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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>Community project cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOK</td>
<td>Government of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPIS:</td>
<td>Key performance indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KWSP</td>
<td>Kenya water and sanitation projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSM</td>
<td>Organizational strategic management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMTT</td>
<td>Project management tools and techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM</td>
<td>Project portfolio management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical package for social sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAP</td>
<td>Sector wide approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASREB</td>
<td>Water service regulatory board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSBs</td>
<td>Water service board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSTF</td>
<td>Water service trust fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Performance is often defined simply in output terms, the achievement of quantified objectives.

Performance indicators help an organization to define and measure progress towards organizational goals, especially toward difficult to quantify knowledge-based processes. Performance indicators are measurements that reflect the critical success factors of an organization which are agreed up front.

A project a unique process consisting of a set of co-ordinated and controlled activities, with start and finish dates, undertaken to achieve an objective conforming to specific requirements, including constraints of time, cost and resources.
ABSTRACT

This study sought to investigate the factors affecting the performance of water and sanitation projects in Garissa county. The specific objectives were to find out the effect of project planning, expectations of stakeholders, monitoring and evaluation and government policies on the performance of water and sanitation projects in Garissa county. The researcher used descriptive research approach which described the factors and variables of this project. A census approach was used to cover the thirteen wards of Dujis constituency in Garissa county and covered all the 12 water and sanitation projects currently in progress. Fifty respondents were chosen where 10 of the local respondents were selected by purposive method and 40 respondents from the other categories were picked by simple random sampling method. Questionnaires were administered to these groups of respondents to represent the entire population. Primary data was collected by the use of self administered questionnaires and researcher administered for the groups that are illiterate especially the members of the local community who may have problems reading and interpreting the questions as expected by the researcher. The collected data was analysed using descriptive statistics and factor analysis for quantitative data, correlation analysis was also carried out on the quantitative data. The researcher used the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS), to process and analyse data. The research results were presented in percentages, and tables. The major finding of this research was that the water and sanitation projects in the county are in good progress both in work in progress and the quality of the projects, the resource utilisation, the budgets are adhered to and also projects work as per the timelines set during project planning and as per the timelines and deadlines given by the government.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Performance is a matter not only of what people achieve but how they achieve it. The accomplishment, execution, carrying out, working out of anything ordered or undertaken. High performance results from appropriate behaviour, especially discretionary behaviour, and the effective use of the required knowledge, skills and competencies. Performance management must examine how results are attained because this provides the information necessary to consider what needs to be done to improve those results.

Gray (2008) noted that organizations are realizing the impact that projects, and therefore project management, can have on their success. A project is a distinct package of scope which when delivered will enable the organization to realize a distinct package of benefits. A project used to be one mechanism that organizations used to deliver benefits, now organizations are managed by project; this has meant the development of project management competency within the organization (Gray and Larson 2002).

Project management nowadays is regarded as a very high priority as all companies or organisations, whether small or large, are at one time or another involved in implementing new undertakings, innovations and changes. These projects may be individually diverse, however overtime, some tools, management techniques and problem solving approaches have proven themselves to be more rewarding than others in bringing projects to a successful end (Olaf, 2009).

The performance of projects can be measured by key indicators for evaluation. The purpose of Key performance indicators (KPIs) is that clients want their projects delivered: on time, on budget, free from defects, efficiently, right first time, safely, by profitable companies (Johansson et al. 1993). So, Regular clients expect continuous improvement from their Water and Sanitation team to achieve year-on-year: reductions in project costs and time. In addition, the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) can be used for benchmarking purposes, and will be a key component of any organization move towards achieving best practice.
Clients, for instance, assess the suitability of potential suppliers or contractors for a project, by asking them to provide information about how they respond to a range of indicators. Some information will also be available through the industry’s benchmarking initiatives, so clients observe how potential suppliers compare with the rest of industry in a number of different areas (DETR 2000).

Water and Sanitation Supply chain companies will be able to benchmark their performance to enable them to identify strengths and weaknesses, and assess their ability to improve over time. The KPIs framework consists of seven main groups: time, cost, quality, client satisfaction, client changes, business Performance, health and safety (DETR, 2000).

According to (Olaf 2009) Projects typically have identifiable phases and each phase has a unique set of challenges for the project manager. These basic project phases can be also identified as major factors influencing the project success. If one of these phases is planned or executed wrongly, the project will have a high probability of failure.

Olaf (2009) indentifies the following factors that influence the performance of projects. They are choosing the right project organization as the first and probably the most important key to success for project management. Therefore a great deal of time should be spent in considering the decision about formation, preparation and initiation of the project organization. Next he notes that a project plan in the beginning is a simple planning tool, however while working on the project it will become one of the most important control instruments and after ending the project it is a measurement of whether the project has reached its goal. Finally, evaluation and control this part keeps the whole project on-track, on time and within budget. Depending on the size of the project, control will be either simple or complex (Olaf, 2009).

Other factors influencing the success of projects include the expectations of the stakeholders, these are the typical groups which could be the customer, sponsor, project team, project office, or anyone who needs project information in order to make decisions and/or contribute to the project processes (Schwalbe, 2007).
1.1.1 Water and Sanitation in Kenya

In Kenya, every citizen has a right to water. The National Water Strategy commits to ensuring that all people are covered by the formal water supply system and that poor Kenyans pay tariffs that they can afford (GOK 2009).

Water has been identified as the likely cause/trigger of future wars in the next millennium. Water shortage can be a catalytic factor pushing a poverty-stricken community to disaster and conflict. Water is a fundamental basic need for sustaining human economic activities. Availability of water in the desired quantity and quality, at the right time and place, has been the key to the survival of all civilizations. As human activities expand in scale and diversity, the demands for fresh water resources continue to grow. Fresh water lakes and rivers, springs, fountains, wetlands etc, which are the main sources of water contain an average of 90,000 m$^3$, or just 0.26 percent of total global fresh water reserves.

Garissa is the headquarter of North Eastern Province of Kenya. It is the capital of both the province and Garrison District. The Tana River flows through the city. Most of the town's inhabitants are ethnic Somalis and Pastoralists. Garissa forms a municipality that has six wards. Garissa's landscape is mostly arid, desert terrain.

In this study, factors affecting the performance of water and sanitation projects in the Garissa county will be analyzed. Performance indicators are used to measure performance in the projects. These indicators can then be used for benchmarking purposes, and will be a key component of any organization's move towards achieving best practice in order to overcome performance problem. However, this study aims at identify the factors and attributes affecting the performance of projects in the Garissa county and to obtain main criteria and indicators to measure performance.

1.2 Statement of the problem

As stated from previous studies (Karim and Marosszeky, 1999; DETR (KPI Report), 2000; Lehtonen, 2001; Samson and Lema, 2002; Kuprenas, 2003; Cheung, 2004; Iyer and Jha, 2005; Navon, 2005; Ugwa and Haupt, 2007) that the failure of any project is mainly related to the problems and failure in performance. Moreover, there are many reasons and factors which attribute to such problem. In Kenya, there are many water and sanitation projects that fail in
performance. In addition, performance measurement systems are not effective or efficient to overcome such problem.

In Kenya, projects performance problem appears through different directions. There are many that projects fail in time performance, others fail in cost performance and others fail in other performance indicators. In 2006 there were many projects which finished with poor performance because of many evidential reasons such as: obstacles by client, non-availability of materials, roads closure, amendments, additional works, waiting the decision, handing over, variation order, amendments in Bill of Quantity and general delays (UNRWA, 2006&2007).

In addition there are other indicators of performance in the Garissa County such as project managers, coordination between participants, monitoring, feedback and leadership skills. However, there are three important issues related to failures and problems of performance in the county which are political, economic and cultural issues.(UNDP, 2007)

Therefore, this research evaluated the factors affecting the performance of water and sanitation projects in the Garissa County in order to assist stakeholders, local government and the Kenya government to overcome performance problem and to improve performance of their projects. Hence, performance of any water and sanitation projects can be evaluated according to key performance indicators.

