



Journal Homepage: [www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

## INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

Article DOI:10.21474/IJAR01/13991

DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/13991>



### RESEARCH ARTICLE

#### EFFICACY OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS IN THE PERFORMANCE OF GOVERNMENT SPONSORED PROJECTS

Nkatha Lenna Muriuki<sup>1</sup>, Prof. Raphael Nyonje<sup>2</sup> and Dr. Joyce Lilian Omutoko<sup>3</sup>

1. Post Graduate.
2. Associate Professor.
3. Senior Lecturer.

#### Manuscript Info

##### Manuscript History

Received: 25 October 2021

Final Accepted: 29 November 2021

Published: December 2021

#### Abstract

This paper is based on the efficacy of monitoring and evaluation systems in the performance of government sponsored projects. A project is a temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product, service or result. Monitoring and evaluation is a key component in project management. The value for monitoring and evaluation is to promote and enhancing successful performance of government sponsored programs. The basic goal of monitoring and evaluation is to periodically track implementation, efficiency and project effectiveness increasing the value and interest to beneficiaries. Monitoring and evaluation system is designed within the organization, which includes indicators, methods, and procedures that can be used to determine whether a project was carried out according to plan and achieved the desired results. Projects have to be completed as expected and to the stakeholders' satisfaction and eventually be sustainable. The importance of monitoring and evaluation is to enhance the successful delivery of the projects. This paper was focused on issues dealing with the role of M&E System in the Performance and Management of government Sponsored Projects; Relevance of M&E Systems; Performance of Projects and Stakeholder Participation in Projects and barriers to the Implementation of Project Monitoring and Evaluation system. The study recommendations include that governmental or non-governmental organization and institutions need to step in advancing the capacities of monitoring and evaluation to check the direction that projects take. Project managers should therefore work hard for change attitudes and perception on the value of M&E for their personnel and finally organizations should start by improving their capacities (personnel, tools, knowledge and skills).

Copy Right, IJAR, 2021,. All rights reserved.

#### Introduction:-

The term "project management" has been defined in a variety of ways, including; "application of knowledge, skills, tools and techniques to project activities to meet the requirements" which has temporal with a defined beginning and end time (Project Management Institute, 2020); (Prabhu, 2020). A project is also regarded as a temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product, service, or result (Prabhu, 2020). Given the necessity for organizations to stay

relevant and competitive within the fundamental process project management enhances and enables planning, coordination, and control of the complex and diversified operations of modern industrial and commercial projects. The basic process and project cycle, which comprises identification, appraisal, design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation, are used to plan and guide projects. As indicated by Continuing Professional Development (CPD) (2012), several reasons for monitoring and evaluation include being a source of centralized data that demonstrates project progress, facilitates learning from each other's perspectives, drawing on knowledge and expertise and produces reports that reflect the level of transparency and accountability and making it easier to share lessons learned from projects (Continuing Professional Development (CPD), 2012). The procedure identifies flaws and offers learning and improvement options, as well as a framework for investigating and testing assumptions.

Basic implementers, beneficiaries, and decision-makers can learn from each other's viewpoints and convert them into policy and practice through monitoring and evaluation. It also allows for an assessment of the crucial relationships that exist between basic implementers, beneficiaries, and decision-makers. The value of monitoring and evaluation cannot be underestimated in promoting and successfully developing government programs besides providing a stronger basis for raising funds and influencing policy formulations. It is aimed at regularly tracking implementation, performance and to determine the effectiveness of projects (Un-Habitat, 2016). It assists in establishing when a project is on track and when changes are required, as well as laying the groundwork for improving interventions and assessing the performance of ongoing operations (UN women, 2010). According to Douvere & Ehler, (2010), monitoring and evaluation are helpful in determining alternative approaches to achieving the desired goals, predicting the outcomes of alternative measures, implementing one or more of the alternative measures, learning about the effects of management measures, and using the results to update knowledge and adjust management actions (Douvere & Ehler, 2010).

The following statements synthesize the many definitions of monitoring and evaluation promulgated by various scholars: "Monitoring is the ongoing process through which stakeholders obtain regular feedback on the progress being made toward attaining their goals and objectives" (Wanjala, Iravo, Odhiambo, & Shalle, 2017). Evaluation is a comprehensive and independent assessment of completed or ongoing activities to determine how well they are meeting their stated objectives and contributing to decision-making processes" (Macharia & Bowa, 2020).

Development evaluation supports innovation development to guide adaptation to emergent and dynamic realities in complex environments in which innovation take the form of new projects, programs, products, organizational changes, policy reforms and system interventions (Patton, 2011). Monitoring is more likely to be effective throughout the project's implementation phases than in the results – outcomes, impact, and sustainability stages (Wanjala, Iravo, Odhiambo, & Shalle, 2017). Monitoring data is used to alter and ensure that projects are being carried out as intended – on time, on budget, and delivery of the desired objectives and goals. In this regard, evaluations are used to assess project planning, design, implementation and results. The evaluation processes are conducted through four phases – planning, implementation, completion, and dissemination and reporting (Sufian, et al., 2015).

