SUCCESS AND SUSTAINABILITY OF DONOR FUNDED PROJECTS OF SELECTED INTERNATIONAL NON GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS IN TURKANA COUNTY, KENYA

BY: ALFRED EJEM LOKANGAE

REG NO: D53/CE/22069/2010

RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT OPTION)

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

APRIL, 2013

Lokangae, Alfred Ejem.

success and sustainability of donor
Declaration

STUDENT

I hereby declare that this research proposal is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in Kenyatta University or any other institution of higher learning.

Name: Alfred Ejem Lokangae
Signature: ___________________________ Date: ____________

SUPERVISOR

This is to declare that this research proposal has been submitted with my approval as the candidate’s supervisor.

Name: Mr. Shadrack Bett
Signature: ___________________________ Date: ____________

Name: DR. Stephen Muathe SMA (PhD)
Chairman, Department of Business Administration
Signature: ___________________________ Date: ____________
Dedication

This work is dedicated to my beloved Family. Their moral and spiritual support, patient
Understanding and encouragement greatly influenced much the completion of this research
project. Their passion for education has been a great source of strength and inspiration to
me.
Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all those people who contributed to this research project in many ways. Special thanks and mention should go to all staff of selected international nongovernmental organizations that responded to questionnaires and interviews.

More sincerely, I convey my heartfelt gratitude to my wife, Cecilia and son Allan and daughter Irene for their moral and spiritual support during the time of data collection and compilation of the project.

I would also thank Miss Anne Anabwani, CARE International executive secretary for typing and editing this work. Special gratitude goes to my Supervisor, Mr. Gary Mcgurk, Assistant Country Director- Programmes, CARE International for his support during my studies for this course and providing me an opportunity to carry out my research work. I am Grateful to the management of CARE International for allowing the use of facilities such as internet, computers, office space and papers for printing.

My sincere gratitude goes to my academic supervisor, Mr. S.K. Bett for guiding me through the process.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Title Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii</td>
<td>LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix</td>
<td>ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Background of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.1 Success and Sustainability of projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2 Description of Study Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Statement of the Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Objectives of the Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.1 The broad objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.2 The specific objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Research Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Significance of the Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 Scope of the Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7 Limitation of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Introduction to Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.0 Theoretical Literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1 Success and sustainability of donor funded projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2 Models of success and sustainability of donor funded projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Strategic Directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.1 Strategic Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2 Project sustainability and strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.2: Target Population frequency................................................................. 39
The sample size is summarized in the Table 3.3 .................................................. 40
Table 4.1: Response Rate...................................................................................... 44
Table 4.2: Respondents Position versus Gender...................................................... 44
Table 4.3: Respondents Position versus Age category .......................................... 45
Table 4.4: Respondents Position versus Duration of work .................................... 46
Table 4.5: Respondents Position versus level of Education .................................... 47
Table 4.6: Strategic Directions ............................................................................. 48
Table 4.7: Major Source of Income ....................................................................... 49
Table 4.8: Financial Reporting ............................................................................. 50
Table 4.9: Auditing of Books of Accounts ............................................................... 51
Table 4.10: Effect of contextual issues on Project Success and Sustainability ......... 53
Table 4.11: Effectiveness of Various Donor Policies .............................................. 54
Table 4.12: Level of Participation and Involvement ................................................. 55
Table 4.13: Project Ownership ............................................................................ 56
Table 4.14: Effects of Staff Training on Project Success and Sustainability .......... 61

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.2: Conceptual Framework ...................................................................... 37
Figure 4.1: Effects of Financial Systems on Success and Sustainability ............... 52
Figure 4.2: Level of Commitment ........................................................................ 57
Figure 4.3: Effects of Withdrawal of Donor Funding ............................................ 58
Figure 4.4: Management Styles Adopted ............................................................... 59
Figure 4.5: Effects of Management Styles on Success and Sustainability ............ 60
Figure 4.6: Overall Staff Competency .................................................................. 60
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ADB.................................................................Asian Development Bank
ASAL..............................................................Arid and Semi-Arid Lands
BHN...............................................................Basic Human Needs
CRA.................................................................Commission on Revenue Allocation
CBOs...............................................................Community Based Organizations
ERSWEC..............................Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation
FBOs...............................................................Faith Based Organizations
GoK.................................................................Government of Kenya
HIV/AIDS......................Human Immuno-deficiency Virus/Acquired Immuno-Deficiency Syndrome
HoA.................................................................Horn of Africa
IIED..................International institute for Environment and Development
INGOs..........................International Non Governmental Organizations
MDGs..............................Millennium Development Goals
NGOs.........................................................Non Governmental Organizations
NORAD......................................................Norwegian Agency for Development
OECD..........................Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
Oxfam GB..................................................Oxfam Great Britain
PRSP..................................................Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
UNDP...........................................United Nations Development Programme
UN.................................................................United Nations
UNHCR...............................United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF..........................................United Nations Children’s Fund
USAID..............................United States Agency for International Development
WCED..........................World Commission on Environment and Development
WFP....................................................World Food Programme
ABSTRACT

The presence of international nongovernmental organizations in Kenya can be traced back to earlier years of independence with most of them recording over fifty years of presence and implementing community supported development programmes. The role played by these organizations through donor support in improving living standards of vulnerable communities in any country cannot be underestimated. However, development projects initiated and/or funded by these agencies perform poorly and many become non-operational on termination of donor support. Despite this problem, evaluative studies and recommendations by external consultants are not relevant with the context and socio-cultural factors of African communities. Most of these projects lack transition and participation strategies due to donor pressure on accountability. This therefore poses a gap that this study seeks to fill through investigation of the factors that influence the success and sustainability of the projects especially in poverty ravaged county of Turkana.

The study adopts a descriptive research design. The target population included the employees of selected INGOs in Turkana County. Data was collected from the sampled respondents using questionnaires as the principal data collection instrument. Stratified and purposive sampling techniques were used to come up with a representative sample size. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) to aid in the generation of results. The study recommended successive planning, active participation of stakeholders, the linkage between development plans and vision 2030, all inclusive gender responsive policies, participative and transition strategies that will ensure projects are consultatively identified, owned, successful and sustained by the community long after the donor funds have been withdrawn.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This chapter includes background of the study covering the linkage between poverty and sustainability, the operational context, the objectives and the scope of the study.

1.1 Background of the study

Despite progress achieved since the endorsement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by world leaders at the UN in September 2000, human poverty still remains widespread in certain parts of the world. Globally, the number of extreme poor has dropped by 650 million in the last three decades, a level of progress humankind had never seen. But still there are more than a billion people living in extreme poverty. In the midst of globalized progress and development, human deprivations are still wide spread (UNDP, 2013). Therefore the consequences of hunger and food insecurity frustrate progress towards the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the country’s blue print Vision 2030. The food, fuel, and financial crises that started in 2008 reverberated throughout the global economy, causing job losses, poverty, and economic, financial, and political upheaval in countries all over the world and these global crises affected specifically the poorer, more vulnerable, powerless, and less visible populations in developing countries (World Bank, 2012).
Over fifty years of aid to third world communities has seen huge numbers of dollars going down the drain with little impact, and if any negligible. Poverty continues to nag at the millions of poor people in these communities. The big question that begets everyone mind including the poor and their governments is “Should the West and North continue pouring aid to the third world poor”?

According to UNDP report (2013), Poverty is a multifaceted reality. It is not simply a lack of adequate income; it is a cruel mix of human deprivation in knowledge, health, dignity and rights, obstacles to participation and lack of voice. Therefore, comprehensive transformational change is needed to address the root causes of poverty. The report expounds that economic growth will not produce jobs and cut poverty unless it is inclusive and equitable, and unless the needs of the poor and marginalized are at the centre of development priorities. When men and women have equal opportunities and freedoms, economic growth accelerates and poverty declines more rapidly. The solution to chronic hunger and poverty lies in the successful implementation and sustainability of projects especially in rural communities.

1.1.1 Success and Sustainability of projects

International nongovernmental organizations operating in Turkana County have the main goal of improving the quality of life and strengthening the livelihood security of the local community through successful implementation and sustainability of projects. Unfortunately the funds provided by most of these organizations are project-driven short-term funds, which do not factor into the whole funding mechanism. Hence the need to establish strategic mechanisms and directions that will ensure that such projects become sustainable
after phase out, (Heeks and Baork 1998). Te success and sustainability of projects for selected INGOs in Turkana County is discussed based on the concept of sustainable development. This concept is anchored on three broad concerns, namely: economic efficiency, social equity and environmental sustainability (WCED, 1987).

Project success is dependent on the vision, mission/mandate of the organization and well thought out strategies. Organizational strategies must be flexible and reflect the changing operating environment of the projects in terms of changes in economic environment, or a new social, financial or political environment. Long range strategic planning must set out the strategic directions of the organization in a manner that makes the organization develop competitive advantage and at the same time helping organizations attain its goals. Success of donor funded projects involves the implementation of management decisions and actions that determine the long term performance of the organization. It involves formulating and implementing strategies that will help in aligning the organization and its environment to achieve organizational goals.