1.3 Research objectives

1.3.1. General objective

The general objective of this study were to investigate the factors affecting the performance of water and sanitation projects in Garissa County.

1.3.2 Specific objectives

i) To establish how project planning affects the performance of water and sanitation projects in Garissa County.

ii) To determine the effect of the expectations of the stakeholders on the performance of water and sanitation projects in Garissa County.
iii) To investigate the effect of monitoring and evaluation on the performance of water and sanitation projects in Garissa County.

iv) To explore the effect of government policies on the performance of water and sanitation projects in Garissa County.

1.4 Research Questions

The research questions as per the research objectives were as stated below.

i) How does project planning affect the performance of water and sanitation projects in Garissa county?

ii) What is the effect of the expectations of the stakeholders on the performance of the water and sanitation projects in Garissa county?

iii) How does monitoring and evaluation affect the performance of water and sanitation projects in Garissa county?

iv) To what extent does government policies affect the performance of water and sanitation projects in Garissa county?

1.5 Significance of the study

The study will enable the policy makers in the ministry of water and the stakeholders of water and sanitation projects in Kenya to review their approaches to issues affecting the water and sanitation projects in order to improve their success in completion and increase their performance and meet the expectations of all the stakeholders.

The findings of this project will be useful to the leaders and management of the Garissa county on how to manage the water and sanitation projects. It will also be useful to the entire country for the management of these projects.

The study will act as a useful source of information for strengthening the operational and managerial capabilities required by a manager to operate and maintain water and sanitation projects according to acceptable norms of quality, continuity, reliability and costs.

Indirectly, the study can be used to improve efficiency in providing adequate and safe drinking water supplies and appropriate sanitation facilities, which forms a sound basis for
improvement in community health. And lastly, the study will be used by future scholars and researchers while undertaking related studies in future.

The study is intended to act as an eye-opener and a spring board for future academic and other researches to further carry out research on the factors affecting the performance of water and sanitation projects in the entire country. The researcher will identify possible research gap which future research can be carried on.

This study will be useful to the water and sanitation project administrators and officials in the country, they will get relevant information on what has affected the performance of projects in the country and will be in a position to make informed decisions on upcoming projects, on work-in-progress projects and possibly the stalled projects across the country.

1.6 Scope of the study

The study was carried out in Garissa County, which is in North-eastern province in Kenya. It focused on the factors affecting the performance of water and sanitation projects in this county. The area of study was limited itself to the thirteen wards of the Dujis constituency. Dujis is the largest constituency in the greater Garissa County.

The study focused on the project officials and administrators, the local authority, and the representatives of Kenya government in the county.

1.7 Limitations to the study

The researcher faced the following limitations in the course of this research,

i) Authentic information especially from the project officials for fear of further implications for failure of the projects was had to obtain but the researcher overcome this obstacle by explaining to the officials that the project was purely academic.

ii) Generalization of results from Garissa County was a challenge because the county faces many location negative issues and the projects surveyed seemed too careful with the type of answers that they gave.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter focused on the literature review on the concepts of performance and on the use of project management tools and technique which included the factors affecting the adoption of these tools by project managers. Thereafter are the research gaps that this study would fill and a summary of reviewed literature. This chapter concluded with the conceptual framework clearly highlighting the dependent and the independent variables.

2.2 Theoretical Review
Project management nowadays is regarded as a very high priority as all companies or organisations, whether small or large, are at one time or another involved in implementing new undertakings, innovations and changes. These projects may be individually diverse, however over time, some tools, management techniques and problem-solving approaches have proven themselves to be more rewarding than others in bringing projects to a successful end. (Olaf, 2009).

Additionally to external challenges, project teams are forced on a macro level to deliver satisfying results for internal or external customers and stay within the restrictions of budget, time and resources (quality and quantity). In parallel to these deliverables, executives are also asking the project management on a micro level to ensure the use of modern management tools, such as customizing the project organisation to fit the operational style of the project teams and respective team members, informing the executive management about the project's progress on a real-time basis, ensuring that critical task deadlines are met and ensuring that project team members know about and monitor project risk and share accurate, meaningful and timely project documents.

As a result, the thrilling and demanding position of a project manager not only requires a particular set of skills - how to communicate, to control and to motivate people, but also the specific knowledge about tools and techniques required to run a project successfully.
According to Johansson et al. (1993), a process can be defined as the constitution of links between activities and the transformation that takes place within the process. This can include the upstream part of the value chain as a possible recipient of the process output. Therefore, every process has the following characteristics, Definability that it must have clearly defined boundaries, input and output. Order it must consist of activities that are ordered according to their position in time and space.

Customer in which there must be a recipient of the process' outcome, i.e. a customer. Value-adding to be the transformation taking place within the process must add value to the recipient, either upstream or downstream and embeddedness where a process cannot exist in and of itself; it must be embedded in an organizational structure. (Olaf, 2009). There is also Cross-functionality a process regularly can, but not necessarily must, span several functions.

A project will deliver business and/or technical objectives, is made up of defined processes & tasks, will run for a set period of time, has a budget and resources. Project Management deals with tracking this process' execution, from a schedule and cost perspective. It includes functions for developing the optimal project schedule, producing a financial model of the project, scheduling and tracking of effort against plan, managing costs against budget, and reporting of status, to name but a few. (Jansson and Ljung, 2004).

Olaf (2009) states that the uniqueness of the deliverable, whether it is a product, service, or result, requires a special approach in that there may not be a pre-existing blueprint for the project’s execution and there may not be a need to repeat the project once it is completed. Uniqueness does not mean that there are not similarities to other projects, but that the scope for a particular project has deliverables that must be produced within constraints, through risks, with specific resources, at a specific place, and within a certain period; therefore, the process to produce the deliverable as well as the deliverable itself is unique.

Projects are usually chartered and authorized external to the project organisation by an enterprise, a government agency, a company, a program organisation, or a portfolio organization. (Olaf, 2009)
2.2.1 Project success

Several studies have suggested that the proper use of project management tools and techniques (PMTT) affects the success of a project, while inappropriate use can be counterproductive. Many PMTT are used in different phases of a project, but it is shown that only some of them enhance the success of the project.

The success of a project can be categorized into three major groups: internal factors (times, cost and performance), customer-related factors (satisfaction, actual utilisation and benefits) and organisation related factor (financial and market benefits). In the conceptual phase, two PMTT contribute to positive project success; analogous estimate and communication plan. Significantly contributions to success in the planning phase are those that serve the purpose of developing detailed scopes, schedules or budgets.

PMTT with project success during the execution phase are those that support monitoring and control activities. In the termination phase, cost baseline, WBS, lessons learned and milestone analysis show significant contribution to project success. However, there are many more PMTT used during the different phases because project managers still use PMTT without understanding their impact on project success. It is important the project manager use the PMTT that impact on the success of the project and not only those commonly known or frequently used by others. (Patanakul, Iewwongcharoen, & Milosevic, 2010).

When a project is a success it does not necessary mean the tool or technique used will be the best suited with the next project because every project is unique and dependent on its historical and organisational context. Projects are open systems and very much dependent in its surroundings (Engwall, 2003). There is no approach of how to formulate the expected benefits that fits all projects or companies, because every project is unique (Nogeste, 2011).
2.2.2 Project portfolio management

When a company has many projects in progress and many project ideas, a project portfolio is a tool to manage all these projects and ideas. There are usually more ideas available for selection that can be undertaken within the physical and financial constraints of the company, so choices must be made in making a suitable project portfolio (Archer and Ghasemzadeh, 1999).

Project Portfolio Management (PPM) is responsible for the project portfolio, with maximising it against corporate objectives, make sure it is balanced and ultimately aligned with the company’s strategy (Bonham, 2004). Strategy can be considered to go through an organisation, linking portfolios and projects in a systematic and hierarchical manner. A strategy is implementing the goals and objectives of a company (Nogeste, 2011).

