A Review on the Factors Affecting Performance of Community Water Projects in Kenya

Nkanatha Muthuri Phinehas & Ochieng Dalmas Odoyo

A Review on the Factors Affecting Performance of Community Water Projects in Kenya

[1]Nkanatha Muthuri Phinehas & [2]Ochieng Dalmas Odoyo

Email of the Corresponding Author: nkanathaphin1360@gmail.com

[1]Author

[2]Co Author

How to cite this article: Phinehas N, M, & Ochieng D. O. (2019), A Review on the Factors Affecting Performance of Community Water Projects in Kenya. *Journal of Public Policy & Governance, Vol* 3(2) pp. 42-60.

Abstract

Water is an essential commodity for the sustenance of human life and economic progress. However, it is a scarce resource and its access and use often generates competition and conflict among the users. Water Resources Management Authority (WRMA) has provided guidelines on the administrative organization and standard operations of community-based water projects in Kenya. The success or failure (performance level) of a community-based water management project can be influenced by level of community participation and ownership, training and education of the project leaders, governance structure of the project and basic management skills of leaders among other factors such as financial and technical support. Prudent use and management of the water resource is therefore fundamental. The conclusion is that more rural people were involved in addressing their own development, confidence and the more the successful level associated with water projects for success. Recommendation is that projects leaders and members should be trained on effective use of water taps to reduce the loss in quantity or quality of water as it flows from its source through water projects pipes for use to eventual disposal. The study also found out that governing policies and performance of community development projects do have a positive association. The findings showed that involvement of key development practitioners and the community in policy making and implementation and constant policy updates is central to performance. The study established a positive relationship between the availability of resources and performance of community development projects. It was clear from the findings that access and frequency of funding does influence performance and that the qualification and relevance of human resource does impact on performance. The study also established a positive relationship between community participation and the performance of

community development projects. It was clear from the findings that community involvement right from project initiation influences project performance and that empowerment and development of transition mechanisms of the management teams at the community level impacts on performance and sustainability. The study recommended that the beneficiaries be committed to protect initiatives meant for their development; that the government ensures good representation of relevant stakeholders and the community in the entire process of policy making and implementation.

Key Words: *Community participation, Resource Availability, Water project & Governance structures.*

1.0 The Concepts of Community development projects

Community development projects leaders are rigid because of the bureaucratic structures and overreliance on manual ways of communication which has affected performance because of delay of information from one member to the other and hence the importance of the adoption of proper planning (Knapke *et al.,* 2013) Hakacova Baysan and Bell (2010), Community development projects in Kenya have been experiencing delays in the area of monitoring and evaluation. In particular, the delays in involving experts from the initiation of community development based projects towards success. Community of any country is the corner stones for development growth, hence the need for a vicious campaign towards strategically thinking of growth. Community based service-learning integrates experiential learning and academic goals with organized activities designed to meet the objectives of community partners. Community based service learning has potential to enhance; academic learning, foster civic responsibility, develop community livelihood and transform student attitudes (Knapke *et al.*, 2013). Despite the poor performance community development based project in Kenya, there is scare literature in the Kenya context to boast the community during the project implementation and finally get value for their money. Most of the available literatures are from developed country and a few from the African region.

2.0 Community Participation

According to Mayberry (2013), participation is 'not only about achieving the more efficient and more equitable distribution of material resources: it is also about the sharing of knowledge and the transformation of the process of learning itself in the service of people's self-development'. McHugh and Hogan (2011), states that the purpose of participation is power redistribution, thereby enabling society to fairly redistribute benefits and costs. In the context of tourism planning, Quinn Patton and Patrizi (2010) define community participation as 'a process of involving all [stakeholders] (local government officials, local citizens, architects, developers, business people, and planners) in such way that decision-making is shared'.

Further, National Anti-Corruption Campaign Steering Committee (2008) in a study in Kenya established that only 32.5% were involved in project monitoring. This means that 77.5 % of the communities were not participating in monitoring the community development fund (CDF) projects and that the community exclusion level stood at 79%, meaning only 21% were included. Slightly over 25% of the population in the same study was involved in CDF projects in one way or another, meaning about 75% of the community was not involved. This indicates low community involvement in development projects. It is evident from the study that there is low community involvement in development in the traditional community development approaches (Quinn, Patton, & Patrizi, 2010). Perez-Gladish (2012) in a study conducted in Bangladesh, indicates that 93% of the respondents reported that they never participated in the planning phase of any

development projects with only 24 % of the respondents saying that they were involved in one or more projects' implementation process, indicating that the remaining 78 % of the people were not involved in the implementation. Strong arguments have been advanced in support of ecotourism playing a central role in conservation and rural development in Sub-Saharan Africa.