Sustainability is the ability of the organization to develop a strategy of growth and development that continues to function indefinitely. This implies that organizations need to have proper strategies covering advocacy, foundations and fundraising, governance, management and leadership among others (Dorothy, 2007). Donor community plays a significant role in the social development process in all regions of the world. They are particularly critical in circumstances where state funds are limited, political situations are fluid, natural disasters resulting from both predictable and unpredictable environmental circumstances, ethnic conflict is rampant and the level of per capita severely restricts the ability to purchase basic goods and services (Social, educational and economic).
The existence of strategic process that not only looks at how a donor funded project is completed but also the transition procedures is critical to the project’s sustainability (Young and Hampshire 2000). Exit strategies should be linked to development strategy as well as the specific goals and objectives for the project. Exit strategies should include identification of institutional capacity-building needs, a description of benchmarks for measuring progress towards project objectives, specific action plans for achieving the benchmarks, and a reasonably flexible timeline within which benchmarks will be met (IFAD 2009). The national policies on poverty eradication as stated in Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) places emphasis on efficient management initiatives supporting improvements on social, economic, political and legal environments. However the question of effectiveness or efficiency of implementation of donor funded projects remains a significant policy and management concern to be investigated.

The donor funded development projects are involved in a wide range of activities and programmes at both regional and national level, all aimed at improving the well-being of poor and marginalized communities. Donor supported agencies such as FBOs, CBOs, NGOs like World Vision, Oxfam GB, Save the Children, Child Fund, MERLIN, Catholic Relief Services and UN bodies such as UNICEF, WFP, UNDP and UNHCR have historically provided vital services to vulnerable communities including refugee populations and contributed significantly to the strengthening of social fabrics and livelihoods of communities (Vital, 2001). Conceptually, development projects undertaken by donor supported agencies are “asset building” that improves the quality of life among residents of low- to – moderate income communities (Vital 2001).
These development projects of INGOs are involved in various activities at the local level which includes integrated food security programmes, promotion of livestock production, Marketing and processing of agricultural and livestock products, access to potable water for human and livestock, conservation of soil, water, wildlife and environment. Health and nutrition programmes for disease prevention and treatment often coupled with mobile health clinics form a common feature in high population density locations. HIV/AIDS pandemic has had far reaching ramifications or impacts on social, cultural, economic, health and religious life of many individuals, families and communities. The fight against the HIV/AIDS scourge is stronger and the donor focus is on information, de-stigmatization and appropriate counseling and coping skills.

The focus on institutional capacity building at regional, national and local levels ensure a workforce with appropriate skills to promote participatory and sustainable community development, while at the same time empowering the community to be more analytical about their situations, resources and develop appropriate interventions to address their plight, their capacities are further enhanced through gender, justice and equity, conflict resolution and civic education and advocacy programmes.

1.1.2 Description of Study Area

Kenya’s land area comprises nearly 80% arid and semi-arid lands commonly referred to as ASALs and also known as rangelands (GoK 2002a, GoK 1994b). Majority of the Counties under ASALs are found in northern Kenya and the government had to create a Ministry of Northern Kenya and Other Arid and Semi-Arid Areas to focus on infrastructural developments of these counties.
Turkana County is the second largest County in Kenya with a land mass of approximately 77,000 sq. Kms, almost 42% of the Rift Valley Province surface area. It is one of the Arid and Semi-arid areas of Northern Kenya that is characterized by persistent and recurrent droughts as a result of poor and erratic rainfall of less than 500 mm, high temperatures of above 35 degrees centigrade, strong and dusty winds and sparse vegetation. According to government census that was conducted in 2009, the County has a population of over 850,000 people with majority of residents being nilotic speaking Turkanas. Other communities include Somalis, Kikuyus, Merus, Kambas and Luhyas who are engaged in businesses. The Population density is 6.9 people per sq.KM and unfortunately 95% of the population live below the poverty line. The County borders Uganda to the west, Southern Sudan and Ethiopia including the disputed Elemi Triangle to the North and North East, West Pokot, Baringo and Samburu to South and Marsabit from North East.

Turkana County has six constituencies namely East, South, Central, West, North and Loima. The economic mainstay of the County is agro-pastoralism but with recurrent droughts and rampant cattle rustling along the international and national borders, majority of the people have resorted to sedentary agriculture along the riverine areas of Turkwel and Kerio. Others are involved in Fishing but again face threats from Ethiopian neighboring communities. Other economic activities include mining of gold and gypsum, weaving and Tourism. The discovery of oil in Turkana early 2012 necessitated the emergence of hope among the poverty ravaged county residents. Though oil comes with challenges as experienced in Countries like Nigeria, Sudan, Niger Delta etc, proper management of the resource will tremendously improve the living conditions of the Turkana community and the entire nation. Some donor agencies such as UNDP and Oxfam have engaged the
communities to demand their rightful share from the oil proceeds and some community organizations have been formed to agitate for corporate social responsibility from the drilling company.

Having successful and sustainable development projects in Turkana County goes hand in hand with the environmental scanning, promotion of skills and investment enterprises for the benefit of local communities. The international nongovernmental organizations are involved in funding a range of resilience building projects, small-scale businesses, social amenities and cottage industries aimed at improving living standards of families and households, groups and individuals.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Several studies have been conducted on project success and sustainability as separate entities. Despite these studies some of the reasons why development interventions had not succeeded in reducing poverty include lack of sustainability strategies, poor prioritization, lack of flexibility in the government budgetary procedures, lack of legal framework for stakeholders' participation in planning and implementation and incomplete devolution. In addition, Government and donors have in the past provided solutions to community problems without community participation. Therefore examining factors influencing success and sustainability of donor funded projects especially in areas the successive government regimes have neglected will contribute significantly to some of the solutions of eradicating poverty and improving quality of life. The decision by INGOs on whether to provide budget support in a given situation and the amount of such support normally rest on a number of issues and considerations. These include policy conditionality, earmarking,
and fiduciary risk. Some of the factors that may influence the success and sustainability of the projects include; strategic directions, financial systems, contextual issues, stakeholders and target groups involvement and participation, and management structures. Evaluation studies done by Agevi (2002) Mutagi (1998), Ashley and Barney (1999) and Cedric (1992) widely linked poor management of community projects to the increase in the cycle of poverty and failure of many donor funded projects in developing countries such as Kenya. This situation is even worse in Turkana County where natural resources have not been fully exploited. Despite this problem, little has been done to establish the cause of the termination and collapse of these donor funded projects in the county. This poses a gap which this study seeks to fill through an investigation of the factors that influence success and sustainability of the donor funded projects of the selected international nongovernmental organizations in Turkana County.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 The broad objective

The broad objective (goal) of the study is to investigate the factors influencing success and sustainability of donor funded projects for the selected international nongovernmental organizations in Turkana County.

1.3.2 The specific objectives.

The study is based on the following specific objectives:-
1. To establish the extent to which organizational strategic directions influences the success and sustainability of donor funded projects of INGOs in Turkana County.

2. To determine the extent to which the existing project financial systems influence success and sustainability of donor funded projects of INGOs in Turkana County.

3. To examine the effect of contextual issues on the success and sustainability of donor funded projects of international nongovernmental organizations in Turkana County.

4. To determine the effects of stake holders and target groups' participation on the success and sustainability of donor funded projects in Turkana County.

5. To establish how the management structure influences the success and sustainability of donor funded projects of INGO in Turkana County.

1.4 Research Questions

The study seeks to address the following research Questions:-

1. How do organizational strategic directions influence the success and sustainability of donor funded projects of INGOs in Turkana County?

2. How do the existing organizational financial systems influence the success and sustainability of donor funded projects in Turkana County?

3. What is the effect of contextual issues on the success and sustainability of donor funded projects of the selected international nongovernmental organizations?

4. What is the role of stakeholders and target groups' involvement on the success and sustainability of donor funded projects?
5. How does the management structure influence success and sustainability of the donor funded community projects of selected INGOs?

1.5 Significance of the Study

Donors play a crucial role in the society, they are a vehicle to which government and other agencies channel their resources to help the community and the poor of the poor. They diffuse political anger and dole out as aid or benevolence what people ought to have by right. (Roy, 2003). With a lot of funds going into projects and with increased need of interventions especially in the social aspects of life including Health, Education and Food Security, it is important to study and determine the factors that influence the success and sustainability of community projects. This project report will therefore be of great use to the following groups:- The donor fraternity supporting projects in Kenya will benefit from the findings of this study by gaining an insight on how well the donor can manage their development projects to ensure effectiveness, success and sustainability; The NGO council will also benefit from the findings of this study in supporting the NGO sector in an attempt to fulfill its mission of providing efficient services, coordination and facilitation to the sector in order to enhance the contribution to the social-economic development and improvement of the welfare of the people; The findings of this study will enable GoK to offer assistance to the donors as they supplement development projects which promote poverty reduction; and The findings of this research will provide a basis and reference information for Future researchers and academicians.
1.6 Scope of the Study

The study is based in Turkana County which is the largest county in Kenya. It is found in the ASALs of northern Kenya. The area generally experiences frequent drought and conflicts that disrupts the normal livelihood and economic activities resulting to loss of lives and livelihood assets. The county has a number of donor funded development projects experiencing management and sustainability challenges which is the primary focus for this study. The study is limited to the employees of the various donor funded projects in the county who are expected to give insights on the success and sustainability related challenges faced by the projects especially after donor phases out. The study will cover on-going and completed projects.