Many possible methodologies can be used in selecting a portfolio but there is no consensus on which are the most effective. It is important every company chose the methodology that suits its culture and allow it to consider the project attributes it believes are the important (Bonham, 2004). An overall balance needs to be achieved between the need to simplify and the need to generate well-founded and logical solutions (Archer and Ghasemzadeh, 1999). It is important the project review process be only for review, and not a platform for micromanaging projects (Bonham, 2004).

2.2.3 Prioritizing projects

Most PPM’s use ranking methods, by assigning initiatives and projects scores and put them against each other. The initiative with the highest score is usually approved to proceed.

However, when considering a balanced portfolio, it may require some initiatives with lower rank to proceed, because it may support a long-term balanced strategic direction more (Bonham, 2004). This is the balancing act between prioritising the business strategy, the limiting budget and knowing when it is the right time to start a project. In this balancing act, the projects in progress need to be monitored to make sure they fulfill the
expected benefits, or they can be closed. If the corporate strategy has shifted or the project scope has changed, the project would be considered more risky if it is not satisfying the company’s strategy. In the case of a closed project, their remaining capital can be applied to other more beneficial projects at the time (Pennypacker & San, 2009).

To make sure an initiation will be reviewed fairly and consistently against other proposals the review process will have to be communicated to the orderers. They need to balance between the corporate culture that encourages innovative ideas and an environment that ensures rigorous strategic assessments. Orderers will be assured their hard work in the initiation phase will get the due diligence it deserves if they know the prioritising of projects process by the PPM. This insurance is important because a project declined by the PPM is definitely closed and will never be seen by the executive review committee (Bonham, 2004).

2.3 Performance of projects

Performance management can be defined as a systematic process for improving organizational performance by developing the performance of individuals and teams. It is a means of getting better results by understanding and managing performance within an agreed framework of planned goals, standards and competency requirements. Processes exist for establishing shared understanding about what is to be achieved, and for managing and developing people in a way that increases the probability that it will be achieved in the short and longer term. It focuses people on doing the right things by clarifying their goals. (Armstrong, 2011)

Performance management can be described as a continuous self-renewing cycle Planning concluding a performance and development agreement. Acting managing performance throughout the year. Reviewing assessing progress and achievements so that action plans can be prepared and agreed and, in many schemes, performance can be rated.

Performance agreements form the basis for development, assessment and feedback in the performance management process. They define expectations in the form of a role profile that sets out role requirements in terms of key result areas and the competen-cies required for
effective performance. The role profile provides the basis for agreeing objectives and methods of measuring performance and assessing the level of competency reached. The performance agreement incorporates any performance improvement plans that may be necessary, and a personal development plan. It describes what individuals are expected to do but also indicates what support they will receive from their manager.

Okuwoga (1998) stated that the performance of any industry is considered as a source of concern to both public and private sector clients. Karim and Marosszeky (1999) studied performance measurement using key performance indicators (KPIs). KPIs enable a comparison between different projects and enterprises to identify the existence of particular patterns. The specialist contractors hoped that the data trends observed will provide insight into certain inefficiencies that are prevalent in the market. They intend to use the data to expose these inefficiencies and as a basis for industry development (Karim and Marosszeky, 1999).

Key performance indicators (KPIs) include factors such as time, cost, quality, client satisfaction; client changes, business performance and safety in order to enable measurement of project and organizational performance throughout the any industry. This information can then be used for benchmarking purposes, and will be a key component of any organization move towards achieving best practice (DETR, 2000). Lehtonen (2001) stated that performance measurement is a current issue in academia, as well as in business community. Samson and Lema (2002) stated that KPIs are very important in order to deliver value to stakeholders. So, companies must be sure they have right processes and capabilities in place. The KPIs also allow to trace which processes and capabilities must be competitively and distinctive, and which merely need to be improved or maintained.

Performance measurement and its indicators had been studied for several years. Karim and Marosszeky (1999) defined performance measurement as an operational management accounting including financial and non-financial performance indicators. Karim and Marosszeky (1999) stated that performance measurement is a process of re-thinking and re-evaluation of business processes to achieve significant performance improvements of
projects. Reichelt and Lyneis (1999) defined performance measurement as a model which treat project as the complex dynamic system.

The key performance indicators are identified by DETR (2000) as an applicable indication of project and/or company levels. In some cases the company indicator is the average value of that company’s project indicators. Al-Momani (2000) stated that the owner satisfaction for performance can be defined as the gap between what the owner expects and the level of performance they believe is being delivered by the contractors. Lehtonen (2001) stated that performance measurement is a basis for progressive improvement and monitoring of company productivity. Chan and Kumaraswamy (2002) remarked that project performance measurement include time, budget, safety, quality and overall client satisfaction. Thomas (2002) defined performance measurement as monitoring and controlling of projects according to regular basis. Kuprenas (2003) stated that project performance measurement means an improvement of cost, schedule, and quality for design and construction stages. Long et al (2004) stated that a project performance measurement is related to many indicators such as time, budget, quality, specifications and stakeholders satisfaction. Navon (2005) defined performance measurement as a comparison between the desired and the actual performances. Ugwu and Haupt (2007) classified the key performance indicators as site-specific and project-specific.

According to previous studies, concepts and definitions, it can be said that the performance measurement is a process include factors as Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) such as time, cost, quality, client satisfaction; productivity and safety in order to enable measurement of current organizational project performance and to achieve significant performance improvements of future projects.

2.4 Empirical Review

2.4.1 Project Planning and Performance of projects

A typical description of the project manager goal is to bring a project to completion on time, within the budget cost, and to meet the planned performance or end-product goals (Simpson 1987). This commonly held view of the project manager task is based on the assumption that the performance or end product goals are always clear and well defined in advance. All the
project manager has to do is to prepare a solid project plan and follow this plan all the way to success. Although there are some that claim that too much planning can curtail the creativity of the project team, there is no argument that at least a minimum level of planning is required.

Simpson (1987) states that, although planning does not guarantee project success, lack of planning will probably guarantee failure. However, there are many cases where projects are executed as planned, on time, on budget and achieve the planned performance goals, but turn out to be complete failures because they failed to produce actual benefits to the customer or adequate revenue and profit for the performing organization.

2.4.1.1 Project planning

Most authors agree that a project is a unique endeavor, a special task that has not been done before. Consequently, it is very difficult or even impossible to know precisely at the initial planning stage what are all the activities that need to be carried out in order to complete the project, and what their cost and duration parameters are. (Andersen 1996). The issue is even more severe when the kind of activities that should be undertaken depends on the outcome of earlier activities. For that reason some might even jump to a conclusion that planning is not necessarily helpful or even desirable. (Andersen 1996).

Andersen (1996) proposes to replace the standard planning approach with milestone planning (Turner 1993), where a milestone is defined as a result to be achieved. Since a milestone describes what is to be done, but not the way it should be done, milestone planning promotes result-oriented thinking rather than activity oriented thinking.

Bart (1993) points out that the traditional approach of planning and controlling of R&D projects tend to fail mainly because of too much formal control which curtails creativity from playing a crucial role in execution of the project. Bart (1993) proposes to reduce the formal control and keep only a minimum required level.

There is no argument as to the contribution of complete and accurate capture of end-user requirements to successful project completion (Chatzoglou, 1996). This is because the
output of the requirements analysis stage will most likely determine the output of the entire development process. Posten (1985) has found that 55% of all defects in R&D projects occur during requirement analysis and specification whereas 43% of all defects are not found until after the testing stage.

The importance of the initiation phase stands out relative to other phases in the project life cycle (King 1988). Dvir et al. (1999) in a recent study of development projects in Israel indicate that the origination and initiation phase, in which major decisions are made, such as deciding the project’s objectives and planning the project’s execution, has the most influence on the project’s success. They also found that although the preparation of formal design and planning documents has a strong positive effect on meeting the project’s time and budget objectives, it also contributes significantly to the customer’s benefits from the end-product.

