real sustainable development. Pastoralism and its nature also affect project
implementation. There is need for better designed, more innovative and efficient implementation of projects in relation to their mobility and socio-cultured systems. Such projects should target the causes of vulnerability in long term. Finally is the sustainability of the projects. This should go beyond just the continued existence of projects but also its continued relevance, efficiency and benefits to the beneficiaries. This will enable benefits over a longer period hence chances of project meeting their goals being raised. These four challenges are intertwined with one leading to another hence the importance of putting them into consideration in project implementation.

2.3.2: Identified Gaps

It was established that so far, no study has been carried out on the challenges that affect implementation of poverty alleviation projects by PISP; especially on water and sanitation project. Based on the above literature review, it was found out that stakeholder participation and community awareness require attention by an organization in implementing the project. Also of importance are sustainability of the projects and the pastoral nature of the community. These had thus to be studied to find out how they affect project implementation of the water and sanitation project by PISP in Kargi and Maikona.

2.4: Conceptual framework

In the study, project implementation was taken to mean the putting into action planned development plan to attain goals set which in this case are reduction of community poverty. The constraints that affect this implementation are stakeholders’ participation, community awareness of project goals, the sustainability of project over time and community’s pastoralist nature. Project implementation is also indirectly affected by such intervening variables like continuous project funding, poor planning and strategy and poor infrastructural development.

To be able to capture the relation between project implementation (dependant variable) and constrains (independent variable) the following was the framework
The independent variables: stakeholders’ participation, community’s awareness, sustainability and community’s pastoralist nature directly affect the implementation of the project. Their control and manipulation is thus bound to affect efficient project implementation. Continuous project funding is a good intervening variable which if maintained is able to enhance project implementation through timely acquisition of funds as planned. Poor planning and strategy as well as poor infrastructural development are bad intervening variables since they reduce the effective achievement of project goals by increasing cost and time of project implementation.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1: Introduction

This section covered the research design, study area, target population, sample and sampling procedures, data collection and data analysis technique.

3.2: Research design

The study entailed the use of descriptive survey approach from the beneficiaries of the project as well as the implementers of the project. Descriptive research is a description of the state of affairs as it exists at present (Kothari 2008). Descriptive research studies are concerned with describing the characteristics of a particular individual or group (Mugenda et al. 2003). The choice of this design was because it is best suited for collection of original data for the purpose of describing a large population (Mugenda et al, 2003).

3.3: Study area

The study was conducted in Maikona and Kargi locations which are part of Marsabit district. These are the areas where water and sanitation project has been implemented over a period of seven years by PISP. They are also the areas facing a water and sanitation problem especially because of the nomadic lifestyle of its inhabitants (Robinson, 2009).

3.4: Target population

According to the Cooper et al (2003), a target population is the list of all the elements from which the sample is selected. The study population consisted of all beneficiaries to the three water collection tanks, forty latrines and four water spring sites by PISP. It consisted of eighty three manyattas with a total of eight hundred and thirty beneficiaries to the project. The study population also consisted of six implementing staff and three
designers of the PISP water and sanitation project. This totaled to a target population of eight hundred and thirty nine respondents.

3.5: Sample and sampling procedure

A sample size according to Kothari (2008), is the number of items selected from the universe to constitute a sample. A sample for study is necessary because according to Welman et al (2001), the size of the population usually makes it impractical and uneconomical to involve all the numbers of the population in a research group. A sample size comes up with a sample of respondents with required characteristics and representation.

The exact proportion of the accessible population that should be sampled is still in contention by scholars. Mugenda et al (2003), suggests that in descriptive studies, ten percent of the survey population is representative enough to generalize characteristics being investigated. This study aimed at sampling fifteen percent of the total target population, five percent above the suggested percentage to cater for respondents who may not respond and increase representativeness of the sample. Purposive and random stratified random sampling was used to pick the sample. Purposive sampling was used to get key informants (project implementers and designers). This was due to importance of the information they held by virtue of the position they hold. All the three designers of the project and six implementers were thus included in the sample. Below is a table indicating the percentages of the sample in relation to the population.

Table 3:1: Sample size and percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population description</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project designers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Researcher 2011)
Stratified random sampling was used to select respondents from the stratum of beneficiaries who were part of the sample. Numbers were assigned to households found in the Manyattas who were benefiting from the project and were accessible at the time of research. Four households were then chosen, two with male respondents and another with female respondents from thirty Manyattas; fifteen from Kargi and fifteen from Maikona. This was to give a total of one hundred and twenty respondents. This was to ensure representativeness of the samples. Mugenda et al (2003), explains that in stratified random sampling, subjects are selected in such a way that existing sub groups in the population are more or less reproduced in the sample. Below is a table showing the sampled population from the two areas and their total.