1.7 Limitation of the study

The study is limited to the donor funded projects in Turkana County due to the vastness of the area, financial, time constraints and other logistical arrangements which will affect the scope of the study making it not possible to take census.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction to Literature Review

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

2.1.0 Theoretical Literature review

This section reviewed theoretical studies on the subject and issues reviewed were organized under the following sub-headings; success and sustainability of projects, models and theories of success and sustainability of projects, strategic directions, project finance, contextual/environmental issues, stakeholder involvement and management structure.

2.1.1 Success and sustainability of donor funded projects

Sustainability and success of projects implemented by international nongovernmental organizations is key to development and in meeting the goals of any enterprise. According to this study, key critical success and sustainability factors include strategic directions of the organizations, project financial systems, contextual or environmental issues, stakeholder participation and involvement and management structure of the organizations. For donor funded projects and more so those implemented by international
nongovernmental organizations based in Turkana County, these factors are crucial and are in line with the attainment of millennium development goals and vision 2030.

Cleland (1986) suggested that "project success is meaningful only if considered from two vantage points: the degree to which the project's technical performance objective was attained on time and within budget; the contribution that the project made to the strategic mission of the enterprise.

Khan and Hare (2005) pointed out that for a NGO funded project to be sustainable, it has to develop a sound institutional base, a strong programmatic approach and sufficient funds. At the institutional level, the NGO needs to establish the internal systems, structures and work culture that promote strong leadership and positive organizational image, foster the belief that people are willing to support products and services they find valuable, and facilitate development plans for sustainability. At the program level, the NGO needs to carefully analyze the market and encourages community participation at all stages from design through implementation to evaluation of the programme in order to offer quality service at reasonable prices. At the financial level, the NGOs need to have systems and strategies for generating adequate level of finance and managing these resources well. It requires a good grasp of the nature and level of its costs and preparedness to sustain its programs through a combination of cost reduction, cost recovery and leveraging support from the community and donors.

Rono (2008) in her study on financial sustainability of NGOs projects in Nairobi revealed that dependence on donor funding was high with low utilization of internal resources, with use of the services offered to provide a descent return lacking. She noted that for the NGO
to be financially sustainable, it must have financial systems and procedures that provide clear and timely accounts of the financial position of the organization, reduce the costs of providing services, recover costs of services provision from clients and community, raise resources through institutional earnings and use assets to attract and leverage resources from the community, the government and diverse donors.

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

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

In Kenya the sharp deterioration in economic performance worsened the poverty situation in the country as outlined in the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ERSWEC) report 2003-2007. The number of people living below poverty line was estimated to have risen from 11 million or 48% of the population in 1990 to 17 million or 56% of the population in 2002 (GoK, 2003). Though the poverty rate in Kenya has decline to 45.5% in the recent past but Turkana County remains as the poorest with 95% poverty rate (Daily Nation, Dec 2011). The vagaries of nature, including climate change, the global economic turmoil and inadequate implementation of strategies addressing food insecurity and untapped natural resources conspired and resulted to the worst famine in 60 years biting the horn of Africa (HoA). This called for a concerted effort aimed at livelihood security and resilience enhancement especially among the pastoralist community in northern Kenya. This was in form of private-public partnerships geared at improving the standards of living of the locals mainly through rural projects initiated (GoK, 2001). The need for sustaining the initiated projects is therefore inherent.

In its broadest sense, sustainable development strategy aims at promoting harmony among human beings and between humanity and nature”, the World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) implied that sustainability requires also a social and an environmental perspective, next to the economical perspective, on development and performance. John Elkington identified the ‘triple bottom line’ or ‘Triple-P (People, Planet, Profit)’ concept: Sustainability is about the balance or harmony between economic sustainability, social sustainability and environmental sustainability (Elkington, 1997).
Elaborating on this, Dyllick and Hockerts (2002), identify three key concepts of sustainability.

**Sustainability is about integrating economical, environmental and social aspects.**

This element refers to the triple bottom line or three-P concept as stated by Elkington (1997) as the ‘three pillars’ of sustainability: Social, Environmental and Economical. The concept suggests that three dimensions are interrelated and therefore may influence each other in multiple ways. And although these interrelations are generally acknowledged, it should be noted that regional differences exist with regards to the relative emphasis placed on each pillar. In (Western) Europe, sustainability is mainly about environmental concerns, whereas in Africa the social concerns seem to be prevailing. In an increasingly globalized economy, however, these differences should diminish over time.

**Sustainability is about integrating short-term and long-term aspects.**

This element focuses the attention to the full lifespan of the matter at hand. An important notion in this aspect is that the economical perspective, because of discount rates, tends to value short term effects more than long term effects, whereas social impacts or environmental degradation may not occur before the long-term.

**Sustainability is about consuming the income and not the capital.**

This aspect is a common realm in business from the economic perspective. From a social or environmental perspective, however, the impact may not be visible in the short-term, causing degradation of resources in the long run. Sustainability implies that “the natural capital remains intact. This means that the source and sink functions of the environment should not be degraded. Therefore, the extraction of renewable resources should not exceed
the rate at which they are renewed, and the absorptive capacity of the environment to assimilate waste, should not be exceeded.” (Gilbert et al, 1996).

2.1.2 Models of success and sustainability of donor funded projects

Theories and models have been developed to provide the basis for project success and sustainability. Some of these theories include; Beneficiary participation in Development Projects, Shifting towards sustainability, Business model for sustainable development and Maturity model for Integrating Sustainability in Projects and Project Management.

2.1.2.1 Beneficiary Participation in Development Projects

According to Kurt, 1989, Development projects have had disappointing results despite the acknowledgement of past mistakes and significant evolution in development strategies. A major disappointment has been the failure of most development projects to benefit significantly the poor majorities in the developing countries. Criticism against the trickle-down aid strategies gained official acceptance during the mid seventies. The New Directions legislation governing the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, and the enunciation of the Basic Human Needs (BHN), doctrine of the International Labor Organization, the World Bank, and other international organizations were explicit efforts to redirect bilateral and multilateral aid towards the poor and to increase participation of beneficiaries in projects aimed at their own development. The philosophy behind these changes is that real development must be people-centered instead of production-oriented. Some critics define beneficiary participation as integral to authentic development. Joining in the chorus of those supporting increased participation are bilateral and multilateral aid agencies, private voluntary organizations, grass-root organizers, global humanist scholars,
and the development management consultants. In sum, the call for participation comes from a broad spectrum of those concerned with development and for a wide variety of reasons.

2.1.2.2 Shifting towards sustainability model: Six insights into successful organizational change for sustainability

According to Hunting, SA and Tilbury D. (2006), there are six insights into successful organizational change for sustainability and these are: adopt a clear, shared vision for the future, build teams and not just champions, use critical thinking and reflection, go beyond stakeholder engagement, adopt a systematic approach and move beyond expecting a linear path to change. The process of change for sustainability needs to be more iterative and reflective, addressing issues as they occur and often taking a branch path for a while. The change process needs to be more flexible and potentially more opportunistic too, and this may lead to more innovative, productive and unexpected outcomes. The results for this model include; organizational response to sustainability is improved by people understanding the vision for sustainability, having access to learning resources and taking ownership for change; The sustainability framework develops a more holistic approach to change, recognized as providing more enduring and widespread benefits; the framework also promotes the establishment of networks and more lasting partnerships which drive broader societal based change. It enables change agents to identify and use levers for change to embed sustainability practices and processes within an organization.
2.1.2.3 Business models for sustainable development

Market-based activities are now recognized by governments, business and development agencies round the world as potential solutions to major sustainable development challenges—reducing poverty, enhancing livelihoods, protecting ecosystem, tackling climate change, and meeting the Millennium Development Goals. Business models for sustainable development aim to deliver economic, social and environmental benefits—the three pillars of sustainable development—through core business activities. In these models, the value proposition includes social, environmental and economic values, while value distribution within the whole market chain is a key feature. Key factors for success for this model include; Business need to build their own capacities and strategic alliances with other enterprises, government agencies and development practitioners; Involving local communities as partners and co-designers of new models enhances local buy-in and ownership, business models for sustainable development need to be self-sustaining in the long term. However, significant investment of time and resources at the start is key for successful innovation and scale-up; trade-offs among different sustainable development goals—economic, social, environmental—need to be recognized and addressed and ongoing monitoring and evaluation need to be built in to the business model (IIED, 2010).