For policymakers aiming to ensure success in selecting, developing and implementing government-sponsored multi-project programmes, governance has become a primary priority. According to Kerzner (2018), the state's role has evolved, governance is central to sustainable socio-economic growth which requires the governments to be more accountable and transparent supported by the demands for the evolved global economy, modern information technology should enhance greater participation and democracy (Kerzner, 2018). Governance is frequently associated with the public sector, and it stems from a real democratic need to satisfy stakeholders by demonstrating accountability and transparency while effectively implementing policy (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2016). The governance of government programmes is a vital component of strategic planning in developing countries because of the numerous underlying risks and complexities (Khan, et al., 2019). This fosters a wide range of project management initiatives in the public sector, encompassing projects and programmes. Successful projects can only be assessed by their performance against the desired results, but also by the project's potential to have an impact on the larger public (UNDP, 2009).

Due to mismanagement, bureaucracy, wastage, pilferage, ineptitude, and irresponsibility on the part of directors and staff, most State Corporations (SCs) in Kenya have failed to meet their goals. Despite government efforts to improve services and accountability by re-examining their objectives and targets, training personnel, and raising salaries and

perks, state corporations have unlikely to improve their performance (Mbiti & Kiruja, 2015). The growing need for M&E and the creation of meaningful information on public policies, programmes, and projects for decision making has resulted from its function as a tool for fostering accountability and good governance in the public sector. At the national and county levels, this has been accomplished through the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (NIMES) and County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (CIMES), respectively (Republic of Kenya, Monitoring and Evaluation Norms and Standards, 2020). Particularly, because of their role in service delivery, counties must have comprehensive and effective M&E processes in place to assess progress toward the sector's objectives and targets (MEASURE Evaluation, 2015).

The implementation of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems and structures is inherently associated with budgeting and accountability reform initiatives in the public sector (Mbiti & Kiruja, 2015). In Kenya, the National Policy on Monitoring and Evaluation (2012) sets out: the government's commitment to transparency for development outcomes; identifies criteria for evaluating the efficacy and effectiveness of public policies, projects and programs; offers channels for effective policy feedback and therefore efficient allocation of resources (Republic of Kenya, National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2012).

### **Monitoring And Evaluation System**

Projects require resources to carry out the numerous activities aimed at achieving a set of objectives and goals, which necessitate close supervision to ensure that they are carried out correctly to avoid rework, increased project costs, and project duration, and hence they must monitor and evaluate projects to achieve the desired results which is a function of management designed to make effective and efficient use of resources (Callistus & Clinton, 2016). The term "M&E system" refers to the indicators, methods, and procedures that can be used to determine whether a project was carried out according to plan and achieved the desired results (Görgens-Albino, Kusek, & Bank, 2010). The M&E system is an effective approach for assessing the achievement of sponsored project objectives through the desired performance indicators (Ocharo, Rambo, & Ojwang, 2020). Monitoring and evaluation systems are often a continuous works process (Kusek & Rist, 2004). The system may consist of participatory monitoring, staff training in M&E, sectoral coordination, scope management and project partnerships which work within the output, outcome and goals (Ocharo, Rambo, & Ojwang, 2020).

In Kenya, a comprehensive M&E System was introduced with the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PR5P) in 2000 and as a predecessor of the ERS2003-2007. The Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS) took into account the need for a fully-fledged national M&E framework and its institutionalization which is under the NIMES and CIMES for national and county governments respectively (Republic of Kenya, National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2012). County governments in Kenya use a monitoring and evaluation system that is seen as a solution to a more equitable allocation of resources to the Kenyan general populace. The systems were introduced as comprehensive national system to guide the country on monitoring and evaluation which was placed under the ministry of planning and national development.

### **Performance Of Projects**

Multinational development organizations, donor governments, parliaments, the private sector, NGOs, civil society groups, and the media, among others, have made significant internal and external demands on governments and public institutions around the world to enhance resource utilization (Kusek & Rist, 2004). Project monitoring and evaluation are key elements in improving project performance.

For decades, international aid agencies have used projects as key instruments for granting, financing, lending, and technical assistance, providing the means to mobilize capital and allocate it to the production of economic and social services, as well as instruments for social transformation in the country (United Nations, 2019). Despite the significant risk of project failure in developing countries, programmes and projects are being increasingly commonly used in the economic and social development process as crucial components in the formulation and implementation of development goals.