Table 3.2: Sample population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Population of respondents</th>
<th>Sample population of Manyattas</th>
<th>Sample Population per manyatta</th>
<th>Total sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kargi</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maikona</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PISP designers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PISP implementers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Researcher 2011)

3.6: Data collection

Data collection for the purpose of this study was based on two sources: primary and secondary sources. Primary data was collected using questionnaires. The questionnaires included structured and unstructured questions that were administered to the respondents. Self-administered questionnaires to project staff were delivered during working hours and
picked after being completed in a period of one week. Researcher assisted questionnaires were administered to the beneficiaries in one week time. This enabled the researcher to get detailed information from the beneficiaries most of whom were illiterate and also got clarification where necessary. Secondary data included documented information that was obtained from journals, reports, newsletters and books at libraries and web sites.

3.7: Reliability and validity of research instruments

Reliability can be defined as measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results on data after repeated trials. It is the degree to which a test yields the same results on repeated trials (Jankowicz, 2005). To ensure reliability, the researcher carried out a pre-visit to the field to test the tools before the actual research.

Validity, according to Jankowicz (2005) is ensuring that a test measures what it is supposed to measure. It was ensured through presenting the research tools to the supervisors, who determined whether the instruments represented the concept under study. The expert feedback in form of recommendations was incorporated in the final instruments.

3.8: Data analysis

On completion of data collection, data was checked for the completeness after which it was coded. Data was then grouped and arranged according to particular research questions. The data was then analyzed by use of descriptive statistics by help of computer software package (SPSS) and presented by use of tables, bar charts, frequency distribution tables, pie charts and graphs. This is because the method provides results that are presentable and reliable (Kothari 2008).
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1: Introduction

This chapter presents findings of the field research based on two questionnaires; beneficiary respondent's questionnaire that was used as the main tool of data collection and project staff questionnaire that was used as a tool of comparison. Data analysis is organized along the research objectives namely to determine the influence of participation of stakeholders to effective implementation of water and sanitation project, to find out the extent that community awareness of project goals and implementation procedures affects implementation of water and sanitation project, to establish the effects of pastoralism to effective implementation of water and sanitation and to examine the relationship between sustainability and its effectiveness in implementation of water and sanitation project as implemented by PISP in Kargi and Maikona locations in Marsabit district.

This chapter also discusses the results of the study. The research was carried out on a total of 120 respondents; 115 beneficiaries and five project staff.

4.2: Background information

4.2.0: Response rate

Out of the target sample of 129 questionnaires, 120 were fully filled. This represents 93% of the total respondents; 115 were beneficiaries while 5 out of expected 9 were project staff. The good response rate is attributed to the researcher working closely with research assistants and translators while the non respondents were inaccessible at the time of research. The analysis of the background information is focused on gender, utilization of water for either domestic or livestock and the duration benefited or worked on the project.
4:2:1: Gender

Figure 4.1 illustrates that 51% of the beneficiary respondents were male while 49% were female. The results thus show that the study population had more men because at the time of research, most response failure came from the female gender.

Fig. 4.1: Respondents in relation to gender.

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:2:2:0: Utilization of water for domestic or livestock use

Figure 4.2 (a) below shows that 77% of respondents utilize the water from the tanks for domestic use while 23% of do not from both genders.

Fig 4.2(a): Respondents utilizing water for domestic use.

Source: Researcher (2011)
Figure 4.2(b) indicates that 72% of the respondents utilize the water from the tanks for livestock while 28% do not from both genders.

Fig 4.2(b): Respondents utilizing water for livestock

![Pie chart showing 72% utilization and 28% non-utilization of water for livestock.]

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:2:2:1: Utilization of water for domestic use from the tanks in relation to gender

Table 4:2:2:1 shows that of the respondents, 42 females used the water for domestic while 14 did not use it for domestic. 46 males on the other hand used the water for domestic use while 13 did not.

Table 4:2:2:1: Utilization of water for domestic use in relation to gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Utilize water fetched from water tanks for Domestic use</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)
4:2:2:2: Utilization of water from the tanks for livestock in relation to gender

Table 4:2:2:2 indicates that 51 of the male respondents used the water for livestock while only 42 of the females used it for livestock.

Table 4:2:2:2: Utilization of water for livestock in relation to gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Utilize water fetched from water tanks for Livestock</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:3:1: Duration benefited from the project.

Table 4.1 below shows that 78.3% of the respondents have benefited for more than two years from the project, 13.9% for between one and two years while 7.8% for less than a year. These results thus indicate that majority of the respondents have benefited for more than two years hence able to comment well on the project.

Table 4:3:1: Duration benefited from the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Less than one year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than two years</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)
4:2:3:2: Duration worked on the project
Figure 4:2:3:2 indicates that majority of the project staff respondents had worked for between one to three years (60%) while the remaining 40% had worked for more than three years.

More than 3 years 40%
1-3 years 60%

Fig. 4:2:3:2: Duration project staff has been on the project.

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:3: Factors affecting implementation of poverty alleviation projects by PISP

4:3:0: Community awareness
This study sought to find out the extent that community awareness of project goals and implementation procedures affects effective implementation of water and sanitation project.

4:3:1:1: Were you informed about project objectives before its implementation?
Figure 4:3 indicates that 36% of the respondents strongly agreed to having been informed about project objectives before its implementation, 33% agreed while 31% did not agree to having been informed of project goals before implementation.
This is in line with table 4:3:2 which illustrate that 80% of the project staff respondents strongly agreed to having given information to beneficiaries while 20% agreed. These results thus show that all project agreed to having given information to beneficiaries.