2.1.2.4 Maturity Model for Integrating Sustainability in Projects and Project Management

Based on the concepts of sustainability, the model assesses the level of consideration of sustainability in projects. The result of the assessment is presented in a graphical way, that allows organization to benchmark their maturity and to monitor their development. With this maturity model, organizations can translate the abstract and interpretive concepts of
sustainable development into practical actions. Some of the qualities for this model include: It translates the abstract and interpretive concepts of sustainable development into practically applicable prescriptive actions, It assesses concrete projects as unit of study, thereby specifying overall corporate strategies, It allows organizations to set their own standards and ambitions in accordance with company values, It allows organizations to monitor and report their development, It is not normative as to whose responsibility (project sponsor, project manager, etc.) the actions are, but allows discussion and agreement about this.

2.2 Strategic Directions

According to Demacy (2002), the pursuit of competitiveness is the art of strategic management and the choices made when designing and using the strategic management process. Organizations are in competition with one another to gain access to the resources needed to maximize economy and provide superior satisfaction to stakeholders’ needs. Effective use of interdependent parts of the strategic management results in selecting the direction the organization will pursue and its choices to achieve the desired outcomes of strategic competencies.

Organizational strategies are responsible for design and execution of effective strategic management of an effective strategic management process. The most effective of this process are grounded in the ethical intentions and conducts. Strategies themselves, people with opportunities to dream and act, will be a source of competitive advantage. The strategists’ work demands decisions tradeoffs, often among attractive alternatives. The top
level managers work hard, conduct thorough analysis of situations, brutally and consistently honest and ask the right questions of the right people at the right time.

Strategic planning sets out to achieve the best way of designing and implementing humanitarian and development projects. It is a systematic approach to identifying the essential and desirable tasks, properly assessing project priorities, identification of competent human resources necessary to bring about desired change or transformational development by the use of the most effective and efficient means of resource utilization.

According to Good Stench, L.D Nolan, T.M and Pfeiffer (1993), strategic planning cycles often have three main elements that is the context of defining outcomes that are aligned to the Vision, Mission and strategic formulation of objectives to identify intervention options and evaluation to test whether the plan and major interventions are working.

For any developmental organization to realize its vision of attaining transformational development and poverty reduction amid competitive environment, donor fatigue, global changes and scarce resources, long range strategic planning that will realign its core competency areas with vision and mission is therefore fundamental and necessary.

According to Mintzberg (1997), strategic intent is the leveraging of an organization’s internal resources capabilities and core competencies to accomplish the organization’s goals in competitive environment concerned with the battle of winning community and donor confidence and obtaining leadership. Strategic intent implies a significant stretch of an organization’s resources, capabilities and core competencies. When established effectively, a strategic intent can cause people to perform in ways they never imagined would be possible. According to Philip Kotten (1990), it is not enough for an organization
to only know its own strategic intent. To perform well, it demands that organizations also identify the public expectations and strategic intent. An organization’s success if not sustained may be grounded in a keen and deep misunderstanding of strategic intent of communities, partners and competitors.

2.2.1 Strategic Mission

According to Saddler (1990), strategic mission flows from strategic intent. Externally focused, the strategic mission is a statement of a firm’s unique purpose and the scope of its operations in service delivery terms. A strategic mission provides general description of the service/product an organization intends to provide or produce, the market it will serve using its internally based core competencies. An effective strategic mission will establish an organization’s individual ability and is exciting, inspiring and relevant to all interested parties. Together, strategic intent and strategic mission yield the insights to formulate and implement the firm’s strategies.

Based partially on the organization’s strategic intent and mission, top management develops a strategic orientation, a predisposition to adopt a certain strategy over others (Saddler, 1990). Strategic implementation involves allocation of sufficient resources needed to accomplish the set targets, establishing a chain of command or some alternative structures to achieve cohesion, team work and good working relationships. It also involves assigning responsibility of specific tasks or processes to specific groups or individuals a way of delegating duties and responsibilities, managing the process to include monitoring results, comparing, benchmarking, evaluating the entire process, training, process testing, documentation and integration.
A clear and communicated strategic vision and mission defines the success and sustainability of projects. People must know where they are going and why. Stakeholders benefit from a clear understanding of the organization’s philosophy, purpose and strategic undertakings. The vision based on a thorough understanding of the operating environment and organizational capabilities sets the context for strategic developments, organizational cultures, management approaches and lays the foundation of the desired means of sustaining competitive advantage. In effect, strategy in this context entails entering the realm of the corrective mind-individuals united by common thinking and or behavior.

2.2.2 Project sustainability and strategy

Sustainable development is about marshalling resources to ensure that some measure of human well-being is sustained over time. According to Pearce and Robinson 2003, the objective is to take actions to strategize in order to avoid impairing future generations from living at least as well as the present and hopefully better. To do this, each generation must leave the next generation a stock of capital no smaller than the present one. Three forms of capital are recognized; natural, infrastructure and human. Together the various forms of capital comprise the aggregation capital stock of a nation.

Sustainability can be viewed as the ability of a project to initiate a process by which benefits are maintained. In the context of donor funded development programs and projects, sustainability can be defined as; the continuation of benefits after major assistance from a donor has been completed or withdrawn. Key points to note in the definition are: the focus on sustaining the flow of benefits into the future rather than on sustainable programs or projects. Projects are by definition not sustainable as they are a defined investment with
a start and finish date. Managing sustainability is a process aimed at maximizing the flow of sustainable benefits. It should be an ongoing process and needs to be reviewed and updated as circumstances change and lessons are learned from experience. Without being too risk averse with the initial selection of programs and projects, all bilateral and regional aid activities should be designed and managed with the aim of achieving sustainable benefits; with the possible exception of one-off emergency and humanitarian relief activities. Because there is no one single way to achieve sustainability, Country, Sector and Program/project specific circumstances need to be taken into account. Each individual project should define its own sustainability strategy on a case-by-case basis.

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

The project needs to develop sustainability analysis which will lead to the development of a sustainability strategy. The aim of the sustainability strategy is to define the benefits to be sustained and specify how each of the main constraints to sustainability will be addressed in implementation. The main elements of the strategy should be fed into the design so that sustainability will be strengthened in a systematic and comprehensive way. Hence sustainability strategy will be reflected in the log frame and risk management, the activity, resource and cost schedules; plus position descriptions and organizational plans.
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2.3 Project financial systems

Project financial systems refer to accounting records and financial statements showing performance and cash flow projections that determine financial sustainability of donor funded projects. Nturibi (2004) states that for a development project to be financially sustainable, it requires a sound financial base arising from reliable sources of funding, financial systems to facilitate accountability and cash flow projections and development of marketable products to generate excess income over the expenditure of the project. Project financial analysis should be undertaken in conjunction with project economic analysis.

According to Asian Development Bank (ADB, 2004), there are three aspects of financial sustainability. These are the availability of adequate funds to finance project expenditures, especially funds drawn from the government budget, the recovery of some of the project costs from the project beneficiaries, and the financial incentives necessary to ensure participation in the project.

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

2.4 Contextual/Operational issues and donor policies

The environmental condition of Turkana County is characterized by rough terrains and its economic mainstay is semi-nomadic pastoralism. Livestock rustling is rampant in the area and settlement is dictated by availability of water and pasture. The poor project design, imperfect plans, delays, cost overruns, coordination failure, scope changes, poor institutional environment in developing countries (Ahsan and Gunawan, 2010) coupled with the vagaries of nature, poor infrastructural development and inadequate resource allocation from the government have always subjected the communities living in the county into abject poverty and rely on humanitarian relief. Since independence, successive regimes have neglected the county explaining why it has lagged behind in development. Turkana is always seen as a ‘county of problems’ with insecurity occasioned by banditry and cattle rustling, hunger, diseases, high poverty levels, illiteracy, lack of health care facilities and general poor infrastructure characterizing its lifestyle. Despite of all these challenges, the county has a potential in oil deposits, minerals such as gold and gypsum, fishing along Lake Turkana, tourism destinations such as Eliye Springs Lodge, Central Island, Turkana Cultural artifacts, Turkana and Lotikipi National Reserves, agro-pastoralism and the existence of abattoir in Lokichoggio. Areas near the lake are believed to be the cradle of mankind. Fossils believed to be of the first man were discovered in this area. All these if harnessed, exploited and utilized could boost the economy of the largest county in Kenya and contribute to the national Gross Domestic Product (GDP).
The successful implementation of projects depends on the consideration of the economic activities and the lifestyle of the community. Most of the projects are influenced by donor policies and these are important because they influence how contracts are prepared, the duration of the funding and what is funded. OECD report (1989) identified important donor policies related factors that affect the success and sustainability of projects. These include: Planning horizon, delivery and contracting mechanisms and operations and maintenance costs.