2.1 Community participation and performance of community water projects

Community should take part in every phase of the project implementation, starting from the planning through the building and managing of the systems. Society and political class are two important forces that cannot be ignored so easily for any project to reach its complete maturity stage. According to Jameel (2009), asserts that while expanded community interest has been upheld as an approach to enhance the nature of open activities and administrations, confirm from randomized assessments gives extremely blended outcomes about its viability by doing this, good performance and long terms arrangements can be found that are suited to their own particular needs and locally accessible assets. As opposed to being forced by pariahs, like development agencies, donors and governments activities ought to tackle the communities own particular challenges which in most cases are different from other communities.

According to Mushtaq (2004), in America Community participation is a process by which people from all sectors of the community (rich, poor, Men, women, uneducated and educated) can influence or 10 control those decisions, which affect their lives. He argues that Community participation is very crucial especially during the initial stages of a project. With clear comprehension on frameworks of their projects, communities will be focused on their undertakings and have a feeling of proprietorship. Eventually people in the community support, is about making an empowering domain for communities to help themselves. In Asia it was observed that using of their own aptitudes and assets communities can remove their initial steps from poverty and move towards sustainable development. And once these fundamental administrations are set up and communities build up the aptitudes and assets for changing their condition they keep on furthering their improvement (Keen, 2007).

A study on decentralization of water resources management in Zimbabwe found that effective dialogue and participation does not automatically occur, raising queries on the assumption that this policy is always effective (Chikozho & Latham, 2005). In Kenya, a study on improving water resources development and management by Mogaka, Gichere, Davis and Hirji (2005) observed that catchment administration bunches comprising of upstream and downstream partners, helped by government office staff, frame a principal part to overseeing a large portion of the reasons for debasement. This has appeared by pilot projects supported in Mt. Kenya East project to create and exhibit great catchment administration rehearses. The Kenyan Constitution (2010) resulted in the reforms of previously existing laws, policies and in situations, seeking to expand the space for communities to participate directly in the management of resources within their localities, which is in turn were expected to have a direct effect on their livelihoods. This is indicative of the fact there exists an unmistakable connection between water assets administration and community vocations. Unless destitution and populace issues are joined in water administration, endeavours to accomplish feasible water assets administration may not yield any success (NEMA, 2011). The GOK (2009), states that pastoralism is a livestock based economic activity that has made due as a business and land utilize framework regardless of changes in ways of life and innovative progressions. Such communities therefore value highly the maintenance of their natural resources especially water because these support their livestock and wildlife which are often their main sources of livelihood.

2.2 The determinant factors for the performance of community projects

The determinant factors for the performance of rural water supply systems are categorized in to two main categories. These are pre implementation factors and post implementation factors. Community participation, technology selection, site selection, demand responsiveness, construction quality, population and training are some of the pre-implementation factors. Post implementation factors are technical support, community satisfaction, institutional and financial management, training and willingness to sustain the water project (UNDP-WSP, 2006). One of the pre implementation factors for rural water supply systems is demand responsive approach. In this context 'demand' is defined as the quantity and quality of water, which community members will choose to consume at a given price (Gizachew, 2005). In a demand responsive approach, beneficiaries should feel the need for safe drinking water supply in order to identify safe drinking water supply projects.