Table 4:3:2: Information given to beneficiaries before inception of the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:3:2 Rate of understanding of the information that was passed

Figure 4:3:2 below shows that 43% of the respondents understood the information passed, 33% did not understand while 24% highly understood the information passed.
These results have indicated that the highest percent of 67% understood the information passed.

Fig 4.3.3(a): Rate of understanding information passed.

![Bar graph showing the rate of understanding information passed.]

Source: Researcher (2011)

**4.3.3: Who gave the information about the project?**

Table 4.3.3 indicates that the highest percent of 60.9% agreed to having got the information from PISP agent, 24.1% from another community member and 13.4% from themselves. 2.6% however did not indicate how they got the information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant of the Information</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid PISP Agent</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another community member</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)
This concurs with project staff information of having given information to the community members. This is indicated in the figure 4:3:3(b) below that indicates 80% of the project staff strongly agreed to having given information to project beneficiaries while 20% agreed.

Fig 4:3:3(b): Gave information to project beneficiaries.

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:3:4: Was there training offered on how the project is to be run after its completion?

Figure 4:3:4 illustrates that majority of the respondents (60%) agreed on having received training on how the project was to be run after its completion, 40% however did not. These results indicate that the majority of the respondents have knowledge on how to run the project after its completion.
Fig 4:3:4: Training offered on how to run the project after its completion.

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:3:5: Level of satisfaction of the information passed

Figure 4:3:5 indicates that 75% of the respondents were satisfied by the information given, 11% were highly satisfied while 14% showed their dissatisfaction.

Fig 4:3:5: Level of satisfaction of information passed.

Source: Researcher (2011)
This concurs with project staff who indicated a good reception of information, as indicated in table 4:3:5 that show 60% gauged the reception of information as good while 40% as very good. This results show all the project staff respondents agreed to good reception of information.

Table 4:3:5: Level of reception of information passed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:3:6: Was information helpful in understanding importance of project to you?

Table 4:3:6 shows that 43.5% agreed to having found the information helpful in understanding the importance of the project, 12.2% disagreed with the statement while 4.3% strongly agreed to the helpfulness of the information to understanding the project. 40% however did not comment on the statement.

Table 4:3:6: Helpfulness of the information in understanding importance of the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)
This concurs with project staff respondents who majority agreed that the giving of information was helpful in implementation of the project. This is shown below in figure 4:3:6 that indicate that 60% said yes while 40% said no.

Fig 4:3:6: Helpfulness of giving information to implementation of project.

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:3:8: Reasons why community awareness is important in implementing projects

Respondents gave various reasons for the importance of community awareness. They can give suggestions on alternative ways of project implementation, they can understand and own the project later. Also, it enables the community to replicate similar projects in future. Finally, they can know how to use the project facilities well.

Project staff on their part gave the following as reasons for importance of community awareness. The beneficiaries become the pillar in project implementation, they become an integral part during progress monitoring and supervision, they are able to see the project as belonging to them, give suggestions on other ways of project implementation and accept the project so that it is not seen as alien to them.
4:4: Stakeholder participation

The researcher sought to find out the effect of stakeholder participation in implementation of water and sanitation project.

4.4.1: Do you consider the project to be first priority in meeting the community needs at its inception

Figure 4:4:1 indicates that all respondents agreed that the project met community priorities. This was by 84% strongly agreeing and 16% agreeing. None rejected the statement

Fig 4:4:1: Project meeting community priorities.

![Pie chart showing agreement and strongly agree percentages.](image)

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:4:2: Involvement in deciding the site of constructing the water tanks and reservoirs

Figure 4:4:2 illustrates that 47% did not agree to having been involved in deciding the site of construction of water tanks and reservoirs, 37% strongly agreed and 16% agreed. This results indicate that majority of respondents were involved in choosing the sites
Fig 4:4:2(a): Involvement in deciding site of water tanks and reservoirs.

Source: Researcher (2011)

This is in line with information from project staff who also majority showed having allowed community members to give their opinions as shown. Table 4:4:2 indicates that 60% strongly agreed while 40% agreed. The results thus indicate that all project staff respondents agreed to having allowed beneficiaries to give their opinions before project implementation.

Table 4:4:2: Staff respondents on allowing beneficiaries to give opinions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)
4:4:3: Rate of involvement in the project

Table 4:4:3 indicates that 28.7% were highly involved, 24.3% moderately involved while 1.7% not being involved. However, 45.2% remained neutral to the question. These results thus show a majority being involved in different degrees in the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately involved</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly involved</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:4:4: If you were not involved, are the tanks located in the best place to serve their purpose

Table 4:4:4 indicates that for those who were not involved in choosing the sites of water tanks, 20% do not agree that the water tanks and reservoirs are located at the right place to serve their purpose, 14% agree, while 12.2% strongly agreed. The missing 53% indicates those who were involved in choosing the sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)
4:4:5 Beneficiary daily involvements in operation of the project

Figure 4:4:5 illustrates that 76% of respondents were not involved in the daily operation of the project, 18% strongly agreed while 6% agreed to being involved.