Although studies of organizational effectiveness and organizational success have been at the heart of organization theory for many years, research into project success has not converged to a standard approach. One widely used approach searches for a simple formula that is unequivocal and easy to apply. Measures of this type have typically equated success with meeting the project’s budget and schedule and achieving an acceptable level of performance (Pinto 1988). However, these measures, even when taken together, are at most partial. They may count as successful projects that met the planning objectives (schedule, budget and performance objectives), but may not have met end-user needs and requirements or there may have been difficulty in commercializing the final product (Baker 1988).

The success rating of a project may also differ according to subjective, individual judgment. Freeman and Beale (1988) point out that success means different things to different people. Comprehensive success criteria must therefore reflect different interests and views, which lead to a multi-dimensional, multi-criteria approach (Cooper et al. 1987). Pinto and Mantel (1990) identified three aspects of project performance as benchmarks for measuring the success or failure of a project, the implementation process, the perceived value of the project, and client satisfaction with the delivered project.
Shenhar, Dvir and Levy (1997) used 13 success measures adapted from previous research and showed that these measures could be grouped into four dimensions which are Meeting design goals, Benefit to the customer, Commercial success, and Future potential. Clearly, not all four success dimensions are of the same importance. Lipovetsky et al. (1997), who analyzed defense projects, concluded that the success dimensions meeting design goals and benefit to the customer are the most important ones to all stakeholders in the projects.

2.4.2 Stakeholder expectations and the performance of projects

Organizational Strategic Management (OSM) integrates all major activities and functions of an organization and directs them towards advancing an organization’s strategic agenda. It integrates all other management processes to provide a systematic, coherent and effective approach in establishing, attaining, monitoring and upgrading an agency’s strategic objectives. Given the dynamic political and institutional environment within which many public agencies operate in Africa, an effective strategic management capability is essential for maintaining or strengthening the links between the organization, external stakeholders, and managing for results (Poister and Streib, 1999).

Public services cannot expect to serve their clients and customers effectively without their full involvement in policy initiation, analysis and formulation (DPMD 2003). The stakeholders in the public service include, the private sector, including the informal sector, professional associations and trade unions, non-governmental organizations, regulatory bodies, multinational corporations, international financial institutions, international development institutions and foreign Governments and Agencies (Gergis 1999).

In the twenty-first century, citizens and other stakeholders are demanding to be heard with greater frequency. The development of partnerships with these stakeholders is therefore paramount to effective formulation and implementation of public sector reforms and strategies for public service delivery. If the ultimate goal of the public sector is to satisfy the needs of the population, then any credible programme should ensure that it represents the interests of the people.
Gergis (1999) dwelt on the need to empower and engage relevant stakeholders in the decision-making process in Botswana. Citizen economic empowerment is seen as a socio-economic process through which the Botswana people are motivated to enhance their belief in self-efficacy, to improve their abilities to control their own resources, and to unleash their creative and productive energies to achieve sustainable improvement in their living standards. Effective empowerment requires multilateral communications and two-way power relations among government, policy makers, private sector organizations, and other civil society organizations at the international, national and local levels. Gergis (1999) concludes by stating that the involvement of stakeholders will increase the transparency and accountability of any process.

2.4.3 Monitoring and Evaluation and performance of projects

Baker (2000) defines a comprehensive evaluation as one that includes monitoring, process evaluation, economic evaluation, and impact evaluation. She also summarizes the different purposes each type of evaluation. Monitoring is used to assess whether a program is being implemented as was planned. Process evaluation assesses how the program operates and focuses on problems in service delivery. Economic evaluation (cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness) assesses program costs and benefits. Impact evaluation, the focus of this document, measures the impacts of the program on individuals, households, or other groups such as firms, and determines whether the program caused these impacts (Baker 2000; WB-OED 2004).

The fact that impact evaluation is concerned with the results that are caused by the program distinguishes it from process evaluations. Process evaluation is focused on how well the program is operating, and relies mainly on qualitative analyses to identify bottlenecks in program implementation or service distribution, deviations from the project plan, user satisfaction, as well as conflicts or transaction costs. As described, these are vital complements to an impact evaluation in gaining a thorough understanding of what works and why. (Bamberger, 2006)
Baker (2000) noted that to measure final impact, an impact evaluation must determine what would have happened in the absence of the program this is known as the counterfactual. This is complicated by the fact that the counterfactual is naturally unobservable we can never know what change would have occurred in program participants (treatment group) if the program was not implemented.

The key focus of impact evaluation is its ability to measure the causes of outcomes. In general, impact evaluation use either randomized trials or, when interventions are not randomly assigned, appropriate quasi-experimental methods. An experimental design, in theory, eliminates all sources of selection bias. However, experimental designs are often not feasible for political or logistical reasons and these designs have rarely been used in WSS. Thus, we rely on quasi-experimental designs that employ a battery of purposive sampling and econometric estimation techniques to control for selection on observables and unobservable (Shadish, Cook, and Leviton, 1991). Most WSS impact evaluations use these designs.

An impact evaluation measures a program’s progress by tracking indicators of the program’s inputs and results. An indicator is any direct and unambiguous measure of progress toward the intended goals of a program. Prenusshi et al. (2000) sees a good indicator as, relevant to program objectives (e.g., per capita water consumption), varying across areas, groups, over time, and sensitive to changes in policies, programs, and institutions (e.g., hours of water supply), not easily diverted or manipulated (e.g., presence of a pit latrine), and able to be tracked (e.g., functionality of public stand pipes). During the evaluation process, it is important to monitor program inputs though what are called “intermediate” indicators provide information on activities and outputs and thus provide valuable information on whether a program was implemented successfully (Bosch et al. 2000; Prenusshi et al. 2000). Outcomes and impacts are tracked through “final indicators”.

Program resources and program activities constitute the program inputs. Resources are the available financial, human, social, and institutional capital for the program. These include
funds from donors, government, and matched funds from communities. It includes the human capital (from the government, nongovernmental organizations, and communities) that contributes to operating and maintaining the system and partnerships that facilitate system operations. Finally, formal institutions (laws, regulations, economy) and informal institutions (custom, norms, social capital) that support or constrain the system are also program resources. (Pattanayak et al. 2006).

A good evaluation should track any “external” indicators, which measure factors exogenous to the program that could influence the program’s ability to achieve its intended results (Prenusshi et al. 2000). As discussed previously, ignoring these exogenous factors can introduce confounding bias into the evaluation. For example, rural WSS programs may initially target poor communities that are located closer to water sources because of the cost advantages of serving these communities relative to more distant communities. Due to their proximity to water sources, targeted communities may have better WSS conditions, health, and incomes at baseline. Failing to account for the differences between the treated and untreated groups in these external factors, which are correlated with both the intervention and the impacts of interest, would lead to upwardly biased estimates of impacts.

Baker (2000) describes key steps in designing and implementing impact evaluations. The first step is to determine whether or not to carry out an evaluation. Since impact evaluation can be complex and expensive, Baker (2000) and Ferraro and Pattanayak (2005) suggest a number of criteria to determine whether an impact evaluation is required. One is to compare the likely costs and benefits of the impact evaluation. The benefits of an evaluation are likely to be higher when the project is innovative (e.g., testing new technology, new delivery mechanisms, or new organizational structure); is scalable, replicable, and likely to be expanded to other settings; involves substantial resource allocations; and has well-defined interventions.

On the other hand, the benefits of impact evaluation are likely to be low when a program’s outcomes cannot be generalized because of certain peculiar characteristics of the population, institutions, systems, program, or environmental setting. If the project is experimental and likely to be revised over time, it could be difficult to conduct an impact evaluation. However, if the evaluation is integrated with a well planned experimental project, it is possible that the
evaluation could provide an answer on which intervention to scale up within a given project. (Bamberger et al. 2004)

2.4.4 Government Policies and Performance of projects

In 1999, Kenya embarked on a radical water sector reform in order to improve the dire state of the water services and water resource management. Kenya’s intention to reform in light of the problems faced and the lessons learnt paved the way for the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp). The Water Act of 2002 is currently the main piece of legislation for the regulation of the water sector in Kenya. All policies, regulations and bylaws, directives and administration actions from the water ministry and strategic plans and all activities by water sector institutions must be carried out in accordance with its provisions.