Water projects are more or less demand responsive to the degree that beneficiaries make choices and commit their resources in support of their choices (Gebrehiwot, 2006). If there is willingness in the community to provide valued resources in the exchange for services then these community members value the service and as a result demand for supply of water will facilitate the management of the water project enhancing the rate of performance of the project (Gizachew, 2005). Project performance can be measured and evaluated using a large number of performance indicators that could be related to various dimensions (groups) such as time, cost, quality, client satisfaction, client changes, business performance, health and safety (Cheung *et al.* 2004). Time, cost and quality are however the three predominant performance evaluation dimensions. Community projects are important in development of an area because they have several advantages. Some of the advantages include funds being spent entirely on the projects, rather than maintaining administrative bureaucracies; projects are conducted at the request of the community with full community participation and ownership whereby community-driven projects are effectively operated, maintained and utilized. The projects foster local and regional capacity to provide basic infrastructure and services, build indigenous expertise, and develop local and regional governance capacity thus facilitating in the long term more democratic, decentralized, participatory governance; the projects reduce aid dependency and learn how to make sacrifices; community water projects conducted by local communities and indigenous NGOs foster rather than undercut governmental capacity and legitimacy. Participatory development is the most important approach towards enabling communities to help themselves and sustain efforts in development work. Communities are no longer seen as recipients of development programmes but rather they have become critical stakeholders who have an important role to play in the management of programmes and projects in their areas.

Community stakeholders are community-based mechanisms that can help support and sustain a programme or project. For example, in implementing education projects, the mechanism can be the school governing council or the parents, teachers and community association (NGO Management School Switzerland, 2014). Water is scarce and therefore not all people live next to water sources creating a need to bring the water closer to their places of habitation. This leads to formation of community water projects since individuals cannot afford. Successful performance is so much dependent on involvement of communities from initiation, through implementation to project closure. Engaging them will ensure that the project responds to local needs utilizing local resources. This will also help understand the community context which will help determine the

characteristics of the community and work out where organizers interests intersect with the needs of the local community (DIY, 2015).

2.2.1 Governance structure and the performance of community projects

Governance structure refers to the body with the power to make and/or enforce laws to control land area, people or project. Which include, planning personnel to execute administrative procedures, risk management, conflict management and reporting. Governance is a procedure of accomplishing a hierarchical objective through composed execution of five particular capacity adopted in American is arranging, organization, staffing, coordinating and controlling; this meets the governance threshold which influences the outcome of a project (Schwartz, 2002). According to Kioko, (2010) these water projects in Britain provide feasible outcomes; Project engineers should ensure availability of finances to reinforce the recognized responses for the issues in long haul. The productive wander pioneers should have the going with capacities and abilities: flexibility and adaptability, slant for basic movement, forcefulness, sureness, impact, verbal commonality, yearning, imaginative vitality, sudden ness, prepared to alter particular courses of action with phase, budget, and human components, efficient and restraint, a generalist as opposed to an authority, competent and willing to submit to a vast part of his or her a chance to organizing and controlling, prepared to perceive issues, willing to choose, prepared to keep up a genuine change being utilized of time for best performance (Turner & Müller, 2005).

For community administration frameworks to be maintainable, they require post development bolster from a directing establishment to give technical assistance, training, monitoring, motivation and encouragement on water projects (Harvey & Reed, 2007). According to Fielmua (2011), in a study conducted in Ghana, community ownership does not imply that the community 14 won't get bolster from outer sources. Support might be gotten from the legislature or different offices as sponsorships and specialized support. Administration engages communities through bona fide organization to advocate for water administrations. Communities can effectively take an interest in the entire procedure of securing and operation of the offices. This suggests communities need to choose water administration boards of trustees that will be responsible for the administration of water facilities. The communities are in charge of all operation and support cost of the offices. This infers the maintainability of the offices lay on the community. Okungu (2008), takes note of that 70% of the appointive voting demographics have brought up negligence, false and poor utilize and that Constituency Development Fund (CDF). The reserve has no specific change inspiration; in this way, it rises as a political gadget (Gikonyo, 2008).

As showed by the Electoral Commission of Kenya, 60% of legislators who had billions of CDF unspent finances in the CDF financial kitty, had incomplete projects and poor undertakings and were voted out, which warns the M.Ps to deal with the kitty honestly, or face the ferocity of the electorate in 2012 (Radoli, 2008). Along these lines, MPs'' execution can be judged in context of their flourishing or deficiency in managing the kitty. Project leaders have no impact over who their project support is. Supports either self-select, or they are picked due to their position in the organization. On the off chance that you realize that your project support needs energy for the project, or if the support doesn't prefer to state no to individuals who continue attempting to extend the project scope, then the leaders should makes sure that they adjust this with harder or more drew in guiding community individuals to ensure the project objective is met (Bunnet, 2009). Governance refers to the leadership and direction of the community. The governance structure on projects enables leaders to articulate and maintaining the community's vision and mission which is shared by all the community members in all aspect of the organizational activities. This is

achieved when the community members work together with the management to articulate issues for the success of the project.