Fig 4:4:5(a): Beneficiary involvement in project operation

![Bar Chart]

Source: Researcher (2011)

These results contradict to the project staff who the greatest percent agreed to having designed the project with beneficiary involvement in daily running of the project. Figure 4:4:5(b) illustrates that 60% of the project staff respondents agreed to having designed the project with beneficiary involvement while 40% agreed. These results show that all the project staff respondents agreed to the statement
4:4:6: Rate of importance of community involvement in project implementation

Figure 4:4:5 illustrates rate of importance that the respondents put to their involvement. 52% viewed it as highly important, 44% moderately important while 4% as not important. This results show that the greatest majority of the respondents saw it as important to involve beneficiaries in daily operation of the project.

Source: Researcher (2011)
This concurs well with the opinion of project staff about importance of beneficiary participation in project implementation. Table 4:4:5 shows that 80% of the staff respondents strongly agreed while 20% agreed to the importance of beneficiary participation in project implementation. The results show that all the staff agreeing to the importance of beneficiary participation in project implementation.

<p>| Table 4:4:5: Importance of beneficiary participation in project implementation |
|----------------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:4:6: Staff reasons for importance of beneficiary participation

The staff respondents gave various reasons for the importance of beneficiary participation. This included for them to get a clear picture on the importance of the project to them, they are able to agree amongst themselves what suits them most, to ensure continuity of the project after phase out by the implementing agency and encourages replication and modification to the project in future.

4:4:7: Where community participation was best

Community participation according to project staff respondents was in different areas as indicated in tables 4:4:7 (a) (b) and (c)

Table 4:4:7 (a): Community participation was best in project management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4:4:7 (b): Community participation was best in technical activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:4:7 (c): Community participation was best in manual activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:5: Pastoral nature of the community

The study sought to establish the effects of pastoralism to effective implementation of water and sanitation project.

4:5:1 Frequency of movement of the community members

Table 4:5:1 indicates that all the respondents agreed to move from one region to another at least yearly.

Table 4:5:1: Frequency of movement of community members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)
4:5:2: Effects of the movements to the use of water

Figure 4:5:2 illustrates that 50% of the respondents strongly agreed that the movements affected their use of water, 40% agreed while 10% disagreed with the statement. This results show that majority of respondents view movement as affecting the way they used the water.

Fig 4:5:2: Effects of movements to use of water.

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:5:3: How often do you use the water from the project?

Table 4:5:3 shows that 53% of the respondents use the water often, 32.7% rarely while 11.3% use the water very often. 4.3% however did not comment on the statement. This results indicate that still majority of the respondents at least use the water though they move from one region to another.

Table 4:5:3: Frequency of use of water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)
4:5:4: Movements from one region to another affect the use of the latrines

Figure 4:5:4 illustrates that 56% strongly agreed to the movements affecting the use of latrines, 30% agreed while 15% did not agree to the statement. Majority of the respondents thus agree to movements affecting their use of latrines.

Fig 4:5:4: Effect of movements on use of latrines.

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:5:5: How often do you use the latrines?

Figure 4:5:5 indicates that 69% of respondents rarely use latrines, 30% often while 2% very often.

Fig 4:5:5: Frequency of use of latrines

Source: Researcher (2011)
4:5:6: Who are involved in the running of the water tanks

Table 4:5:6 shows that 80.9% of the respondents agreed that it’s the community that runs the water tanks, 12% said its individuals while 10% said it was PISP. Majority thus indicate that it’s the community members involved in project running.

Table 4:5:6: who are involved in the running of the water tanks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid PISP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:5:7: Who are involved in the daily operation of the latrines?

Table 4:5:7 shows that 81.7% of the respondents agree that it’s the community that daily operates the latrines, 9.6% by individuals while 8.7% said it was PISP.

Table 4:5:7: Involvement in operation of latrines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid PISP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)
4:5:8: Does the project serve the required needs of the community?

Figure 4:5:8 shows that 53% of the respondents strongly agreed that project serves the required needs of the community, 24% agreed while 23.2% did not agree. The results indicate the greatest majority agree that the project serve the community needs.

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:6: Sustainability

This study sought to find out how sustainability affects effectiveness in implementation of water and sanitation project.

4:6:1: Who do you think the water tanks and latrines belong to?

Figure 4:6:1 indicates that 93% of the respondents agreed that both water and latrines belong to the community while only 7% said belong to PISP. This results show that majority had seen the project as belonging to them and not the implementing agency.
Fig 4:6:1: Ownership of water tanks and latrines.

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:6:2: Can the community manage and run the project after its completion

Figure 4:6:2 illustrates that 52% of the beneficiary respondents strongly agreed that the community can manage and run the project on completion, 37% agreed while 11% did not agree. The results thus show the majority respondents agree to be able to manage and run the project after its completion.

Fig 4:6:2: Community managing the project after its completion.