An institutional framework with eleven new Water Sector Institutions was created, with water resources management and water services forming separate entities and given clear mandate of a division of regulatory and implementing roles. Additionally, as a part of the overall Public Sector Reform, performance contracting was introduced into the water sector, leading to performance objectives being spelt out both at institutional as well as individual level. (Danida, 2010).

According to Danida (2010) the major achievements of the KWSP can be defined as supporting, through technical assistance and direct investment, the effective establishment of the new water sector institutions and the development of a project cycle (Community Project Cycle or CPC) for the support and financing of rural water and sanitation schemes.

The institutions and the CPC system is sustainable and will continue to result in improved access to water supply and sanitation beyond the life of the KWSP. Through Non CPC and CPC schemes the total number of people provided with improved access to water during the KWSP does not fall far short of the 900,000 people anticipated. (Danida, 2010). By all accounts, the KWSP has made a considerable and significant contribution in the establishment of each of the WSBs. It has further assisted the WSTF in its orientation and development as it has supported the WASREB in addressing key constraints. (GOK, 2009).
From the late 1980s, the debate on good governance and its requirements has provided an impetus for new approaches to public sector management reforms. Some of the changes that have taken place have been aimed at tackling some of the worst forms of governance abuses and failures in Africa: the personalized nature of rule in which key political actors exercise unlimited power; systemic clientelism; misuse of State resources and institutionalized corruption; opaque government; the breakdown of the public realm; the lack of delegation of power and the withdrawal of the masses from governance (Hyden, 1992 and 2000, Bratton & van de Walle, 1992).

Good public management and administration, with emphasis on accountability and responsiveness to customer needs, has been seen as an aspect of good governance by donor agencies supporting reforms in developing countries. To the World Bank (1992), good governance consists of a public service that is efficient, a judicial system that is reliable, and an administration that is accountable to the public.

The World Bank elaborates on four elements of good governance (World Bank, 1989, 1992): public sector management emphasizing the need for effective financial and human resource management through improved budgeting, accounting and reporting, and rooting out inefficiency particularly in public enterprises. Accountability in public services, including effective accounting, auditing and decentralization, and generally making public officials responsible for their actions and responsive to consumers.

A predictable legal framework with rules known in advance, a reliable and independent judiciary and law enforcement mechanisms, and availability of information and transparency in order to enhance policy analysis, promote public debate and reduce the risk of corruption. It is apparent from the above conception of “good governance” that there is some emphasis on improving public-sector management systems. Thus, in the good governance prescriptions, one finds public management reforms as a key component pointing towards market and private sector approaches to public sector management (DPMD 2003).

The volume of external financial assistance is not likely to grow fast enough to meet water and sanitation needs around the world. Governments will have to continue to be primarily responsible for raising and using public funds (from general revenue, cross subsidization,
user fees, and borrowing) for water resources and sanitation infrastructure needs (UNDP, 2007).

2.5 Summary of Literature Review and Research Gaps

Project managers typically use several tools and techniques to help them manage project activities from the beginning of the project to completion of the project. The proper use of these project tools impacts the success of the project. Projects generally have outcomes and performance targets that have been set by the overseers of the project. These overseers may be the government, funders, financiers or the non-governmental organizations in charge of the project.

Project performance indicators must be met and these are accountability of the use of funds and ensuring that projects complete on the set budgets, effective utilization of resources and completion of the projects on the expected date. However, these targets are affected by some external factors which influence the project success and project management. All project managers must ensure that they look into the influences of these factors so as to efficiently complete their projects.

The manner and way in which the project manager sets their objectives, executes the project and carries out project implementation is vital to the success of any project. Project planning can never be overemphasized on how it is essential in the success of projects. The stakeholders on the hand also closely monitor the progress of these projects and are quick at pointing out any deficiencies. Their decisions are important and project managers must be keen in taking in their suggestions.

Other factors such as government policies on issues such as funding or financing, their policies on the expectations of the benefits of the projects to the community, political influence on the projects and the deadlines set must be monitored by the project managers. Monitoring and evaluation as another factor affecting the performance of projects should be ensured that impact assessments are carried out to give feedback on how far projects have been carried, they also point out areas of improvement and the work in progress charts.

This empirical review has categorically shown that this research on the factors affecting water and sanitation projects has been done on a general term in Kenya but not on specific county's
hence the need to carry the research in Garissa county. These studies do not show the specific effect and how these factors affect the performance of water and sanitation projects in the selected county.

### 2.5 Conceptual Framework

Conceptual framework is a schematic diagram of the independent variables and the dependent variables. The independent variable includes project planning, expectation of the stakeholders, monitoring and evaluation, and government policies. These are the variables as used in the performance of water and sanitation projects in Garissa County.

![Figure 2.1 schematic diagram](image)

Source: (Author, 2012)

The performance of the water and sanitation projects is affected by many factors some of which are shown in the figure above. Since performance is an observable characteristic is it observed through the budgets if projects have been completed within the set budget, the completion time that is if the project has been completed within the expected timeline and with the resources allocated to the project.

**Project planning** – This is the basis for scheduling budget, equipment, labour, communications, the estimated time consumption and the start and the finish dates. Project
planning is carried out by the project manager by setting out the projects objectives to be attained.

**Expectations of stakeholders** - The expectations of the typical groups such as the customer, sponsor, project team, project office, or anyone who needs project information in order to make decisions and/or contribute to the project processes. The stakeholders’ decisions and support also affect the performance of the projects.

**Monitoring and evaluation** – this holds a big place in the success of the projects for it gives proper feedback to the stakeholders on the progress of the projects, it provides the control of the progress by indicating whether the standards set are being met and it provides the corrective measures and way forward for successful completion of the projects.

**Government policies** – the government gives directives, rules, or orders which can affect the performance of the project. Procedures and policies in support of the project are essential ingredient of successful completion of projects.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter was to discuss the research design used, the total population and the target population, the sampling procedure and the sample size. It also discussed the validity and reliability of the instruments of the research, the methods of data collection and the method of data analysis and presentation.

3.2 Research Design
The researcher adopted a descriptive research design with a case study of the water and sanitation projects in Garissa County. According to Kombo and Tromp (2006) a descriptive design determines and reports the way things are by describing the behavior, attitudes, values and characteristics. The descriptive design was appropriate because the researcher sought to determine the present effect of factors on a selected population. Descriptive design is also a method of collecting information by interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals (Orodho, 2005).

3.3 Target Population

The target populations for this study were the people who are directly involved in the water and sanitation projects in Garissa County. There are a total of 250 employees employed in the 12 projects currently on progress in the county and approximately 14,000 people who benefit directly from these WAS projects. (USAID, 2011). The target population comprised of individuals who were drawn from the following groups of Dujis constituency which had 13 wards in the county. They comprised of a total of 50 residents who the researcher picked purposively from the 13 wards. The respondents included the water and sanitation officials where 24 officials were selected from the 250 employee, 2 officials per project. Also 10 government representatives through the administrative office were selected.

3.4 Sampling design and procedure
Since the researcher surveyed all the WASAN projects in the county a census approach was used. When the universe is small there is no use resulting to a sample. When all items are
covered, no element of chance is left and highest accuracy is obtained (Kothari, 2004) The respondents were picked using the random sampling method to ensure that all the respondents stand equal chance of being selected to avoid sample bias and ensure that the results are reliable enough to be generalized. 10 residents will be picked purposively, simple random sampling method was used to select 30 the employees of WAS, 2 employees from the projects currently running. Finally, 10 government officials were also selected randomly. The sample size was a total of 50 respondents.

3.5 Data collection instruments and procedures

Both primary and secondary data was used for this study. Primary data will be collected from the respondents using data collection instrument which comprised of questionnaires. The questionnaires were self administered where the respondents completed them on their own. The Researcher obtained a letter of introduction from the university it was attached to the questionnaires and delivered to the targeted respondents by the researcher and his assistants. The questionnaires were collected after two weeks.