In Kenya, national and county development plans are required to serve as the foundation for performance measurement, with indicators defined to track progress toward goals. The achievement of specified targets at the national and devolved levels is based on institutional, sectoral, individual, and policy achievements, which requires gathering and interpreting evidence to influence decision-making processes. At the same time, budget allocation will be tracked at all levels to ensure effective and efficient use of funds which will go a long way in boosting the value

for money (Republic of Kenya, National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2012). Evaluations should provide evidence that is authentic, reliable, and relevant, allowing for the timely integration of findings, recommendations, and lessons into the governance systems and associated members through the organization's decision-making processes (Wasike, 2014).

The project environment consists of a wide range of variables, all of which can have a substantial impact not only on the project's results, but also on how it is implemented and regarded. Physical, Economic and Financial, Institutional and Political, and Socio-cultural elements all have the potential to influence a certain environment. Many developing countries' project environments face unique problems for project managers, presupposing significant cost and time overruns even prior to project start-up (Akanni, Oke, & Akpomiemie, 2015).

Political intervention, for example, impedes project M&E activity (Waithera & Susan, 2017). Because initiatives that are extremely successful in industrialized countries may fail due to a disregard for internal organizational cultures. Culture is a critical factor in monitoring and evaluation. Due to differences in their underlying values and attitudes, different stakeholders in different cultural environments are likely to behave differently in similar situations. To succeed, the project manager must learn to maintain, support, and embrace cultures, which is a major strength of the cultural perspective.

### **Government Projects In Developing Countries**

The aim of project management in developing countries is to make it easier to plan, coordinate, and monitor complex, unique, specific, time-bound, and varied projects within the fundamental process, which includes monitoring and evaluation, among other aspects in the project life cycle. Project life cycles, which comprise initiation, planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation, should be utilized to guide projects in developing countries (Project Management Institute, 2020) (Maley, 2012).

In developing countries, several projects are being conducted that need to be completed in order for national progress to be achieved. Without good project identification, planning, and implementation, development programmes are nothing more than ideas, and developing countries would languish or disintegrate (Rondinelli, 1976). In Kenya as clearly delineated in the Fourth Schedule of the Constitution, the two levels of governments have a clear mandate to provide a range of services some done through the implementing of varied projects. The primary objective of decentralization was the transition responsibility, resources and representation to the grassroots level. The constitution was designed to increase participation in governance and to allow better monitoring and evaluation of policies at the grassroots level (Commission on Revenue Allocation, 2020).

In many developed countries, government effectiveness is at an all-time low since the government has failed to deliver essential public services such as property rights, roads, and basic health and education (Kusek & Rist, 2004). Kenya's monitoring and evaluation strategy is designed to improve project management in the country. As a result, efficient M&E policy execution necessitates the availability of sufficient financial resources, with M&E being an explicit component of project planning and budgeting (Republic of Kenya, National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2012).

The National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) was established in 2003 as a way for the Kenyan government to track the execution of the IP-ERS, which was formally launched in September 2007 for implementation (Republic of Kenya, National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2012). National indicators developed by NIMES have often provided support to both governmental and private sector activities (Ministry of Devolution and Planning, 2015).

Factors that impede the proper/smooth implementation of sponsored projects. Many scholars have suggested that such failures are caused by a number of issues, including the ones listed below;

Effective communication is critical in project management because it facilitates information transmission, offers direction, and improves project performance. Effective communication provides stakeholders with critical information on a timely basis, allowing the project to be delivered effectively and efficiently (Rajkumar, 2010), (Zulch, 2014), (Abdullah, 2017).

Planning is one of the most crucial components of every project, and poor planning is responsible for a number of project failures (Damoah, Akwei, & Mouzugh, 2015). Projects are more likely to fail (Pinto, 2013) if project deliverables are not clearly stated in the project planning phase, including how they will be achieved (Damoah, Akwei, & Mouzugh, 2015). According to Lewis (2005), "good project planning is like the basic infrastructure of a building; if done incorrectly and improperly, it can lead to serious consequences," as illustrated by Damoah, Akwei, and Mouzugh (2015), (Nzekwe, Oladejo, & Emoh, 2015).

Cultural differences alter the methodologies necessary for successful project management based on the geographical areas (Muriithi & Crawford, 2003), which might contribute to project failure (Damoah, Akwei, & Mouzugh, 2015).

Scope change is one of the leading causes of project failure, as many project requirements are changed prior to the start of work or throughout the course of the project, with no impact on the schedule or completion date (Damoah, Akwei, & Mouzugh, 2015) (Muriithi & Crawford, 2003). (Nzekwe, Oladejo, & Emoh, 2015).

Many initiatives fail due to a lack of or inadequate resource allocation, according to Damoah, Akwei, and Mouzugh (2015). Financial, human, goodwill, reputation, expertise, and material resources are all examples of resources in this circumstance. Physical items required for project execution are known as material resources, and their scarcity might impede project implementation effectiveness (Nzekwe, Oladejo, & Emoh, 2015).