Source: Researcher (2011)
This concurs with respondents of project staff of having trained the beneficiaries and them being confident to manage the project. Table 4:6:2 indicates that 60% of the staff respondents strongly agreed to having trained the beneficiaries on how to manage the project by themselves while 40% agreed. The results show that all the staff respondents agreed to having trained the beneficiaries on project management. The difference in percent may be attributed to the confidence of beneficiaries after the training.

Table 4:6:2: Training of beneficiaries on project management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:6:3: **Project still giving the same service as it used to give when it was started**

Figure 4:6:3 illustrates that 42% disagreed that the project was still giving the same service, 36% agreed while 23% strongly agreed to the statement.

Fig 4:6:3: Project still giving the same service as before.

![Pie chart showing responses to the statement](source)

Source: Researcher (2011)
4:6:4: If do not agree what do you think has gone wrong

The respondents gave various reasons why the project is not giving the same services. They said there was inconsistency in project machine operation, poor management, increased population, negligence of duty of those given responsibility to manage some of the project facilities and lack of enough knowledge to operate and repair project generators and water pipes. The table below illustrates the project beneficiary respondents on what they thought had gone wrong.

Table 4:6:3: If don't agree, what has gone wrong with project performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical problems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistency in</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>machines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased population</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligence of duty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of sufficient</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of manpower</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:6:5: Community has carried out modification to ensure project served them better

Table 4:6:5 indicates that 40.9% of the beneficiary respondents agreed to having made modifications, 31% said no to having made adjustments while 27.8% did not react to the statement because of lack of knowledge if they had done so.
Table 4:6:5: Community having made adjustments to the project facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)

4:6:6: The problem of poor sanitation has been addressed by the project

Figure 4:6:6 illustrates that 81% of the respondents agree that the problem of sanitation has been addressed, 10% strongly agree while 10% did not agree. The results indicate that majority of respondents agree that the problem of poor sanitation has been addressed by the project.

Fig 4:6:6: Problem of poor sanitation having been addressed.

Source: Researcher (2011)
4:6:7: The community can now face a dry season without a lot of problem

Figure 4:6:7 indicates that 70% of the respondents agreed to that the community could face a dry season without a lot of problem, 22% strongly agreed while 8% did not agree. The results thus show that majority of the respondents agree that the community can now face a dry season without a lot of problem. This is because the beneficiaries can face a dry season without having to go for a long distance in search for water.

Fig 4:6:7: Community facing a dry season without a lot of problems

Source: Researcher (2011)

This concurs with the project staff respondents as shown in table 4:6:7. It indicates that all the staff respondents said the beneficiaries were no longer facing water scarcity. This thus is an illustration that the project was successful in reducing water scarcity.

Table 4:6:7: Are beneficiaries facing water scarcity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2011)
4:7: Summary of data analysis

Data was analyzed through use of two questionnaires; the main questionnaire being beneficiary questionnaire while staff questionnaire was used as a comparison on response of the beneficiary.

Most of the beneficiary respondents were male which was attributed to them being readily available during the research data collection period. Project water tanks were mainly used for watering the livestock than domestic use. This could be attributed to the fact that the community is pastoralist and values livestock as their source of livelihood. Latrines on the other hand were mainly used by the population of the community that rarely moved. This mainly consisted of women who stayed at home. Data collected also indicated that community awareness had been carried out by the agency. The information greatly was given by PISP although the community also was got from fellow community members. Training on running the project was also carried out though members were not confident in running the project on their own.

On stakeholders’ participation, data collected indicated the community members valued their involvement in implementation of the project though very few of them continued being involved after completion of the project. During implementation, participation was highest in provision of manual labor, followed by technical activities and least in management activities.

Pastoral nature of the community according to the data analyzed affected mostly the use of latrines that were then least used. Water tanks were however used with the herders bringing back their livestock for watering. This also left only a few members to run and manage project facilities. On sustainability, data indicated community having owned the project as had been designed by the agency. However, the community indicated that project facilities showed reduction in service delivery with passage of time. This was mainly so due to breakdown. Although they had been trained to run the project after phase out, they were not confident to do so by their own. This may be attributed to inadequacy of information given to them especially those who did not receive information directly from the agency.
All the respondents (beneficiaries as well as project staff) agreed to the fact that the project had reduced the water problem and increased sanitation in the community.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5:1: Introduction

This chapter contains the summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study. The overall object of the study was an investigation of challenges affecting implementation of poverty alleviation projects by Pastoral Integrated Support Programme (PISP) in Marsabit district Kenya. The specific objectives included;

i) To determine the influence of participation of stakeholders to effective implementation of water and sanitation project.

ii) To find out the extend that community awareness of project goals and implementation procedures affect effective implementation of water and sanitation project.

iii) To examine the relationship between project sustainability and its effects in implementation of water and sanitation project.

iv) To establish the effects of pastoralistic nature of community to effective implementation of water and sanitation project.