Secondary data was obtained from journals, published materials, government reports and articles and also from the United Nation library on water and sanitation projects.

3.5.1 Reliability and Validity of instruments

Sekaran (2003) defines reliability as the measure of degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results. To ensure reliability, the research instrument will be pre-tested in a selected group of 10 respondents to ensure consistence and comprehensiveness. In addition consultation with experts, supervisor and peers will be done. Sekaran (2003) defines validity as the accuracy and meaningfulness of inference using the validity index which measured the degree of accuracy of the data collected representing a specific domain of indicators or constructs of a concept.

On other hand Validity and Reliability of the study was assured by checking the questionnaire for accuracy and completeness.
3.6 Data Analysis and Presentation

Data was compiled, sorted, classified into qualitative and quantitative data. Factor analysis was conducted on the variables. The intent is to reduce the variables to a manageable number and eliminating variables that may belong together and have overlapping measuring characteristics to fit well into the model (Field, 2009). Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics was worked out and percentages formed the presentation. Correlation analysis was also conducted and correlation coefficients obtained for analysis. The results were presented in tables and figures.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.0 Analysis of background information

4.1 Response Rate
Out of the total fifty 50 questionnaires distributed, 30 of them were correctly filled and
turned, giving a response rate of 60%. Descriptive statistics was carried out on the
background characteristics of the respondents which seemed to affect the results.

4.1.1 Gender
The table below gives the gender response between men and women who filled the
questionnaires as distributed.

Table 4.1 Gender Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)

The above results depicts that the male respondents were 76.7%, which is very high from the
respondents of the female, which was 23.3%. This may imply that most of the projects in
Garissa County are managed and supervised by the male community.

4.1.2 Level of Education

Table 4.2 level of Education of Respondents

The respondents’ level of education is analyzed in the table below, this shows how literate the
respondents are.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)

Table 4.2 represents the level of education of the respondents. The table indicates that the education is evenly distributed. The respondents were educated with 6.7% with secondary education which is the lowest, 23.3% holding a diploma qualification, the holders of degree certificates with the highest percentage of (40.0%). Professional certification and qualification holders were at 13.3%. This may signify that the projects are managed by equally qualified personnel.

4.1.3 Job Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)
Table 4.3 shows the various job roles or positions held by the respondents who manage or are interested in the successful completion of the projects. Those who hold clerical positions are 20% and the supervisors are 23.3% while the management took a percentage of 30% comprising the highest positions to respond to the questionnaires however, the local took a percentage of 26.7%. This table depicts that the respondents were balanced across job roles or positions.

4.2 Factors Affecting Performance

4.2.1 Project planning
Section B of the questionnaire comprised of questions that indicate how the various factors affect the performance of the water and sanitation projects in Garissa County. The first factor to be analysed is project planning which used a five-likert scale ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’.

Figure 4.1 project Planned Timeline

![Graph showing project planned timelines]

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)
Figure 4.1 above shows the level of agreement or disagreement on whether the project operated as per the planned timelines that have been set for starting and completion of projects in the county. The highest number of respondents standing at 73.3% strongly agreed that the water and sanitation projects work as per the timelines that have been set. Just 20% of them agreed while 3.3% were not decided and 3.3% disagreed that the project begun on time and finished on time. This may signify that the projects begun on the timelines given by the project planners.

**Figure 4.2 Resource Utilization**

![Resource Utilization Chart]

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)

The figure above shows whether the planned project resources are utilized as planned without either misappropriation or unnecessary wastage. A very high percentage of 56.7% strongly agreed that resources are well utilized by the project officials. 16.7% of the respondents agreed to this statement however, 23.3% were not decided whether the resources were utilized
as planned or not and 3.3% disagreed that the resources were utilized as agreed by the project planners.

Figure 4.3 Completion on Planned schedule

![Completion on Planned Schedule Chart]

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)

Figure 4.3 above shows the level of agreement on whether the water and sanitation projects are completed on the planned scheduled time. 53.3% of the respondents strongly agree that the projects are completed on the scheduled time, 13.3% of them just agree with the completion schedules while 26.7% actually are not decided. 3.3% disagree and strongly disagree that the projects are completed on schedule.

4.2.2 Stakeholder Expectation
Project stakeholders play a vital role on how projects are managed and run. The stakeholders in reference are government officials, local community, banks, donors, and other interested
parties to the projects. Respondents were asked to state their level of agreement or
disagreement on the expectations of the stakeholders.

The frequency distribution table for the stakeholders is as given by table 4.4 below

**Table 4.4 Project Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government officials</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks/donors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.4 Stakeholder Involvement**

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)
Figure 4.4 shows that 36.7% the highest level of agreement agree that project stakeholders are involved in the projects and are aware of the progress and activities of the projects, 30% are not decided on whether the stakeholders get involved or not, 20% of the respondents strongly agree that the stakeholders are involved in the daily management of the projects. Respondents who either disagree or strongly disagree respectively disagree to an extent of 6.7%. this signifies that there is a balanced level of agreement on whether stakeholders are involved on the daily management of the projects.

**Figure 4.5 Pulling out of projects by Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Decided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** (Survey Data, 2012)

Figure 4.5 shows the level of agreement whether pulling out of the projects by any of the stakeholders have any impact on the progress on the projects. 46.7% of the respondents strongly agree that if any of the stakeholders pull out of the project, there is a notable impact on the progress of the projects. 16.7% agree and strongly disagree respectively that pulling
out of stakeholders have an effect on the running of the projects. 10% of the respondents are not decided or disagree with the statement that pulling out of projects affects the progress of projects. This signifies that stakeholders are of important value to the progress of the projects.

4.2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation
Projects must be continuously be monitored and evaluated phase by phase to be able to assess the progress and to ensure that the planned timelines, schedules, resources are sufficient to carry the projects through. The respondents were asked to state their level of agreement on the issues of monitoring and evaluation.

Figure 4.6 Continuous M&E
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Source: (Survey Data, 2012)

Clearly the figure above shows that 97% of the respondents agree that projects are continuously monitored and evaluated by the relevant officials hence why the success rate of completion is too high. Only 3% of the respondents state that projects are not continuously
monitored, this is a small percentage which can be ignored in favor of continuous Monitoring and evaluation.

Figure 4.7 Government Policies and Regulations

![Government Policies and Regulations](image)

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)

The respondent posits that government policies and regulations are followed by project managers. 70% of the respondents agree that the project managers follow the policies and regulations set by the government while 30% disagree. This signifies that the project managers work closely with government officials to ensure the success of the projects.
From the figure above, the respondents were to state their level of agreement or disagreement on whether the timelines and deadlines were adhered to by the project managers. 66.7% of the respondents strongly agreed that the timelines and deadlines were adhered to. 20% of the respondents agree to the level of adhering on the timelines and deadlines. 6.7% were not decided while 3.3% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. This may signify that the projects in Garissa County are on track to successful completion.

4.3 Factor Analysis and Correlation Analysis
A principal component analysis was conducted on the 26 items using Varimax technique. Field (2009), states that a factor loading of 0.6 is significant regardless the sample size. Field (2009) particularly recommends an average of communalities of 0.4 to be significant.
The average communalities obtained from the analysis yielded 0.830, which is far above the acceptable limit of 0.4. Generally, a small value below 0.4 indicates variables that do not fit well with the model and such variables should possibly be dropped from the analysis. Nonetheless, from the factor loading table below, all the values are above 0.4, which means that all the variables can be included in the analysis. The total variance explained was 83.03%.

Correlation looks at whether two variables or more are associated or whether they covary. This research used correlation analysis to find out the relationship between the factors affecting the performance of projects. Selected performance dimensions were selected appropriately for ease of data analysis. Bivariate correlation analysis was chosen and Spearman correlation coefficients were found. A Spearman correlation is used when one or both of the variables are not assumed to be normally distributed and interval but are assumed to be ordinal (Field, 2009).