### **Statement Of The Problem**

Project management has become an important part of contemporary public or private institutions, organizations and corporations to achieve the desired objectives as they improve project performance and outcomes, enforced by the demand to deliver quality amidst high level rivalries. At the same time projects are becoming more sophisticated and complex, involving multiple organizations and spending billions of dollars (Meredith, Shafer, & Mantel, 2018). Effective project management should increase the likelihood of the project providing long-term benefits to the beneficiaries and by extension enhanced national development.

Successful projects are delivered "on time, on budget, and to specification," while also ensuring that stakeholders and their expectations are not met (Kobusingye, Mungatu, & Mulyungi, 2017). The project management teams must concentrate on each of the constraints, which will be quite helpful in monitoring and evaluating the project. Project managers predominantly focus on the implementation and expedite on-time delivery of each milestone, aligned to concentrate goals, eliminate non-essentials, monitor expenses, and link them to technological progress, all while ensuring efficiency and quality are delivered in which deviations are addressed appropriately and promptly. However, most projects lack a robust process for realizing strategic value expected to successfully deliver outcomes (Musawir, Serra, Zwikael, & Ali, 2017). Successful projects should be judged, not only by the performance and delivery of desired outcomes, or economic value, but also by the project's capacity to have an impact on the broader community; enhanced relationships with the beneficiaries and strong alliances with selected partners (UNDP, 2009), (Kerzner, 2018).

Beneficiaries place a high emphasis on project monitoring and evaluation as projects address pressing concerns and challenges. Organizations should focus on building monitoring and evaluation systems to effectively manage projects, which places a greater emphasis on systematic monitoring of project progress and, as a result improved performance. Projects must be completed on time and to the satisfaction of all stakeholders, and that they must ultimately be sustainable. The degree of socioeconomic progress brought about by the successful implementation of projects is normally predisposed to the advancement of any country.

### **Review Of Related Literature:-**

The importance of sponsored projects cannot be overemphasized as it is regarded as one of the organs of economic development (Amusan, Dolapo, & Joshua, 2012). Capital projects that are worth millions of dollars are being conducted on a day to day basis and therefore their performance is of critical importance (Meredith, Shafer, & Mantel, 2018). Several studies have been undertaken to aid with project monitoring, evaluation, and performance in developing countries, which has also become a global phenomenon that is not restricted to emerging economies.

### **Role of M&E System in the Management and Performance of government sponsored Projects**

Essentially, developing countries have large-scale, but frequently fragmented and dissipative plans for projects that require strong leadership and competent management to attain the essential strategic objectives (Meredith, Shafer,

& Mantel, 2018). The information provided by the monitoring and evaluation processes should assist the management in making appropriate decisions. As a recipe for development, monitoring and evaluation allows public officials, development managers, and civil society to learn from previous experiences, improve service delivery, organize and allocate resources, and communicate outcomes to key stakeholders as part of accountability (Kerzner, 2018). (Kusek & Rist, 2004).

Monitoring and evaluation together provide the necessary data to aid strategic planning, the development and implementation of initiatives and strategies, and the better allocation of resources (UN women, 2010). In order to inform continuous decision-making processes, assessment methods include asking questions, applying evaluation logic, and acquiring real-time data. The project manager must assess the quality of available project data, select an appropriate technique combination, and establish a project infrastructure that includes planning, scheduling, and motivational systems, as well as control (Meredith, Shafer, & Mantel, 2018). To improve the successful delivery of projects, corporations, small and medium enterprises, governments, and non-profit organizations must recognize the value of project management. Understanding the principles, techniques, and approaches used in project management will help enhance overall results (Kerzner, 2018). Eventually, monitoring supports the project by aligning the project to plan and design and addressing the expected objectives and goals.

Monitoring and evaluation can be an effective tool to provide ongoing feedback, identify potential issues, assess project accessibility and performance, and provide recommendations. It will also entail altering the character of the initiatives and incorporating the perspectives of stakeholders, as well as demonstrating the necessity for mid-term modifications (Gudda, 2011). M&E informs project success, while evaluation informs future projects about what has to be done differently. The M&E system focuses on the efficient use of input resources, such as finance, human, technical. The M&E system focuses on the effective use of input resources such as finance, human, technical, and material resources, each employee's activities or specified functions, expected performance from input resources, the accomplishment of the organization's task or vision, and, finally, the achievement of organizational goals such as the effective completion of projects (Ocharo, Rambo, & Ojwang, 2020). Monitoring and evaluation give feedback and lessons learned to project teams and management as part of the continuous learning and capacity building processes (Kerzner, 2018).