2.2.2 Training and the performance of community projects

Training of Community Jackson (2013), assert that the capacity to partake cannot be guaranteed merely by the right to do so: the means to get involved is also necessary. Practical participation requires both the right and the means. The residents themselves often do not even know where to begin when it comes to participation (Gómez-Navarroet *et al*., 2013). Effective project managers carry out projects through the project team and all stakeholders with a balance of technical, interpersonal and conceptual skills. Jackson (2013), refers to 425,000 members with PMI certificates in 2008 as project managers in over 170 countries and the Guide being one of twelve wellknown worldwide standards. She points out that not until in the fourth edition of 2008 was the emphasis of interpersonal skills brought forward, in appendix G in PMBOK. Because of dynamic organizations, and the people who work in them, the awareness is increasing around the world of interpersonal skills being important elements in successful project management. This acknowledgement of interpersonal skills in one of the most widespread guides for project managers and indicates more significance of interpersonal skills importance than before (Collins & Clark, 2013).

Moreover, that even where full community investment or administration is arranged from the begin, community level panels and Human limit improvement through specific preparing of project pioneers, community individuals and the entire project community has been noted to be crucial for wander accomplishment and reasonability. Campos (2008), in an arbitration demonstration exhibited in Peru deliberated on community readiness as a fundamental part in which the project utilized different techniques for preparing, for example, sound visuals. Mwangi (2012), noted in their review on supportability of drinking water supply connects in the Area of North Gondar, Ethiopia prescribe that building sufficient aptitudes and ability to keep up water sources is a key part to manage the water framework.

2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation

Participation of all the segments of the community in project implementation is one way through which communities own and contribute towards their development. The study established that it is mainly women followed by men, community groups' members, administrative leaders, local elites, opinion leaders and youth respectively who get involved in implementation of projects. It can therefore be deduced that in the community driven development approach, it is mainly women who are involved in the implementation stage, just like in conventional approaches where it is mainly women who implement projects through provision of manual labour, paid or voluntary and trainings (Stein & Valters, 2012). All beneficiary community members should be involved in project monitoring since it is a crucial stage which entails taking stock of development inputs and processes as a right and a responsibility for all development stakeholders and constituents.

The study found out that it is community groups' members followed by men, women, administrative leaders, opinion leaders, youth and local elites who were involved in project monitoring activities. This means that in the community driven development approach, all beneficiaries are not necessarily involved in project monitoring (Stein & Valters, 2012). Monitoring and evaluation can make essential contributions to impact evaluation (Taplin, Clark, Collins, & Colby, 2013). Indeed, meaningful impact evaluation is not possible without significant support from an organization's regular M&E activities. While the scope of this note is too focused

to discuss the nature and diversity of monitoring and evaluation, it is important to recognize some significant differences between "monitoring" and "evaluation," which make different contributions to impact evaluation. Thus, it is helpful to consider some basic characteristics, including differences and opportunities for complementarities, before identifying more specifically how "M&E" can contribute to impact evaluation (Bacharova, Mozos & Palkovicova, 2011).

2.3.1 The concept of implementation of M&E in water projects

Monitoring is the routine collection, analysis and use of information about ongoing development intervention (OECD, 2012). It furnishes information on the extent of progress and achievement by informing the stakeholders whether the project team is doing things right. It gives the project team a clear picture of changes that have occurred during the project implementation which enables them to formulate appropriate action plan to responds to the unfolding situation. it covers activities, outputs, use of funds, indications on achievement of the objectives and unexpected effects or changes in the environment of the project. Thus, monitoring provides continuous snapshots of realities in the life of a project meant to enhance program success. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of the achievement of an ongoing or completed project (OECD, 2012). It informs the project team if they are doing the right thing. Evaluation encompasses the rationale, design, implementation and results of the intervention. Thus, evaluation considers the general framework, structure, process as well as the result of the intervention (Leviton, 2003). It aims at continually improving the success of the project based on effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability.