4.3.1 Project Planning

Project planning entails the plans and items that the project managers and officials consider important for successful completion of projects. This includes items such as planning for the objectives of the projects, planning for the timelines, the utilization of resources, planning for the timelines that the project should take phase wise and completion schedules.
Table 4.5 Factor Analysis for Project Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Name</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Planning</td>
<td>• The projects have clear objectives</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project activities are documented and well laid down</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project managers are transparent in the planning process.</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholders participate during the planning of projects.</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Projects operate as per the planned timelines.</td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project resources are utilized as planned by the project managers.</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The planned budget is adhered to.</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Projects are completed as per the planned schedule.</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)

Table 4.5 shows the factor loading for project planning dimensions a variance of .766 explains the project planning variables with project planned schedules with the highest factor loading of .893 and utilization of planned resources as carrying a factor loading of .644.
Table 4.6 Spearman’s correlation Analysis between project planning and performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Transparent</th>
<th>budget</th>
<th>planschedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.462(*)</td>
<td>.376(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.390(*)</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)

Table 4.6 depicts the relationship between project planning and performance parameters. There is a significant relationship between the budget levels and the quality of the projects. This relationship is explained by a coefficient of .462 at a significant level of 0.05. There is also a notable relationship between the completion of projects as per the planned schedule and the quality of the projects; this is again explained by a correlation coefficient of .376 at a significant level of 0.05. On the other hand how transparent the project managers are in the planning process has a significant relationship with the utilization of the resources. This relationship is explained by a correlation coefficient of .390 at a significant level of 0.05. This signifies that the quality of projects and the resource utilization is affected by the transparency of the project managers, the budget schedules and the set schedules.

4.3.2 Stakeholder Expectations

The stakeholders of the projects have certain expectations from the projects this includes been involved in key decision making process of the projects, actively getting involved in the management of the projects on a daily basis, their opinions on dissatisfaction on the progress
of the projects been considered and taken seriously by the project managers among other expectations.

Table 4.7 Factor Analysis for Stakeholder Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Name</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Expectations</td>
<td>Stakeholder decisions matter in the management of the projects.</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholders are actively involved in the daily management of the projects.</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholders are always aware of the progress of the projects.</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholders’ dissatisfaction about any aspect of the progress of the project is documented and acted upon.</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any stakeholder can pull out of the project without much impact on the progress of the project.</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)

Table 4.7 shows the factor loading for stakeholder expectations, the highest factor loading is that stakeholders can pull out of the projects without much impact this is explained by the highest factor loading of .924 although the decisions of the stakeholders matter to a great extent and has a factor loading of .860. This table shows that the dimensions of stakeholder expectations are highly related and explains a very close relationship between the variables.
Table 4.8 Spearman’s correlation Analysis between stakeholder expectations and performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decision Involvement</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>dissatisfaction</th>
<th>budget</th>
<th>timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.445(*)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disatisfaction</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.404(*)</td>
<td>.616(**)</td>
<td>.623(**)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullout</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.444(*)</td>
<td>.583(**)</td>
<td>.719(**)</td>
<td>.741(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.439(*)</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.483(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)

Table 4.8 depicts the results of correlation coefficient matrix which looks at the relationship between stakeholder expectations and the performance of projects. The matrix shows that there is a significant relationship between the factors variables for example there is a significant relationship between awareness of stakeholders on the progress of the projects with a correlation coefficient of .443 at a significant level of 0.05, their pullout impact on the progress of the projects with correlation coefficient of .444 at a significant level of 0.05 and correlation coefficient of .583 which is very significant at a significant level of 0.01 and their involvement into the relationship. There is also a significant relationship between the factors and performance, utilization of resources with a correlation coefficient of .439 at a significant level of 0.05 and stakeholder involvement into the projects, resource utilization with a correlation coefficient of .483 at a significant level of 0.01 and dissatisfaction of stakeholders.
4.3.3 Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and Evaluation of projects explained the need to continuously monitor the projects, it involves who monitors the projects, whether the results for monitoring and evaluation are considered in decision making and if the exercise makes any impact on the completion of the projects.

Table 4.9 Factor Analysis for Monitoring and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor name</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>Are projects continuously monitored and evaluated.</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who evaluates the projects.</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the results of monitoring and evaluation published.</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The progress of the Projects can be attributed to effective reporting of monitoring and evaluation results.</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project managers take the results seriously and amend any loopholes in the progress of the project.</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjustments in project implementation can be attributed to the result of M&amp;E.</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects that are not monitored do not finish on the scheduled time.</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M &amp;E ensures projects utilize allocated resources effectively</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)

Table 4.9 gives the factor loading for Monitoring and Evaluation and clearly from the table there is a close relationship between the variables. The results for monitoring and evaluations once implemented by the project managers explains the success of the project by a factor
loading of .907 which is the key and major reason for carrying out monitoring and evaluation of projects. Taking the results of the M&E by project managers is explained by a factor loading of .900, these results signifies that there is a very close relationship between M&E of projects and the performance of these projects.

Table 4.10 Spearman’s correlation Analysis between M&E and performance

| Source: (Survey Data, 2012) |

Table 4.10 gives a correlation analysis of monitoring and evaluation factors and performance.

The quality of the projects is affected by taking M&E results seriously and by amending any loopholes in the progress of the projects. The correlation coefficient of .439 at a significant level of 0.05 explains this significant relationship. There is a negative relationship between who evaluates the projects and the timelines of the projects. The coefficient is .382 at a significant level of 0.05. This signifies that whoever evaluates the projects does not affect the completion timeline of projects and the quality of projects is affected by the amendments done after M&E results are given to project managers.
4.3.4 Government Policies and Regulation

This variable checks whether the policies and regulations set by the government explains any relationship with the performance of the projects. The factor entails dimensions of how often the regulations are followed, whether the presence of the government officials is felt in the projects progress and whether the government policies on utilization of funds and resources are followed by the project managers.

Table 4.11 Factor analysis for Government Policies and Regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor name</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Policies and</td>
<td>• How often are government policies and regulations followed.</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is the presence of government officials and representatives felt.</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In the allocation of funds/financial budgets.</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Their decisions are valued by the project managers.</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The timelines and deadlines given by the officials are adhered to.</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)

Government policies and regulations factor loadings of the variables are depicted in table 4.11 this table shows that among all the other factors affecting the performance of projects this factor has the highest relationship; the dimensions have a variance of .921. This table shows that the government policies are followed highest in the allocation of funds and financial
budgets of the projects and is explained by the highest factor loading of .967. This signifies that the project managers take seriously the presence of the government officials in the management of the projects for successful completion.

Table 4.12 Spearman’s correlation Analysis between Government policies and regulations and performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: (Source Data, 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 4.12 shows the relationship between government policies and regulations and performance. The table shows that there is a significant relationship between the utilization of resources and funds that have been allocated by the government. The relationship is significant with correlation coefficient of .472 at a significant level of 0.01. There is also a strong negative relationship between the utilization of resources and the timelines given by the government to complete the projects.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter is for summaries, conclusion and recommendations. It summarized the research study, presents the major findings and implications for the project managers of Garissa County water and Sanitation projects; it also gave the appropriate recommendations.

5.2 Summary
5.2.1 Background Information
The completed and returned questionnaires were 60% which is a good response rate, 76.7% of the respondents were male and 40% had university degrees. The highest numbers of questionnaires were responded to by the project managers and those in managerial positions in and around the projects.

5.2.2 Performance of projects
The purpose of this study was to analyze the factors that affect the performance of projects in reference to water and sanitation projects in Garissa County. The literature review chapter gave empirical evidence between the study variables, how the study variables affect the performance of projects positively or negatively. The study used a sample population of eighty four respondents. Data was collected primarily through both primary and secondary sources. One research assistant administered data collection through personal contact. Statistical analysis methods used in the research analysis included descriptive statistics, factor analysis, and correlation analysis. All the research variables were significant and fitted in the model that was tested. The research findings indicated that all the independent variables had a direct relationship with performance. However, monitoring and evaluation and government
policies and regulations had the most effect on the quality, timelines, resource utilization and budgets of the projects.