2.4.1 Planning horizon

It is now widely recognized that the usual 3-5 year planning horizon for development programmes and projects is often inadequate in terms of promoting sustainable benefits, particularly when behavioral and institutional change are included in the objectives or if there are multiple local agencies involved or a wide geographical spread. Open-ended commitments are not appropriate; however, phasing implementation over a long period is a management strategy which may support sustainable benefits (White, Salamanca and Courtney 2002).

2.4.2 Delivery and Contracting Mechanisms

A strong sense of local ownership and genuine participation in design by men and women are critical to successful implementation and sustainable benefits. However, pastoralism as way of lifestyle, culture and donor policies on how their aid programme is designed and delivered can work against this. According to Francis (2001), the key concerns include: 1) Design process; designs which are expected to result in sustainable benefits should respect culture, customs and build on local demand and initiatives. This requires that the beneficiaries play a core role in identification and design process. (ii) Team selection; the
professionalism and inter-personal skills (expatriate or locally engaged is an important factor in sustainability. Selection policies and criteria should therefore ensure that as broad labour market as possible is tapped and that the best consultants are selected. (iii) Contract structures; contracts that focus on the detail of the contractor’s outputs and inputs rather than on the purpose or outcome can impede efforts to achieve sustainability. It is important that designs have flexibility and can lead to contracting approaches that allow field-level managers to respond quickly to changing circumstances and which encourages them to keep sustainable benefits in mind. (IV) Monitoring and Reporting; Monitoring and reporting frameworks based on log-frames should look beyond the contracted activity and output levels and incorporate regular assessments of the movement towards achieving sustainability outcomes.

2.4.3 Operation and Maintenance Costs
Donor funding policies often focuses on new capital investments to the exclusion of supporting operating and maintenance budgets. This can have adverse effects on the successful implementation and sustainability, particularly in insecure environments. New capital projects require additional operational and maintenance funds that have to be drawn from the same limited pool of funds that finance other ongoing programmes. As a consequence, either the new investment is not maintained or existing infrastructure or services suffer funding cuts. A long-term and more transitional approach to operation and maintenance cost funding is required, based on a rigorous and realistic assessment of the local capacity to meet these costs.
2.5 Stakeholder and Target groups Participation

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

A more positive, proactive approach to sustainability is to actively engage a range of stakeholders to ‘imagine a better future’ and develop a clear, shared vision (whether at a project or organizational level) which will inspire and motivate them in making change towards sustainability (Hunting, SA and Tilbury D, 2006).

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

2.6 Management structure of the project

2.6.1 Management structure and local capacity

According to Natasha (2003), programmes and projects which integrate with, and build on local management structures have better prospects for promoting sustainability of benefits than those which establish new or parallel structures. The capacity of local agencies to manage (or absorb) new structures, systems, ideas and funds is often not adequately assessed, and over-optimistic assumptions can be made. Getting the management structure 'right' requires an adequate institutional analysis during the project design phase and this requires specific knowledge, skills and field time. Expatriate technical assistance is a common input of the humanitarian programmes and projects; how expatriate technical assistance work with their counterparts and colleagues can have a major influence on the prospects for sustainability. Their departure should not presage any significant weakening of key program/project supported benefits. Practical strategies to avoid weakening include: locating counterpart and expatriate team members in the office, emphasizing team work approaches; having specific sustainability strategies in place, including a phase-out strategy, well before the completion of donor funded assistance; clearly defining "advisory" and executive roles; limiting the number of expatriates to the necessary
minimum; ensuring that short-term technical assistance is not conducted on a hit and run basis, if possible, identifying multiple counterparts per expatriate rather than only one or two; and working with counterparts who are in existing line positions rather than in newly created “project positions”.

### 2.6.2 Administrative Systems

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

### 2.6.3 Flexibility in, and Phasing of implementation

Competent managerial leadership should be encouraged to guide adaptations and achieve sustainable outcomes(Ahsan, K. and Gunawan, I ,2010). Donor supported programs and projects must be designed and managed so that they permit some flexibility in implementation. Designs must sometimes be phased and allowed to evolve as lessons are learnt, community leadership must be able to respond quickly to changing needs and priorities, and administrative or financial management procedures must not be made burdensome.
2.6.4 Technology adoption and training

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

2.6.5 Information dissemination and networking

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

2.7 Critical Review of Major issues

The literature review focused on factors influencing project success and sustainability. Views on project success have changed over the years from definitions that were limited to the implementation phase of the project lifecycle to definitions that reflect an appreciation of success over the project and product life cycle. According to Kam Judger et al (2005), project management can have strategic value when a clear connection is made between how efficiently and effectively a project is done and how the project’s products and service provide business value. However, if project success is limited to the variables of time, cost and scope and the links to product/service value are missing, then project management is perceived as providing tactical (operational) value and not strategic value.

De Wit (1988) discusses the concept of project management success in terms of time, cost and quality/performance (scope), and indicates that project success involves broader objectives from the viewpoints of stakeholders throughout the project life cycle. Cooke-Davies (2002) distinguishes between: project management success, being measured against
the traditional gauges of performance (i.e. time, cost and quality) and project success being measured against the overall objectives of the project.

The concept of sustainability has also grown in recognition and importance. The pressure on companies to broaden its reporting and accountability from economic performance for shareholders, to sustainability performance for all stakeholders has increased (Visser, 2002). The recent world crises may even imply, that a strategy focused solely on shareholder value, is no longer viable (Kennedy, 2000). The balance between economic growth and social wellbeing has been around as a political and managerial challenge for over 150 years (Dyllick and Hockerts, 2002). Also the concern for the wise use of natural resources and our planet emerged many decades ago, with Carson’s book “Silent Spring” (Carson, 1962) as a launching hallmark. Propelled by the World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) and the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, the opinion that none of these three goals, economic growth, social wellbeing and a wise use of natural resources, can be reached, without considering and effecting the other two, got widely accepted (Keating, 1993). With this widespread acceptance, project success and sustainable development became one of the most important challenges of our time.

2.8 Summary and Gaps to be filled by the study

Success is measured in subjective and objective ways and it means different things to different people (Freeman & Beale, 1992). During early years, simple metrics such as time, cost, and specifications were used to rate project success because they are easy to use and within the realm of the project organization. A successful project involves staff training and
education, dedicated resources, good tools, strong leadership and management, and concurrent development of the individual, team, and organization (Bounds, 1998).

Clarke’s project CSFs (Critical Success Factors) included effective communication, clear objectives and scope, dividing the project into manageable components, and using project plans as living documents (Clarke, 1999). Cleland and Ireland (2002) suggested that success be viewed from two vantage points—the degree to which technical project performance objectives were attained (e.g., time, cost, and scope) and the contribution that the project made to the strategic mission of the firm.

Morris and Hough (1987) were pioneers in developing a comprehensive framework on the preconditions of project success. They analyzed project success in the context of major projects and the work was based on eight case studies. They grouped project success as follows: Project functionality, Project management, Contractors’ commercial performance and Project termination. Morris and Hough developed a comprehensive framework depicting the elements of project success. The elements included attitudes, project definition, external factors, finance, organization and contract strategy, schedule, communications and control, human qualities, and resources management. Their book addressed the concepts that success is both subjective and objective, that success varies across the project and product life cycle, and that various stakeholders are involved (Morris & Hough, 1987).

After analyzing some past studies, many scholars have provided so many variables influencing success and sustainability and yet most of them can be lumped together. Moreover not much has been done specifically on the factors influencing the success and
sustainability of donor funded projects in Turkana County despite the long existence of the international nongovernmental organizations in the area. From the review it is worth noting that relevant literature on the subject is not readily available and in cases where it is available, there is a big separation of success and sustainability and the factors are too many for any meaningful study. The information is also too old to inform any decision making and this study therefore endeavors to fulfill these gaps.

2.9 Conceptual Framework

This section discusses the conceptual framework for analyzing the factors influencing the success and sustainability of the donor funded development projects in Kenya. These factors are as follows: Strategic directions, Project financial systems, contextual /operational issues, levels of stakeholders and target groups participation and organizational management structures which are indicators of success and sustainability. These formed the independent variables of the study. The conceptual model is a conceptualization in functional form of how the independent variables influence the dependent variable which is success and sustainability of donor funded projects as shown in Figure 2.1.
Figure 2.2: Conceptual Framework
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(Source: Author, 2013)
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter outlines the research methodology that will be employed in this study and adopts the following structure: research design, target population, sampling methodology, data collection and data analysis.

3.1 Research design

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

3.2 Target Population

The target population of this study includes 110 employees working in the donor funded projects of selected international nongovernmental organizations in Turkana County. These will include World Vision Kenya Programmes, Oxfam GB-Turkana Programme, Child Fund Projects, Merlin Projects, UNICEF projects, WFP Food for Assets Project, Lutheran World Federation-Turkana Project, IRC Host Community Projects, AMREF Projects,
FHI360 health Projects, Veterinary San frontiers-Belgium (VSF-B), Practical Action projects. Representative samples will be drawn from each of these organizations.