### **Relevance of M&E Systems and Performance of government sponsored Projects**

Successful development projects are grounded in careful planning, rigorous data collection, meticulous implementation, and thorough analysis and reporting which is the importance of monitoring and evaluation (TolaData, 2019). Greater transparency and accountability, increased project performance, optimal resource allocation, methodical management and learning, and informed decision-making are all benefits of monitoring and evaluation. One of the most significant benefits of M&E is that it aids businesses in tracking, evaluating, and reporting essential data and information throughout the project life cycle. It provides evidence of project success, allowing partners, donors and community members to make informed decisions. A well designed M&E enables the project team to develop a clearer understanding of the needs of the target population, which identifies the scope of the appropriate, measurable and achievable project and project objectives and also allows organizations to see their progress and recognize gaps as they arise and make timely modifications to achieve the desired results (Muchelule, 2018).

Projects are frequently bound by their budgets, which influence the timing and volume of interventions, resource selection, and people quantities and quality, among other things. M&E is a useful technique for increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of finances in project implementation since it allows the team to assess the value and impact of various project components and make decisions about the project's implementation (Lankester & Grills, 2019).

M&E systems come in handy when it comes to providing evidence-based data to help with informed decision-making, policy formulation, and implementation (Kanyamuna, Kotzé, & Phiri, 2019). This provides quantifiable results to help stakeholders learn from and adapt to project successes and challenges. Involved parties are better prepared to respond to the ever-changing project circumstances, identify the reasons for failures and hence make informed decisions to enhance the project performance.

M&E supports in the systematic management of an organization and serves as a performance management tool by allowing the organization to collect, disseminate, and utilize data to improve internal operations and provide value to

its activities (Muchelule, 2018). Monitoring is the process of gathering, analyzing, and reporting data about a project's inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts on a regular and systematic basis. Organizations can then focus on their objectives, such as increasing success, encouraging innovation, sharing and using lessons gained for continuous improvement.

### **Stakeholder Participation in government sponsored Projects**

Based on the context of the stakeholder, the success of a project may be determined from the perspective of the means or the end (what it was intended or expected to accomplish) (Bannerman, 2008). Most donor institutions are working hard to ensure successful projects and enhance the value of their funds. Sustainability, defined as the project's ability to continue working toward its purpose for as long as feasible after the donor withdraws assistance, is the highest level of project success, and has thus become an important criterion for monitoring and evaluation. Donors providing assistance in establishing or supporting development eventually come to see sustainability as the key goal. Sustainability eventually represents the main purpose for donors providing aid in achieving or promoting development (Muluh, Kimengsi, & Azibo, 2019).

Public and private initiatives both require some level of public/stakeholder involvement. Public involvement is an open, accountable, and systematic procedure in which citizens, people, or a section of a community can communicate, share views, and influence decision-making in initiatives as part of the democratic process (Mariru, 2018). In Kenya, public participation is a constitutional obligation, Article 1, which states that sovereign power belongs to the people and Article 10(2)(a) and Section 2(14) of the Fourth Schedule of the Constitution of Kenya and is stipulated by the County Government as a key function. In government projects, the Kenya constitution 2010, recognizes the role citizens in projects development and management, which should be done at both the county and national government levels projects (articles 76 (d), 174 (c) and 176). Participation is also recognized under the Public Participation Act, 2018 (Republic of Kenya, The Public Participation Bill, 2018, 2018).

In Kenya the Public Participation Bill, 2018 provides a general framework for effective Public Participation to give effect to the constitutional principles of democracy and participation of the people under the Constitution in the management of projects. The conduct of Public Participation Bill is guided by various principles (Republic of Kenya, The Public Participation Bill, 2018, 2018) which include that communities and organizations affected by a decision have the right to be consulted and to participate in the decision-making process. The public institutions need to provide effective mechanisms for public, community and organizational participation that would be affected by or interested in a decision and also ensuring equitable access of respondents to the information they need to participate in a meaningful way. In the act the public views shall be taken into consideration in decision making which also requires the development of appropriate feedback mechanisms; adhering to the national values referred to in Article 10 of the Constitution. The act recognizes the adherence to the leadership and integrity principles set out in Chapter Six of the Constitution through the compliance with the principles of public participation, as any written law may prescribe and also fostering sustainable decisions that recognize the needs and interests of all stakeholders, including decision-makers.

Specifically, the participation means monitoring and evaluation of the project activities under the government, besides ensuring accountability. Article 196 – “Public participation and county assembly powers, privileges and immunities.” In the public finance bill recognizes that “there shall be openness and accountability, including public participation in financial matters” on public finance chapter 12 article 201. In the Fourth Schedule on the Functions of the County government (Part II (14) – “Ensuring and coordinating the participation of communities and locations in governance at the local level and assisting communities and locations to develop the administrative capacity for the effective exercise of the functions and powers and participation in governance at the local level.”