5.2.3 Project Planning
Project planning was considered as one of the independent variables of this study and it included checking for planning dimensions such as planning and setting of project objectives, documentation of project activities, transparency in the planning process and stakeholder participation in the planning process. 53.3% of the respondents strongly agree that the projects complete on time. The project planning dimension has a variance of .766 indicating that these dimensions are highly related, and a significant correlation coefficient of .462 between the quality of projects and the budgets planned by the project managers.

5.2.4 Stakeholder Expectations
Stakeholders of the projects have expectations from the projects this includes been involved in key decision making process of the projects which takes 36.7% highest level of agreement, actively getting involved in the management of the projects on a daily basis, their opinions on dissatisfaction on the progress of the projects been considered and taken seriously by the project managers among other expectations. There is a very significant relationship between stakeholder dissatisfaction and the pullout rates of stakeholders of .719 at a significant level of 0.01.

5.2.5 Monitoring and Evaluation
M&E of projects explained that 97% of the projects are continuously monitored by the relevant authorities and it involves who monitors the projects, whether the results for monitoring and evaluation are considered in decision making and if the exercise makes any impact on the completion of the projects. A factor loading of .907 agrees that projects that are not monitored and evaluated do not finish on time.
5.2.6 Government Policies and Regulations
The researcher sought to check whether the policies and regulations set by the government explains any relationship with the performance of the projects. 70% of the respondents agreed that the projects keenly followed the policies and regulations as set. The factor entails dimensions of how often the regulations are followed, whether the presence of the government officials is felt in the projects' progress and whether the government policies on utilization of funds and resources are followed by the project managers. It was found out that the highest variable in the allocation of funds and financial budgets which has a factor loading of .967.

5.3 Conclusion
The conclusion of this study is that generally the progress of the projects and their performance is excellent. Karim and Marosszeky (1999) observed that projects' performance key indicators included quality, time, resource utilization and budgets. These performance key measurement indicators were studied along factors such as project planning, stakeholders, monitoring and evaluation exercises and government policies and regulations play a major role in the quality of projects, resources are utilized effectively when monitored and constantly evaluated and when stakeholders have an eye on them also when the government officials are involved in the management of the projects. The World Bank elaborates four elements of good governance of public project management which they emphasized on effective financial utilization, proper reporting, and responsibility of officials for good governance of projects (World Bank, 1992). Also the projects are completed on the scheduled timelines as set during project planning; they are completed as per the government deadlines.

Budgets of the projects are adhered to as planned by the project managers, the budgets and funds allocated by the stakeholders such as donors, financial institutions are utilized
appropriately. Government budgets are also utilized as required. The conclusion is that the performances of the sanitation and water projects in Garissa County are in good progress.

5.4 Recommendation
Based on the research findings, as the researcher the commendation will be that the project officials involved in project planning align their planning strategies appropriately because project planning variable seemed to be the only factor with minimal effect on the quality, timelines and budget though it had an effect on the utilization of resources. Project planning is the only factor with lesser relationship with the performance of the projects in Garissa County, the recommendation is that the project managers should involve all the stakeholders in the project planning process and should ensure that the objectives and plans set out in the beginning of the projects are followed for successful implementation of the projects.

Although the results showed that stakeholders are involved in the daily running of the projects, it also showed that when a stakeholder pulls out of the project there is less impact. The project managers should ensure that they utilize the stakeholders as a vital resource in the running of the projects and also ensure that they keep the stakeholders satisfied at all times during the management and implementation of the projects.

The researcher will recommend that since that there is a negative correlation between M&E and the persons who monitors and evaluates the projects, the project managers should ensure that they re-strategies on the persons or divisions will be responsible for this exercise in the future.

Since there is a very high relationship between the government policies and regulations the researcher would recommend that the project managers continue to work closely with the
government officials and keep up the spirit of ensuring that the policies are followed as expected.

5.5 Recommendations for further research

Since this research was limited to the factors affecting performance of water and sanitation projects in Garissa County, a strong recommendation is to carry out a survey of all the projects of various dimensions and compare the results in order to validate the results obtained from this research. A further research could also be done using different analysis methods to also cross confirm the results obtained.
REFERENCES


Saleh, Samir, and Abu 2008 *Factors Affecting the Performance of Construction Projects in the Gaza Strip*, University of Gaza.


UNRWA, (2007), Projects completion reports, UNRWA, Gaza.


APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Letter of introduction

TO

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Request for permission to collect data

I am undertaking a Master of Business Administration in Kenyatta University. I am carrying out a study entitled; “factors affecting the performance of water and sanitation projects in Garissa County”. I have selected your organisation/ward for data collection.

I hereby request to be allowed to administer a questionnaire to you and some of the members of this organisation/ward which will assist me to complete my study. The information shall be used for the study purpose only.

Thank you in advance

Yours sincerely,

Abdikarim Mohamed Sadiq

P.O BOX 559, 70100
Garissa.
Appendix 2: Questionnaire

Part A

a. Name of the respondent

b. Ward of the respondent

c. Job Position

d. Level of education

Part B

Objective One: project planning and performance of water and sanitation projects.

1. To what extent has project planning affected project performance?

(5) Strongly agree (4) Agree (3) Not decided (3) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT PLANNING</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The projects have clear objectives</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Project activities are documented and well laid down.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Project managers are transparent in the planning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stakeholders participate during the planning of projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Projects operate as per the planned time lines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Project resources are utilized as planned by the project managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The planned budget is adhered to
8. Projects are completed as per the planned schedule

Objective Two: stakeholder expectation and the performance of water and sanitation projects

(6) What is the effect of stakeholder expectations on the performance of projects?

(5) Strongly agree (4) Agree (3) Not decided (3) Disagree (1)

Strongly disagree

STAKEHOLDER EXPECTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stakeholder decisions matter in the management of the projects</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stakeholders are actively involved in the daily management of the projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stakeholders are always aware of the progress of the projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stakeholders' dissatisfaction about any aspect of the progress of the project is documented and acted upon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Any stakeholder can pull out of the project without much impact on the progress of the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective Three: monitoring and Evaluation and the performance of water and sanitation projects

(7) How does monitoring and evaluation affect the performance of projects?

a) Are projects continuously monitored and evaluated?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

b) If yes 3(a) is (Yes), who evaluates these projects? (Tick as appropriate)
   Government officials [ ] project managers [ ]
   Project official’s [ ] stakeholders [ ]
   Others (specify) ____________________________

c) Are the results of the monitoring and evaluation exercise published?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

d) If 3 (c) is Yes, state your level of agreement or disagreement to the following statements.

(5) Strongly agree (4) Agree (3) Not decided (2) Disagree (1)
   Strongly disagree

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The progress of the Projects can be attributed to effective reporting of monitoring and evaluation results.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Project managers take the results seriously and amend any loopholes in the progress of the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adjustments in project implementation can be attributed to the result of M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Projects that are not monitored do not finish on the scheduled time

5. M &E ensures projects utilize allocated resources effectively

**Objective Four: Government policy and the performance of water and sanitation projects**

(8) To what extent do government policies on the performance of projects?

a) How often are government policies and regulations followed by project managers?
   - Always [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Never [ ]

b) Is the presence of government officials and representatives felt in the management and progress of the projects?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

c) If 4 (b) is Yes, to what extent (tick as appropriate)
   - (5) Strongly agree (4) Agree (3) Not decided (2) Disagree (1) strongly disagree

**GOVERNMENT POLICY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In the allocation of funds/financial budgets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Their decisions are valued by the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART C: PERFORMANCE OF PROJECTS

1. Rate the performance of the projects as per the following indicators
   (5) Excellent  (4). Good  3. Average  (2). Poor
   (1). Very poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The quality of the project, both work in progress and final product.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How the budgets are appropriated/used and spend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How are the deadlines/benchmarking phase by phase adhered to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How appropriate are the resources utilized and managed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank You.