Table 3.2: Target Population frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of INGO</th>
<th>Population Frequency of Project staff</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Vision Kenya</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam GB-Turkana Programme</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWF-Turkana Project</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Fund-Turkana Cluster</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Action-Karamoja Cluster</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC- Host Community Project</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERLIN- Turkana Project</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHI360</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMREF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSF-Belgium</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, (2013)

3.3 Sampling Strategy

Stratified and purposive sampling techniques will be used in this study. In stratified sampling, the donor funded projects will be treated as strata from which a sample will be drawn using purposive sampling method. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), purposive sampling is a sampling technique that allows a researcher to get cases that have the required information with respect to the objectives of the study. This is appropriate due
to the non-homogeneity of the donor funded projects in terms of management sizes, number of staff in each project and nature of projects offered by the projects. Through purposive sampling, the study will focus on the following personnel in each project: Project Managers, Human Resource Manager, project accountants and technical staff. This will help the study to achieve the needed information. A purposive sample of 56 respondents will be drawn from all strata categories which will represent 50% of the target population.

The sample size is summarized in the Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of INGO</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sampling rate (%)</th>
<th>Target Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Vision Kenya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam GB-Turkana Programme</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWF-Turkana Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Fund-Turkana Cluster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Action-Karamoja Cluster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC- Host Community Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERLIN- Turkana Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHI360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMREF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSF-Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, (2013)
3.4 Data Collection Tools and Techniques

3.4.1 Data Types and Instruments

The study will utilize primary data which will be both qualitative and quantitative data. This data will be collected through administration of questionnaires. A questionnaire will be designed to capture the various variables of the study. The questionnaire has both open-ended and closed questions covering issues on the success and sustainability of the projects. Open-ended questions will permit free responses from the respondents without providing or suggesting any structure for the replies. The closed questions will enable the researcher to analyze data easily using the stated alternatives. These alternatives will be designed in such way as to be simple for respondents to understand. Questionnaires will be chosen because they will help the researcher to collect large amount of the information in a large area within a short period of time. The questionnaire will be self administered. In some cases it will be dropped and picked later or where the respondents are available, it will be dropped and picked immediately.

3.4.2 Data Collection Techniques

The researcher will collect primary data through field research. An introductory letter from Kenyatta University and permission to carry out research in the targeted projects will be obtained to enable the researcher to administer questionnaires to the target respondents. The researcher will reassure the respondents about the confidentiality of their feedback. This will encourage the respondents to be honest. Brief follow up interviews will also be
held with the respondents in order to elicit more information or clarifications on data submitted in the questionnaire. This will ensure the validity of the data collected.

3.5 Data Processing and Analysis

The data will be analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative techniques. This will involve generation of descriptive statistics such as percentages and measures of central tendency. Statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) will aid in generating descriptive statistics and to establish the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables of study. The scaled types of questions will be analyzed descriptively through the Likert scale based on the various attributes provided in the questions. The research findings will be presented using frequency tables, percentages, cross-tabulations, pie-charts and bar graphs.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

4.0 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to establish the factors influencing success and sustainability of donor funded projects and programmes in Turkana County of Kenya. Among these factors investigated include: Strategic directions, Project financial systems, Contextual issues, Level of stakeholders and target group involvement and management structures. The study targeted all employees working in donor supported projects in Turkana County whereby a sample size of 56 respondents were selected based on the sampling matrix presented in the previous chapter. The data was presented in form of frequency tables, pie-charts and percentages.

4.1 Demographic Information

4.1.1: Response Rate

This study had targeted a total of 56 respondents which was computed as shown in the sampling matrix in table 3.3. However, due to the study limitations, only 52 responses were achieved which represents 92.9% response rate. This formed the basis for the analysis presented in this chapter. This is shown in table 4.1 below.
### Table 4.1: Response Rate

| Source: Field Data, (2013) |
|---|---|---|
| Target Sample | 56 |  |
| Successful responses | 52 |  |
| Missed responses | 4 |  |
| Response rate | 92.9% |  |

### 4.1.2 Respondents Position against Gender

Table 4.2 shows a cross tabulation of respondents position versus gender. The finding show that majority of the respondents (32.7%) were project Managers with most of them being females as accounted by 19.2% of the respondents. Male project managers accounted for 13.5% as shown in the table 4.2. This table also shows that male respondents were 53.9% and female respondents were 46.1%

### Table 4.2: Respondents Position versus Gender

| Respondents Position | Gender of the respondents |  |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female |  |
| Project Managers | Count | 07 | 10 | 17 |
| % of Total | 13.5% | 19.2% | 32.7% |  |
| Field Coordinators | Count | 06 | 08 | 14 |
| % of Total | 11.5% | 15.5% | 27.0% |  |
| HR Managers | Count | 04 | 02 | 06 |
| % of Total | 7.7% | 3.8% | 11.5% |  |
| Others | Count | 03 | 02 | 05 |
| % of Total | 5.8% | 3.8% | 9.6% |  |
| Total | Count | 28 | 24 | 52 |
| % of Total | 53.9% | 46.1% | 100.0% |  |

Source: Field Data, (2013)
4.2.3 Respondents Position and Age Category

Majority of the respondents (32.7%) were project Managers within the age category of 30-39 years as accounted by 17.3% of the respondents. These were followed by Accountant who accounted for 19.2% of the respondents. Other details are as shown in table 4.3. Table 4.3 also shows that majority of the respondents were between the ages of 20 to 39 years as accounted by 88.4.3% of the respondents and a few were in the age category of 40 to 49 years and above 50 years as accounted by 11.6% of the respondents.

Table 4.3: Respondents Position versus Age category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Position</th>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29 years</td>
<td>30 to 39 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Coordinators</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2013)

4.2.4 Respondents Position and Duration of work

Most of the respondents (32.7%) were Project Managers who had worked in the donor funded projects for between 3 to 5 years as accounted by 13.5% of the respondents. Those
Project Managers who had worked for above 5 years accounted for 9.6% as shown in the table 4.4. This shows that most of the key staffs were experienced with the donor funded projects since they have been in these projects for more than one year as accounted by 80.7% of the respondents and few had worked for less than one year as accounted by 19.3% of the respondents.

Table 4.4: Respondents Position versus Duration of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Position</th>
<th>Duration of work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>Between 6 months to 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Accountants</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Coordinators</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2013)

4.2.5 Respondents Position and Highest Level of Education

Majority of the respondents had attained undergraduate level of education as accounted by 46.2% of the respondents. However most of the Field Coordinators had attained tertiary
college education as accounted by 11.5% of the respondents. This is shown in table 4.5. This shows that most of the key personnel in the donor funded project had attained a high level of education (that's tertiary and university levels) as accounted by 90.4% of the respondents.

Table 4.5: Respondents Position versus level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents position</th>
<th>Highest level of education</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Tertiary college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Accountants</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Coordinators</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2013)

4.3 Strategic Directions

The findings presented in table 4.6 shows that majority of the respondents working for INGOs (94.2%) had vision, mission and long term goals for the project and its partners only 5.8% of the respondents had no long-term goals for the projects. According to 92.3% of the respondents, most INGOs had strategies in place to obtain additional funding and technical support. In addition, the findings showed that majority of the INGOs had project promotion and marketing plan for raising awareness of the project and updating and
disseminating its products as accounted for by 80.8%. This is a step forward in enhancing successful implementation and project sustainability. These findings are consistent with Khan and Hare (2005) study that pointed out for funded projects to be successful and sustainable, it must develop a sound institutional base, a strong programmatic approach and sufficient funding. This study established the capacity of INGOs to fund raise and instituting sound financial base, effective implementation and provision of technical services to the projects.

Table 4.6: Strategic Directions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency (N=52)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic objectives of the organization</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Fund raising and Technical support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project promotion and marketing plans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2013)

4.3.1 Major Source of Income

The study established that the major source of income for the project was mainly institutional donors and public appeals from western countries as accounted for by 69.2%. Christian based organizations (World Vision, Child Fund and LWF) receive unrestricted funds through church donations. Other sources of additional funding are as shown in table 4.7. This shows most projects had strategies of obtaining additional funding which is also a reinforcement of the Khan and Hare (2005) study.
Table 4.7: Major Source of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major source of income</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local fundraising</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional donors and Public Funds</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self sustenance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government funded</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2013)

4.4 Project Financial Systems

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

4.4.1 Financial Reporting

The study sought to establish the status of financial reporting as well as the errors experienced during financial reporting. According to majority of the respondents, most projects followed Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) as accounted by 88.5% and 73.1% of the respondents respectively. Most of the respondents (80.8%) acknowledged that they did not encounter some errors in their financial reporting and those who experienced errors accounted for 19.2%, as shown in table 4.8. This shows that some errors were inherent in their reporting hence the need for accuracy in project financial reporting. Some of the sources of errors cited by the respondents included; errors in data capture and
reconciliation, different uses of accounting concepts such as historical cost and present value cost, adoption of different methods of depreciation among others.