### **Barriers to the Implementation of Project Monitoring and Evaluation system**

The idea of M&E has not been acknowledged candidly as it assumed by many organizations as being a donor requirement rather than a valuable management tool for reviewing progress, identifying and correcting problems in planning and implementation of projects (Amstrong & Baron, 2013)(Okello & Mugambi, 2015). Building and sustaining result-based monitoring and evaluation is demanding since it requires continuous commitment, time, effort, resources and champions (Kusek & Rist, 2004).

In some cases, opposition and resistance to the monitoring and evaluation system is due to deficiencies of implementation or reveals weaknesses of management, which may be disliked by the members of the project staff

since it exposes them. In some cases, too much attention is given to monitoring and evaluation which diverts their efforts to project processes (Binnendijk, 2019). There are also cases of disregard of monitoring and evaluation results, in which project teams do not apply or just disregard the outputs. In many institutions, there are limited experiences on how monitoring and evaluation should be managed and who should do it (Burggraf & Gühnemann, 2014).

According to the Burggraf & Gühnemann, (2014), typical barriers to the appropriate utilization of monitoring and evaluation is lack of financial and personnel resources as well as technical knowledge and skills deficiencies in project management which includes an understanding of the performance indicators, data retrieval and collection, data preparation, analysis and data comprehension. The identification of any limitations, biases and threats to data quality and analysis is an important factor in the preparation of data collection and analysis. The feasibility and performance of every monitoring plan largely depend on the capacity of the organization or individuals responsible for carrying out the activity. Consequently, the implementation of project monitoring and evaluation is hampered by poor institutional capacity (Callistusa & Clinton, 2016) (Burggraf & Gühnemann, 2014).

The barriers to monitoring and evaluation include limited resources and budgetary allocations, development of M&E objectives not consistent with the needs and values of intended beneficiaries, the weak linkage between planning, budgeting and monitoring & evaluation, weak demand for and utilization of monitoring and evaluation results and poor data quality, data gaps and inconsistencies (Callistusa & Clinton, 2016) (Hassan, 2013). The different and little consistency in the definitions of indicators to be monitored result in diverse perspectives and opinions creating conflict in making accurate discussions and decisions. In many cases, Monitoring and evaluation are not popular and regarded amongst the political class and agenda (Burggraf & Gühnemann, 2014). The participation of stakeholder groups in the monitoring and evaluation process and the use of data to inform opinions are increasingly becoming essential, although being seen as complex and potentially vulnerable to pressure from interest groups (Burggraf & Gühnemann, 2014).

According to Kusek and Rist (2004), one of the biggest challenges for the monitoring and evaluation systems is sustaining it. Some of the challenges for the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation system in Kenya include poor M&E culture in which many public institutions in Kenya have not adopted the culture of M&E in their programs and projects. As such, it is difficult to assess whether M&E affects decision-making in organizations and M&E budgets are not synchronized with the projects/programs as they should be. There are weak and non-harmonized M&E reporting structures within organizations and uncoordinated monitoring and evaluation systems with fragmented and uncoordinated M&E units without consistent reporting structures make it difficult to collect information from the various components concerned.

Weak institutional, managerial and technical capacities, which lack structures for stakeholders and partner institutions, as well as the necessary skills and capacity to carry out effective M&E, have not been adequately carried out, constraining evaluations of programs, policies and projects. Weak legal framework for guiding and the coordination of monitoring and evaluation system. In some cases, the monitoring and evaluation institutions do not have legal mandate to ensure central and county level institutions comply with requirements.

### **Conclusions:-**

The importance of monitoring and evaluation in project management cannot be overstated, and all stakeholders must give it the attention it deserves. Government projects, like any other, must be delivered by assuring compliance, achieving the stated quality and scope, and being executed on time and within budget, all of which can be enhanced by appropriate monitoring and evaluation systems. Thus identifying the most valuable and efficient use of resources, manage the project scope and objectives, ensuring the project is delivered within schedule as expected. The system ensure that projects are relevant to the beneficiaries, target communities and development agendas.

### **Recommendations:-**

The study makes the following recommendations;

1. The performance of projects is wanting in many developing countries and sectors. Several studies have isolated effective adherence to the project management concept specifically monitoring and evaluation as a means of improving and enhancing the performance of projects. Therefore, the governmental or non-governmental organization and institutions need to step up in advancing the organizational and individual capacities to enable



effective performance of projects through effective and efficient use of resources which can be guided through/by monitoring and evaluation.

2. Several organizations or institutions mainly in the developing world have often developed negative attitudes towards monitoring and evaluation assumed as donor requirement rather than a management tool. The project managers should therefore work hard to change such perception and attitude in order to improve the utility of monitoring and evaluation and hence better performance of projects.