5:2:0: Summary of findings

5:2:1: Background information

The study illustrated that more males participated in the study than females. This implies that men are in most cases given the opportunity to comment on issues affecting the community than women. It also indicates that most people used the water for livestock than domestic, with more men using the water for livestock than domestic and more women using the water for domestic than livestock. Water in this community therefore is used for livestock than domestic. Animals therefore are the priority in water use with men who take them for watering being the greatest users.

Most of the beneficiaries (78.3%) had benefited from the project for two or more years. This thus enables them to give the research tangible information about the project.
Also, most of the staff respondents had worked on the project for at least three or more years thus giving reliable responses for the research.

5.2.2: Community awareness

Most of the respondents had been made aware of project objectives before implementation. The rate of understanding however was varied with 61% receiving directly and 40% getting the information indirectly. Training on management of the project after completion was carried out with high degree of satisfaction. However, most of the respondents (53%) did not find information given useful in understanding the importance of the project to them. These results are indicative that though community awareness was carried out the information was not well targeted in content. This thus continued to affect effective implementation of the project. The beneficiaries and project staff were indicative of importance of community awareness giving various reasons for it.

5.2.3: Stakeholder participation

The beneficiaries all agreed that the project met community priorities even though 47% of them had not been involved in deciding the site of constructing the water tanks, reservoirs and latrines. Most of the beneficiaries were involved in implementation of the project as had been designed in the project. The majority of beneficiaries (76%) were not involved in the daily running of the project. These results show that most of community members participated in implementation of the project but left the daily running of the project to few community members. The community as well as project staffs were indicative of a high value put on stakeholder participation in all areas of project implementation and operation.

5.2.4: Pastoral nature of the community

All the beneficiaries agreed that their frequent movement as a community affected their use of water and latrines of the project. The effects of the movement are more on latrines that have 69% beneficiaries rarely using them in comparison to water with 64% who use the water often and very often. This may be indicative that it is because of necessity that
the beneficiaries come for the water unlike the latrines. This thus continues to affect sanitation that requires both parts of the project. Although they move, most beneficiaries still agreed that the project still serves the required needs of the community.

5.2.5: Sustainability

The majority of beneficiaries (93%) and project staff viewed the project as belonging to the community. This shows complete ownership of the project by the beneficiaries. This has given them the confidence to be able to manage it after phase out by the implementing agency. The beneficiaries however are indicative that the project is not giving the same service as it did during inception due to poor management, inadequate knowledge on maintenance, increased population and inconsistency as the major reasons. The beneficiaries have also not been able to carry out any modifications to the project to be able to serve the emerging needs of the community. This thus shows a blow to continued sustainability of the project and consequent alleviation of poverty in the area. The beneficiaries as well as staff members agreed to the project having met the goals of addressing poor sanitation (81%) and provision of water to the pastoral community.

5.3:0: Conclusions

5.3:1: What was the main use of water tanks and latrines and by which group

It was realized from the findings that the main use of water was for livestock than domestic. Due to men being the ones responsible for herding, they become the main users of the water. They therefore become the main group in choosing where the tanks are to be located. Latrines however were frequented by the females who rarely moved and thus their location was mainly influenced by women.

5.3:2: Giving of information to beneficiaries

PISP as a development agency had carried out community awareness and the community was highly receptive as well as valued this approach. The awareness was both directly and indirectly from the agency and other community members. However, the information given was not well targeted. This left knowledge gaps in the community members that
needs to be filled to make community awareness complete and useful. This was realized to affect the community’s confidence in managing the project after phase out by PISP.

5.3:3: Stakeholder participation

Stakeholders were involved in choosing project sites and prioritization. They also participated in implementation of the project which enhanced ownership of the project. However, their involvement was mainly in provision of manual labor during construction of tanks and latrines. This made them not to be able to manage the project after its completion. This affected project sustainability.

5.3:4: Pastoral nature of the community and use of project facilities

Project facilities were affected by the pastoral nature of the community. The community members constantly had to move back and forth to water their livestock from various areas where the tanks were situated. This thus indicated that water was an important resource to the community yet the water tanks were improperly positioned. The latrines however were least used during such movements hence though they were good for sanitation project, the community did not put a lot of emphasis in their use. The community had also taken and owned the project facilities as theirs. However project sustainability is still hampered by their being non-committed to run the project after the phase out of PISP.

The results thus indicate that PISP as an agency put into consideration various factors; community awareness, stakeholders’ participation, pastoral nature of the community as well as sustainability of projects which affected their implementation of water and sanitation project.
5.3: Recommendations

The following recommendations were made;

5.3.1: Giving of information to beneficiaries during implementation of project

Community awareness is crucial for any effective implementation of poverty alleviation projects. Project implementing agencies should therefore invest more finances and time in community awareness before and during project implementation. This information should also be properly targeted to ensure that information passed to the beneficiaries helps in the implementation of the project and its operation in the long run. Proper strategies of community awareness should also be designed to be in line with their cultural values to make community members motivated in reception of information and create more curiosity for the same.