Table 4.8: Financial Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally Accepted Accounting Principles</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Financial Reporting Standards</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience error during Financial Reporting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2013)

4.4.2 Audit of the Books of Accounts

The findings in table 4.9 showed that majority of the projects' books of accounts were audited as accounted by 94.2%, only 5.8% of the respondents said their projects books of accounts were not audited at all. The findings also showed that majority of the projects were audited annually as accounted for by 53.0%. Those audited Monthly, quarterly, bi-annually and occasionally accounted for 8.2%, 14.3%, 20.4% and 4.1% respectively. This shows that most projects' books of accounts were audited but the frequency of audit was quite low since it was done once a year. This low frequency of audit is attributed to the dynamics of the projects and the duration of different project activities conducted as well as the structure of the donor funds which are released in specified intervals based on the activities hence making accounting and auditing process difficult during implementation time.
Table 4.9: Auditing of Books of Accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auditing of Books of Accounting (N=52)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Frequency of Auditing (N=49) | Monthly | 4 | 8.2 |
| | Quarterly | 7 | 14.3 |
| | Semi-Annual | 10 | 20.4 |
| | Annual | 26 | 53.0 |
| | Occasionally | 2 | 4.1 |
| | Total (N) | 49 | 100.0% |

Source: Field Data, (2013)

4.4.3 Financial Systems in relation to Project Success and Sustainability

The study sought to establish the extent to which the respondent agreed or disagreed with the fact that financial systems influence the success and sustainability of the projects. The findings showed that majority of the respondents (56.6%) disagreed with the fact that financial systems influence the success and sustainability of the projects. The rest of the responses are as shown in figure 4.1. This shows that financial systems in the existing donor funded projects have no direct influence on the success and sustainability of the projects. These findings were consistent with Nturibi (2004) study as reviewed in chapter two. He stated that for a development project to be financially sustainable, it requires reliable sources of funding, financial systems to facilitate accountability and cash flow projections and development of marketable products to generate excess income over the expenditure of the project.
4.5 Contextual/operational issues

The study sought to find out the effects of contextual issues on the success and sustainability of donor funded projects in Turkana County. Key issues addressed in this section include effect of contextual issues on the project success and sustainability and effectiveness of various donor policies.

4.5.1 Effect of contextual issues on the Project Success and Sustainability

The respondent rated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the fact that contextual issues influence success and sustainability. A five point Likert scale showed that majority of the respondents agreed with the fact that operational issues influence the success and sustainability of the project as shown in table 4.14. This shows that the prevailing environmental conditions
hindered the success and sustainability of projects. There is no literature on the effects of operational issues on success and sustainability of project hence this study filled this gap.

Table 4.10: Effect of contextual issues on Project Success and Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual issues influence the success and sustainability of this project</th>
<th>Strongly agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2013)

4.5.2 Effectiveness of Various Donor Policies

The respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of the stated donor policies in ensuring success and enhancing sustainability of the projects. A five-point likert scale (comprising of very effective, effective, ineffective, very ineffective, do not know) was used and the findings are as shown in table 4.13. The findings show that contracts preparation, duration of funding, donor planning horizon and operation and maintenance costs policies were rated as ineffective by majority of the respondents as accounted by 52.5%, 65%, 61.5% and 61.6% (ineffective and very ineffective) cumulative responses. This showed that most of the donor policies in place were ineffective hence not supportive to project success and sustainability. These findings are consistent with the literature review since this study found out that the contracts preparation and donor planning horizon were ineffective.
### Table 4.11: Effectiveness of Various Donor Policies

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

Source: Field Data, (2013)

### 4.6 Stakeholder and Target Groups Participation

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

#### 4.6.1 Level of Participation and Involvement

The respondents were asked to rate the level of involvement and participation of various stakeholders and target beneficiaries in the projects. A five-point likert scale (comprising of greatly, fairly, low, very low, not involved at all) was used and the findings are presented in the table 4.11. The findings showed that the Government (40.0%) and the community groups (67.5%) were greatly involved in the projects while the private sector was fairly (45.0%) involved in the project. This shows that there is strong partnership between the Government, Community and INGOs in Turkana County.
Table 4.12: Level of Participation and Involvement

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

Source: Field Data, (2013)

4.6.2 Project Ownership and Decision Making

The respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the various stated statements as relate to stakeholders and target groups involvement and participation in the project. A five-point likert scale (comprising of strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly Disagree) was used and the findings are as presented in the table 4.12. The findings showed that majority of the respondents agreed with the following statements; The project is owned by beneficiaries, the project is owned by stakeholders, Target beneficiaries are involved in decision making and stakeholders are involved in decision making as accounted by 77%, 74.4%, 79.9% (strongly agree and agree) cumulative responses. This show that the project is owned by both the target beneficiaries and stakeholders and that they are also involved in decision making process. This is a step forward in ensuring cost efficiency and enhancing sustainability.
Table 4.13: Project Ownership

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

Source: Field Data, (2013)

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

4.6.3 Level of Commitment of Stakeholders and Target Beneficiaries.

The study sought to assess the level of commitment of stakeholders and target beneficiaries in the project. The findings presented in figure 4.4 shows that the stakeholder and target beneficiaries committed in the project implementation accounted for 63.4% of the respondents. Very committed and less committed responses accounted for 31.7% and 4.9% respectively. This shows that most stakeholders and beneficiaries are committed in the
project implementation and therefore timely, cost effective projects are successfully implemented with enhanced sustainable benefits due to stakeholder commitment and ownership.

Figure 4.2: Level of Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Commitment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committed</td>
<td>63.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Committed</td>
<td>30.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Committed</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Committed</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2013)

4.6.4 Effects of Withdrawal of Donor Funding

The study sought to assess the effect of withdrawal of donor funding to the donor funded project in the study region. According to majority of the respondents (68.3%), withdrawal of donor funding would affect significantly the smooth running of the project. Continue normally and cease operation responses accounted for 19.5% and 12.2% respectively as shown in figure 4.5. This showed that most project were not self sustaining after the withdrawal of the donor funding hence the need to design mechanisms to enhance project sustainability.
Figure 4.3: Effects of Withdrawal of Donor Funding

Source: Field Data, (2013)

4.7 Management Structures

The study sought to establish how the existing management structures influence the success and sustainability of donor funded projects. Key issues addressed included; Management styles adopted and their effectiveness, project staffing and staff competency.

4.7.1 Management Styles Adopted and their effectiveness

The findings presented in figure 4.6 shows that majority of the project managers (58.5%) adopted a laissez faire management style which means that most employees worked with minimum interference from the management. Democratic, open door policies and combination of both laissez faire and democratic responses accounted for 9.8%, 19.5% and 12.2%. This show that most managers adopted laissez faire management style. In addition, the study assessed the effectiveness of the management style adopted by the project managers in the various donor funded projects.
4.7.2 Effects of Management styles on project success and sustainability

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

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

The respondents rated the overall staff training and competency in the project. The findings show that most project staffs were competent in their work as accounted for by 78.1% cumulative responses. Incompetent response accounted for 21.9% as shown in figure 4.9.

Figure 4.6: Overall Staff Competency

Source: Field Data, (2013)
4.7.4 Staff Training Versus Project Success and Sustainability

The respondent rated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the fact that staff training influenced the success and sustainability of donor funded projects. A five point likert scale showed that majority of the respondents (80.8% agreed and strongly agree cumulatively) agreed with the fact that staff training influenced the success and sustainability of donor funded projects. Those who disagreed with the fact that staff training influenced the success and sustainability of donor funded projects accounted for 19.2% as shown in table 4.14. This shows that staff training is not a major factor influencing success and sustainability of donor funded projects in Turkana County.

The respondents’ comments were that though staffs have relevant training on their field of specialization, there are specific aspects of the projects that staffs need to be oriented with such as result based management, gender consideration and climate change adaptation. This will increase the efficiency and effectiveness in the project operations. Other respondents were of the view that hiring well trained staff saves the projects time and cost hence increases overall performance therefore ensuring project success and sustainability in the long run.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>07.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, (2013)
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to establish the factors influencing success and sustainability of donor funded projects in Turkana County in Kenya. Among the issues contained in this chapter includes; summary of the findings and conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of Findings

This study aimed at establishing the factors influencing success and sustainability of donor funded projects in Turkana County. Among the factors investigated include; strategic directions, project financial systems, contextual issues, level of stakeholder and target group involvement and management structures.

5.2.1 Strategic Directions

The study established that majority of the respondents (95.1%) had a long-term vision and goals for the project and its partners. Most projects were however found to have strategies in place to obtain additional funding and technical support. The findings also demonstrated that most international NGOs have marketing and promotional plans especially through websites for public awareness (82.9%). The study established that the major source of
income for most projects was institutional donors and public funds. This shows that support offices in western countries are capable of fund raising and providing technical assistance to projects.