### References:-

1. ABDULLAH, A. M. (2017). MANAGING COMMUNICATION FOR MULTI PROJECTS IN BUILDING CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY . INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM IN DEVELOPING ECONOMIES; COMMONALITIES AMONG DIVERSITIES , 59-73.
2. Akanni, P. O., Oke, A. E., & Akpomimie, O. A. (2015). Impact of environmental factors on building project performance in Delta State, Nigeria. HBRC Journal Volume 11, Issue 1, 91-97.
3. Armstrong, M., & Baron, A. (2013). Performance Management. The New Realities. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
4. Amusan, L., Dolapo, D., & Joshua, O. (2012). Cost and Time Performance Information of Building Projects in Developing Economy. International Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Technology (IJMET) Volume 8, Issue 10, October 2017, 918–927.
5. Bannerman, P. L. (2008). Research Conference: Defining the Future of Project Management. Warsaw, Poland. Newtown Square: PA: Project Management Institute.
6. Binnendijk, A. L. (2019). Donor Agency Experience with the Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Projects. Taylor and Francis group .
7. Burggraf, K., & Gühnemann, A. (2014). Why is monitoring and evaluation a challenge. Institute for Transport Studies University of Leeds.
8. Callistus, T., & Clinton, A. (2016). Evaluating barriers to effective implementation of project monitoring and evaluation in the Ghanaian construction industry. Johannesburg: Department of Construction Management and Quantity Surveying, University of Johannesburg, South Africa.
9. Callistus, T., & Clinton, A. (2016). Evaluating barriers to effective implementation of project monitoring and evaluation in the Ghanaian construction industry. Science Direct.
10. Commission on Revenue Allocation. (2020). Functions of County Government. Nairobi.
11. Continuing Professional Development (CPD). (2012). Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for Continuing Professional Development. Retrieved from Continuing Professional Development (CPD); Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for Continuing Professional Development 2012 Continuing Professional Development (CPD): [https://www.unam.edu.na/sites/default/files/cpd-regional1/cpd\\_me\\_framework.pdf](https://www.unam.edu.na/sites/default/files/cpd-regional1/cpd_me_framework.pdf)
12. Crawford, P., & Bryce, P. (2013). Project Monitoring and Evaluation: A method of enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of aid project implementation. International Journal of Project management , 363 – 373.
13. Damoah, I., Akwei, C., & Mouzoughi, Y. (2015). Causes of government project failure in developing countries – Focus on Ghana..
14. Douvère, F., & Ehler, C. N. (2010). The importance of monitoring and evaluation in adaptive maritime spatial planning. Journal of Coastal Conservation, 305–311.
15. Görgens-Albino, M., Kusek, J. Z., & Bank, W. (2010). Making monitoring and evaluation systems work : a capacity development tool kit. Washington: World Bank.
16. Gudda, P. (2011). A guide to monitoring & evaluation. Bloomington: IN AuthorHouse.
17. Hassan, A. I. (2013). An Investigation of Structural Capacity as a Component of Monitoring and Evaluation in Project Success of Road Construction Projects in Kenya. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences Vol. 3, No. 8.
18. Kanyamuna, V., Kotzé, D. A., & Phiri, M. (2019). Monitoring and Evaluation Systems: The Missing Strand in the African Transformational Development Agenda. World Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Vol. 5, No. 3, 160-175.
19. Kerzner, H. (2018). Project management best practices: achieving global excellence. Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley.
20. Khan, A., Waris, M., Ismail, I., Sajid, M. R., Ullah, M., & Usman, F. (2019). Deficiencies in Project Governance: An Analysis of Infrastructure Development Program. MDPI, 2-15.
21. Klijn, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. (2016). Governance Networks in the Public Sector 1st Ed. London: Routledge.