5.3.2: Involvement of stakeholders in project implementation

All stakeholders need to be actively involved in project planning and implementation by ensuring continuous meetings with beneficiaries in deciding vital aspects of project implementation, like project sites, and ways of improving implementation. This involvement of beneficiaries should be at all levels of project design, implementation and operation. To ensure proper participation, there is need for capacity building of beneficiaries to increase their level of participation in project implementation and operation. This capacity building will also reduce the notion of community members only being involved in provision of manual labor and make them participate in running of project after phase out.

5.3.3: Movement of community members and their use of project facilities

A community is always faithful to its way of life. A new project needs to fit thus in their way of life to be useful as well as avoiding destabilizing community way of life. A project implementing agency thus needs to ensure that project implementation is designed in such a way as not to disturb the mobility of pastoral community in search of pasture since members would always stick to its nature at the expense of the project being
implemented. This will enable community members to benefit from the use of project facilities, easily accept the project as theirs and be able to maintain it hence its sustainability over time.

5.3.4: Community running of the project after phase out of PISP

Project effectiveness in poverty alleviation is achieved through its use over time. This is achieved through project sustainability. Sustainability can be achieved by enhancing community awareness and participation from the design stage, implementation and management of project that will encourage project ownership by beneficiaries. This ownership is especially important after phase out of implementing agency since a community always takes care of what is theirs. Beneficiary training therefore should always be put into consideration to empower beneficiaries for continued maintenance and possible replication of similar projects in future.

5.4: Further research

The researcher recommends the following:

1. That similar research be carried out on other projects being implemented by PISP to compare whether the same situation applies to them.
2. Similar research should be done for other agencies both governmental and non-governmental implementing projects in Marsabit district since they operate in almost similar social cultural setup.
3. There is need to carry out research on factors that inhibit stakeholder participation in project implementation when they have indicated the realization of its importance and value.
4. To carry out research on causes of lack of confidence in beneficiaries to be able to run the project even after having been trained to do so.
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Appendix 1

Introductory letter

P.O Box 131-60500,
Marsabit.
1st August 2011

Dear Respondent,

RE: BENEDICT FELIX OKUMU REG NO D53/CE/15578/08

The above is a student at Kenyatta University pursuing a master degree in Business Administration. Kindly take ten to fifteen minutes in filling this questionnaire in the best way you can to be picked in a week’s time. This questionnaire is on evaluating factors affecting implementation of poverty eradication projects by Pastoral Integrated Support Programme. The information collected will be used for academic purpose only and information given will be treated with absolute confidentiality. Please complete it appropriately, truthfully and honestly. Your name is not required.

Sincerely,

Benedict Felix Okumu

Email: flxokumu@yahoo.com
Mobile no. 0722676049
Appendix II

Questionnaire for the project staff

This questionnaire is a tool to obtain data on examining challenges affecting poverty alleviation projects by Pastoral Integrated Support Programme in Marsabit. Please tick where appropriate and give brief explanations where necessary.

Part A: Personal information

1. Indicate your gender
   - Female [ ] Male [ ]

2. As a staff of implementing agency, are you on project Implementing team [ ] Project design team [ ]

3. How long have you been a staff of PISP?
   - Less than one year [ ] 1-3 years [ ] More than 3 years [ ]

Part B: Community awareness

4. As a staff, did you give information to the community members before inception of the project?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]

5. If yes above, did the giving of the information help you as the agent in implementing the project to achieve the objectives?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]

6. If no in (4) above, is there any specific reason for not giving the information?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. If yes, in (6) please state the reasons
   i) 
   ii)
8. How would you gauge the reception of the information by the community if you gave the information?
Very good □   Good □   poor □

9. Was the giving of information helpful to the community in regard to this specific project?
Very helpful □   Helpful □   Not helpful □

10. Give a reason for your answer in (9) above.
(i) 
(ii) 

Part C: Stakeholder participation

11. As an organization, did you allow the community members to give their opinions about the project before its implementation?
Yes □   No □

12. During implementation of the project, did you allow the beneficiaries to get involved?
Yes □   No □

13. Where do you think community participation could best be used?
□ Management of project activities
□ Technical building of other projects
□ Manual labor of the project
□ Others (Specify)
(i) 
(ii) 

14. In the project design, did you allow for beneficiary involvement in daily running of the project?
Yes □   No □

15. In your opinion, is it good for beneficiaries to participate in project implementation?
Strongly agree □   Agree □   Don’t agree □
16. Give reasons for your answer above
   (i)
   (ii)

Part D: Pastoral nature of the community

17. In designing the project, did you consider mobility of the community members?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
18. If Yes in (17), what strategy did you put to combat this?
   (i)
   (ii)
19. If No in (17), does the mobility of the community affect in any way the projects meeting its goals and objectives?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
20. Who are actively involved in the project?
   Men [ ] Women [ ] All [ ]
21. Does the above (20) in any way affect project implementation?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
22. If yes how?
   (i)
   (ii)
23. Do you think nomadism affects project implementation?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
24. If yes, what can be done?
   (i)
   (ii)

Part E: Sustainability

25. Did the organization train the beneficiaries on how to manage the project by themselves?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
26. If yes, were they confident to do it or still depend on the organization?