5.2.2 Project Financial Systems

The study established that most projects had proper financial system since they followed the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) (75.6%) and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) (56.1%). More than half of the respondents (53.7%) acknowledged that they did not encounter some errors in their financial reporting. Majority of the projects kept proper books of accounts however the frequency of audit of these books of accounts was low since it was done annually (53.8%). The errors experienced in the project financial reporting could be attributed to the low frequency of the audit of the books of accounts of the project.

5.2.3 Contextual/Operational issues

The respondents were asked to rate the effects of contextual issues and effectiveness of the stated donor policies in ensuring success and enhancing sustainability of projects. The findings showed that environmental conditions have a direct bearing in the success and sustainability of projects. The finding also showed that contracts preparations, duration of funding, donor planning horizon and operations and maintenance costs policies were ineffective as rated by majority of the respondents which showed that most of the donor policies in place were ineffective hence not supportive to success and sustainability of projects.
5.2.4 Stakeholder and Target Groups Involvement

The study established that the Government (40.0%) and community groups (67.5%) were generally involved in the activities of the donor funded projects. The private sector was fairly (45.0%) involved in the project. The projects were found to be owned by beneficiaries and stakeholders. In addition, target beneficiaries and stakeholders were directly involved in decision making processes of the projects. The stakeholder and target beneficiaries were found to be committed in the project implementation. This was a step forward to achieving success and sustainability of projects.

5.2.5 Management Structures

The findings shown that the management of the most donor funded projects adopted a laissez faire management style (58.5%) which means that most employees worked with minimum interference from the management. In addition, the study assessed the effectiveness of the management style adopted by the project managers in the various donor funded projects. The findings showed that the management Style adopted by the management was ineffective to the running of the project hence no achievement of success and sustainability. However the findings further shows that most project staff were competent in their work (56.1%) and had acquired the necessary skills needed for effective performance.
5.3 Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to establish the factors influencing success and sustainability of donor funded projects in Turkana County in Kenya. The study established that most INGOs have well thought out strategic directions (Vision, Mission and Objectives), projects have proper financial systems since they followed Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). The projects kept books of accounts however the frequency of audit of these books was low since it is done annually. The errors encountered during financial reporting were however minimal.

The study also established that the Government (and community groups were greatly involved in the activities of the donor funded projects. The private sector was fairly involved in the project. In addition, target beneficiaries and stakeholders were directly involved in decision making processes of the projects. The study further established that the projects were owned by beneficiaries and stakeholders which is an indicator of success and sustainability.

The study established that the prevailing operational conditions were a hindrance to the successful implementation and sustainability of projects. This is because of the nomadic-pastoralism lifestyle of Turkana residents. Harsh environmental conditions and cattle rustling are some of the factors contributing to lack of success and sustainability of projects. Among the donor policies that were found to influence most of the projects included; contract preparations, duration of funding, donor planning horizon and operation and maintenance costs policies. These were very ineffective in enhancing project success and sustainability.
The study further established that the major management style adopted by most of the management of the projects was laissez faire management style. This meant that employees worked with minimum interference from the management. This style was however found ineffective since it was prone to abuse by most employees hence not recommended.

Finally, key factors that were found to influence the success and sustainability of donor funded projects were strategic directions, contextual issues and the management systems adopted. The existing financial systems and participation and involvement of target beneficiaries and stakeholders were not key factors that influenced the success and sustainability of the donor funded projects in Turkana County.

5.4 Recommendations

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

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

2. Transformational development is gradual and succession planning is however necessary to ensure that the target beneficiaries and the stakeholders are well prepared to effectively run the project after withdrawal of donor support.
3. In-depth analysis of the context should be done and donors kept abreast of environmental changes that influence the project success and sustainability. Project should be redesigned to reflect changes in the operational environment.

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

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

6. Gender mainstreaming in all phases of project cycle management.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

Further studies need to focus of various ways in which the locally available funds and resources such as Constituency Development Funds (CDF), Local Authority Transfer Funds (LATF) and funds for Devolved system of Government can be utilized to start successful and sustainable projects in the region. Use of locally available funds would reduce overdependence on external donors whose aid comes with conditions and restrictions.

The researcher also recommends that similar studies be conducted in other parts of the country to assess the factors influencing success and sustainability of the donor funded projects and compare the results of other parts of the country with the Turkana County’s results.
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Appendix: Questionnaire for NGOs Staff

Serial No.................................................................

The questionnaire is meant to collect information on the factors influencing success and sustainability of donor funded projects of selected international nongovernmental organizations in Turkana County. Kindly answer the questions by writing a brief statement or ticking in the boxes provided as will be applicable. The information provided will be treated as strictly confidential and at no instance will your name be mentioned in this research.

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Gender of the respondent?

1) Male ______ 2) Female ______

2. Respondent Position:

1) Project Manager ______ Project Coordinator ______
2) Project Officer ______ 4) Accountant ______
5) Others (Specify)...............................................................

3. Indicate your Age Category.

1) Below 20 years ______ 2) 20-29 Years ______
2) 20-29 years ______ 4) 30-39 Years ______
5) 40-49 Years ______ 6) Above 50 years ______

4. How long have you been working with the organization?
1) Less than 6 months
2) Between 1 to 5 years
3) Above 10 years

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

Section Two: Factors Influencing Success and Sustainability of donor funded projects

A) Strategic Directions

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

7. Does the organization have long range strategic plan?
1) Yes
2) No

8. What are the key focus areas of your strategic plan?

9. Does the organization have strategies for obtaining additional funding and support for its projects beyond the contractual timeframe?
1) Yes
2) No

10. Does the organization have project promotion and marketing plans for awareness of its projects and their impact to vulnerable communities?
1) Yes
2) No

11. What are the funding sources of the organizations for its projects?
1) Local fundraising
2) Institutional donors (DFID, USAID, CIDA, AUSAID, DANIDA, etc)
3) Public appeals
4) Church based Organizations
5) Government funds
6) Others (Please specify)…………………………………………………..

B) Project Financial systems

12. Are the following followed during preparation and presentation of financial statements for the organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Do you experience errors during financial reporting?
   1) Yes [ ] 2) No [ ]

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

[Blank space for answer]

15. Does the organization have Audit and Compliance department as an independent entity?
   1) Yes 2) No

16. If Yes, how often does the auditing for project take place
   1) Monthly 2) Quarterly 3) Bi-annually 4) Annually 5) Occasionally

17. Do you experience under-expenditures in budget utilization and if yes, please provide a brief explanation on low burn rates.

[Blank space for answer]
18. To what extend would you agree or disagree with the fact that financial systems influence the success and sustainability of projects

1) Strongly agree 2) Agree 3) Disagree 4) Strongly disagree 5) No idea

C) Stakeholders and Target groups Involvement and Participation

19. How would you rate the level of involvement and participation of the following during the project design, implementation and evaluation? Rate as follows: 1= greatly, 2= Fairly, 3 = low, 4= Very low, 5= Not involved at all

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The project is fully owned by the target beneficiaries of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The project is fully owned by the stakeholders of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The target beneficiaries of the project are involved in decision-making process including participation in assessments, prioritization of interventions, planning, implementation and evaluation of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) The project stakeholders are involved in key decision-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. How would you describe the level of commitment of stakeholders and target beneficiaries to the project being implemented by your organization?
   1) Very committed  2) Committed  3) Less committed  4) Not committed at all

22. What do you think would be the effect of withdrawal of the donor funding to the project implemented? The project will
   1) Continue normally  2) Cease operations  3) Will be affected significantly  4) No effect at all

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

D) Contextual issues in relation to donor policies

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. To what extent would you agree or disagree with the fact that operational context influence the success and sustainability of the project?
   1) Strongly agree  2) Agree  3) Neutral  4) Disagree  5) Strongly disagree
E) Organizational management structures

26. What kind of organizational management styles does the management of the organization/project adopted?
   1) Autocratic (dictatorial)  3) Democratic (Employee driven/Participative)
   2) Laisser-faire (Minimum interference from management)  4) Open donor policy (Freedom of Access)
   5) Any other (s) Specify ......................................................

27. To what extent would you agree or disagree with the fact that management styles adopted in the project /or organization will influence the project success and sustainability after withdrawal of donor support?
   1) Strongly agree  2) Agree  3) Neutral  4) Disagree  5) Strongly disagree

28. How would you rate the effectiveness of the management systems adopted in this project?
   1) Very effective  2) Effective  3) Ineffective  4) Very Ineffective

29. Did you conduct any training related to the project cycle management before implementing the projects in this organization?
   1) Yes  2) No

30. Do you think the management of the project has the necessary technical skills in implementing the project and ensuring sustainability strategies are in place?
   1) Yes  2) No

If yes, please explain your answer above?

31. How would you rate overall level of competency of the staff working for the organization and the project?
   1) Very Competent  2) Competent  3) Incomplete  4) not able to rate
32. A) To what extent would you agree or disagree with the fact that the current levels of staff training influence the success and sustainability of the project?

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

B) Comment on your answer above

______________________________________________________________________________

33. What recommendations would you make to help improve the success and sustainability of donor funded projects in Turkana County?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR RESPONSES
Map of Turkana County