22. Kobusingye, B., Mungatu, J. K., & Mulyungi, P. (2017). Influence of stakeholders' involvement on project outcomes. A case of water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) project in Rwanda. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, Vol. 6, No. 06, 195 - 206.
23. Kusek, J. Z., & Rist, R. C. (2004). *Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system : a handbook for development practitioners*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
24. Lankester, T., & Grills, N. J. (2019). *Setting up community health programmes in low and middle income settings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
25. Macharia, C. F., & Bowa, O. (2020). Monitoring and Evaluation and project performance in Kenya: the case of nongovernmental organizations implementing education projects in Nairobi county. *International Academic Journal of Information Sciences and Project Management | Volume 3, Issue 6*, 312-337.
26. Maley, C. H. (2012). *Project Management Concepts, Methods, and Techniques*. London: CRC Press.
27. Mariru, P. (2018). What about public participation? Where are we? Retrieved from International Institute for Legislative Affairs.: <https://ilakenya.org/what-about-public-participation-where-are-we>
28. Mbiti, V. M., & Kiruja, E. (2015). Role of Monitoring and Evaluation on Performance of Public Organization Projects in Kenya: A Case of Kenya Meat Commission. *International Journal of Innovative Development & Policy Studies* , 12-27.
29. MEASURE Evaluation. (2015). *Baseline Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Capacities in 17 Counties in Kenya* . Chapel Hill, NC : MEASURE Evaluation, .
30. Meredith, J. R., Shafer, S. M., & Mantel, S. J. (2018). *Project management a strategic managerial approach 10th Edition*. New York: Hoboken Wiley.
31. Ministry of Devolution and Planning. (2015). *Implementation of the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System*. Nairobi: Ministry of Devolution and Planning.
32. Muchelule, Y. (2018). Role of monitoring and evaluation on performance of non-governmental organizations projects in Kiambu county. *International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations* Vol. 6, Issue 1, 649-664.
33. Muluh, G. N., Kimengsi, J. N., & Azibo, N. K. (2019). Challenges and Prospects of Sustaining Donor-Funded Projects in Rural Cameroon. *Sustainability* .
34. Muriithi, N., & Crawford, L. H. (2003). Approaches to project management in Africa: Implications for international development projects. *International Journal of Project Management* 21(5), 309-319.
35. Musawir, A. u., Serra, C. E., Zwikael, O., & Ali, I. (2017). Project governance, benefit management, and project success: Towards a framework for supporting organizational strategy implementation. *International Journal of Project Management* Volume 35, Issue 8, 1658-1672.
36. Nzekwe, J. U., Oladejo, E. I., & Emoh, F. I. (2015). Project failure as a reoccurring issue in developing countries: focus on Anambra state, south East Nigeria. *International Journal of Energy and Environmental Research* Vol.3, No.3, 1-20.
37. Ocharo, D. R., Rambo, C., & Ojwang, B. (2020). Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks On Performance of Public Agricultural Projects in Galana Kilifi County, Kenya. *European Journal of Physical and Agricultural Sciences* Vol. 8 No. 1.
38. Okello, L. O., & Mugambi, F. (2015). Determinants of Effective Monitoring and Evaluation System of Public Health Programs: A Case Study of School-Based Hand Washing Program in Kwale County, Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Sciences*.
39. Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Developmental evaluation : applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. New York : Guilford Press.
40. Prabhu, T. (2020). *Project Management: Fundamental Principles of Project Management*. Nestfame Creations Pvt Ltd.
41. Project Management Institute. (2020, 7 30). What is Project Management? Retrieved from Project Management Institute: <https://www.pmi.org/about/learn-about-pmi/what-is-project-management>
42. Rajkumar, S. (2010). *Art of communication in project management*. Paper presented at PMI® Research Conference: Defining the Future of Project Management. Washington, DC. Newtown Square, PA: Project Management Institute.
43. Republic of Kenya. (2012). *National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*. Nairobi: Ministry of State for Planning, National Development and Vision 2030.
44. Republic of Kenya. (2018). *The Public Participation Bill, 2018*. Nairobi: Republic of Kenya.
45. Republic of Kenya. (2020). *Monitoring and Evaluation Norms and Standards* . Nairobi : Government of Kenya .

46. Sufian, M., Grunbaum, J. A., Akintobi, T. H., Dozier, A., Eder, M. (., Jones, S., . . . White-Cooper, S. (2015). Program Evaluation and Evaluating Community Engagement. In Clinical and Translational Science Awards (CTSA) Consortium, Principles of Community Engagement 2nd Edition (p. 197). NH Publication .
47. TolaData. (2019). 5 reasons why monitoring & evaluation is good for NGOs. Retrieved from TolaData: <https://www.toladata.com/blog/why-is-monitoring-evaluation-good-for-ngos/>
48. UN women. (2010, 10 31). Why is monitoring and evaluation important? Retrieved from UN Women: <https://www.endvawnow.org/en/articles/331-why-is-monitoring-and-evaluation-important.html>
49. UNDP. (2009). Handbook on Planning Monitoring and Evaluation for development results . New York: United Nations Development Programme.
50. Un-Habitat. (2016). Planning Sustainable Cities Global Report on Human Settlements 2016. Un-Habitat.
51. United Nations. (2019). Mobilization of financial resources for inclusive and sustainable development. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.
52. United Nations Development Group. (2011). Result Based Management, Handbook - Harmonizing RBM concepts and approaches for improved development results at country level . United Nations Development Group.
53. Waithera, K. B., & Susan, W. (2017). Factors affecting cost overruns in construction projects: A case of Kenya National Highways Authority. International Journal of Project Management 1(10), 167-184.
54. Wanjala, M. Y., Iravo, M. A., Odhiambo, R., & Shalle, N. I. (2017). Effect of Monitoring Techniques on Project Performance of Kenyan State Corporations. European Scientific Journal July 2017 edition Vol.13, No.19.
55. Wasike, S. (2014). Monitoring and Evaluation for Development in Kenya: Focus on County Governance. SSRN Electronic Journal.
56. Zulch, B. (2014). Communication: The foundation of project management . Science Direct.