Confident on their own  □  Depend on PISP  □

27. Are the water tanks still functioning?

Yes  □  No  □

28. If yes, who maintains them?

PISP Alone  □  Community alone  □  Both PISP and community  □

29. Are the latrines still functioning?

Yes  □  No  □

30. If yes, who maintains them?

PISP alone  □  Community alone  □  Both PISP and community  □

31. Has the community so far made any adjustments to the project to suit the changing needs of the community?

Many changes  □  Few changes  □  No changes  □

32. According to you is the project still beneficial to the community?

Strongly agree  □  Agree  □  Don’t agree  □

Thank you for taking your time to respond to the questionnaire
Appendix III

Questionnaire for beneficiaries

This questionnaire is a tool to obtain data on examining challenges affecting poverty alleviation projects by Pastoral Integrated Support Programme in Marsabit.

Please tick where appropriate and give brief explanations where necessary

Part A: Personal information

1. Indicate your gender.
   Female ☐ Male ☐

2. In which ways do you utilize the water fetched from the water tanks?
   Domestic use ☐ for livestock ☐

3. As a beneficiary, how long have you benefited from the project in question?
   Less than one year ☐ 1-2 years ☐ More than two years ☐

Part B: Community awareness

4. As a beneficiary, were you informed about the project objectives before its implementation?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

5. If yes above, how would you rate your understanding of the information that was passed to you about the project?
   Highly understood ☐ Understood ☐ Not understood ☐

6. Who gave you the information about the project?
   PISP Agent ☐ Another community member ☐ Self ☐

7. Was there training offered on how the project is to be run after its completion?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

8. If yes in (7) above, how would you rate your level of satisfaction of the information passed during the training?
9. Did the information help in understanding the importance of the project to you as a beneficiary?
   Strongly agree □  Agree □  Don’t agree □

10. Would you wish to continue receiving information about projects before and during implementation?
   Strongly agree □  Agree □  Don’t agree □

11. In your own view, do you agree that community awareness is important in implementing project?
   Strongly agree □  Agree □  Don’t agree □

12. Give reasons for your answer above
   (i) □
   (ii) □

**PART C. Stakeholder participation**

13. As a beneficiary, do you consider this project to be the first priority in meeting the community’s needs at its inception?
   Yes □  No □

14. If no, please state what you consider to be the project which would have been given the first priority in order to meet the need of the community.
   (i) □
   (ii) □

15. As a beneficiary were you involved in deciding the site of constructing the water tanks?
   Yes □  No □

16. If yes in (15) above, how would you rate your level of involvement?
   Highly involved □  moderately involved □  Poorly involved □

17. If No in (15) above, do you think where they are located now is the best place to serve their purposes?
   Strongly agree □  Agree □  Don’t agree □
18. As a beneficiary, are you involved in daily operation of the project now?
   Yes [ ]    No [ ]

19. How would you rate the importance of community involvement in projects implementation?
   Highly important [ ]  Moderately important [ ]  Not important [ ]

**Part D: Pastoral nature of the community**

20. As a community, how often do you move from one region to another?
   Weekly [ ]  Monthly [ ]  yearly [ ]

21. Do these movements affect the way you use the water?
   Strongly agree [ ]  Agree [ ]  Don’t agree [ ]

22. If strongly agree or agree above, how frequent do you use the water from the project?
   Rarely [ ]  Often [ ]  Very often [ ]

23. Do the movements from one region to another affect your use of the toilet?
   Strongly agree [ ]  Agree [ ]  Don’t agree [ ]

24. If strongly agree or agree above, how often do you use the latrines already built?
   Rarely [ ]  Often [ ]  Very often [ ]

25. Who are involved in the running of the water tanks?
   PISP [ ]  Community [ ]  Individuals [ ]

26. Who are involved in the daily maintenance of the project latrines?
   PISP [ ] community [ ] Individual [ ]

27. Does the project serve the required needs of the community?
   Strongly agree [ ]  Agree [ ]  Don’t agree [ ]
PART E: Sustainability

28. Who do you think the water tanks belong to now?
   Community    PISP

29. According to you, to whom do latrines belong to?
   Community    PISP

30. Do you agree that the community can manage and run the project after its completion?
   Strongly agree    Agree    Don’t Agree

31. Is the project still giving the same services as it used to give when it started?
   Strongly agree    Agree    Don’t agree

32. If don’t agree, what do you think has gone wrong?
   a)
   b)

33. Has the community carried any modification to ensure the projects serve the people better?
   Yes    No

34. According to you, do you agree that the problem of poor sanitation has been addressed by the project?
   Strongly agree    Agree    Don’t agree

Thank you for taking your time to respond to the questionnaires.
## Proposed research budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Cost (Ksh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ream of typing papers</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing and printing costs</td>
<td>6000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying charges</td>
<td>2500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report binding cost</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling cost</td>
<td>8500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence allowance to researchers</td>
<td>10200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling: Marsabit to Nairobi ten times</td>
<td>15000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone and E-mail charges</td>
<td>3000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 % contingencies</td>
<td>1800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47900.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature Search Review,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal writing,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense and review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report writing &amp; Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>