The M&E activities are reflective processes aimed at learning from the experience which involve observation and collection of information, reflection, and decision making regarding new action to be taken. Meredith, Jack and Mantel, Samuel (2010) noted that the moment program implementation begins it is the monitoring, evaluating and control processes that become the project drivers. However, monitoring differs from evaluation in a number of ways in that monitoring is continuous process with recurrent reflection cycles, while evaluation is periodic and reflection extents longer time intervals. Monitoring focuses on use of funds, activities, and outputs while evaluation appraises outcomes and impacts. Monitoring takes place at each level while evaluation links the lesson learned across the different levels. Moreover, monitoring checks whether the project team is doing things right. On the other hand, evaluation checks whether the project team is doing the right thing.

Monitoring is carried out by the implementation staff while evaluation is a responsibility of the senior management. More so, monitoring is carried out by individuals and organization implementing the program while evaluation is carried out in cooperation with external evaluators or entirely outsourced. In addition, monitoring serves as a basis for evaluation (Meredith et. al., 2010). M&E process offer several benefits to the implementation of programs in that it directs the program by keeping track of progress besides checking whether program progress is being made with regard to pre-established objectives and proposing measures for improvement when called for. It also promotes accountability by providing empirical evidence of the effectiveness of the program as well as assessing the performance of different stakeholders making them accountable to each other and to wider public (Leviton, 2003). It provides the information, in a structured and formalized manner, which allows scrutiny of the use of resources as well as focuses on causes of problems rather than the manifestation of problems thus, facilitate learning by drawing lessons from experience to continuously improve the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and

sustainability of programs. M&E encourages organizational development by engaging all members of the organization in the M&E process and sharing the responsibility for M&E and the lessons learned builds the competencies of the staff (Meredith *et. al.*, 2010).

Ministry of Water Irrigation, (2005-2007) conducted a study on the National water services strategy (NWSS) which was published and was prepared in accordance with section 49 and 50 of the water act 2002. The study found out that sound institutional frameworks to adequately carry out the water sector reforms were not properly functional. There were also improper design programs to carry out water facilities expansion to all areas in Kenya. There was no proper national monitoring and evaluation mechanisms on water service deliveries and no well documented investment programs in the water sector to carry out water reforms effectively. The study recommended that there is need for a well-structured and design programs as well as M&E systems to bring about the progressive extensive of water supply infrastructure to all the Kenya people.

2.3.2 Stakeholder involvement and implementation of M&E in water projects

Davies (1998) defines stakeholder as an individual, group of people, organization or institution that will affect or maybe affected by the project. The stakeholders include the community-men, women and youth; project field staff, program managers, donors, government and other decision makers, supporters, critics, government and civil societies. IFAD (2002) concluded that stakeholder involvement means more than just beneficiary contribution to the project execution; rather, it should encompass all stakeholders and be formalized at all stages of the project cycle. This underpins just how stakeholder involvement is important to M&E phase of the project. Thus, participatory M&E is core to ensure program success. IFAD (2002) noted that this is achieved by providing key stakeholders with the information needed to guide the project strategy towards achieving the goal and objectives; provide early warning of problematic activities and processes that need corrective action; help empower primary stakeholders by creating opportunities for them to reflect critically on the projects direction and help decide on the improvements; build understanding and capacity amongst those involved in the project; motivate and stimulate learning amongst those committed to making the project a success and assess progress and so enable accountability requirements to be met. IFAD (2002) continues to recognize the role of stakeholders that they provide invaluable insights on priorities and appropriate processes during the design, planning, implementation, and M&E phases of the projects. All these guarantee local ownership of the project and thus the likelihood of a sustained impact.

Community-based development and its more recent variant, community-driven development are among the fastest growing mechanisms for channeling development assistance. Community-based development is an umbrella term for projects that actively include beneficiaries in their design and management, while community-driven development refers to community-based development projects in which communities have direct control over key project decisions, including management of investment funds (Jackson, 2013). Many critics note that evidence on community-driven development initiatives lags well behind the rate at which projects are being implemented and scaled up. However, the diversity of views and the intensity of their expression make a review of the available evidence both necessary and timely. Because of the considerable overlap between community-based and community-driven development projects, evaluation evidence is reviewed for any project with community participations as a crucial element of its design. Using this broader definition, there is enough credible research to glean some useful insights about specific facets of these programs (Stein & Valters, 2012).

Mushori (2015) carried out a study on the determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation of county government funded infrastructural development projects in Nakuru East constituency, Nakuru County and found out stakeholder's participation has significant influence on the effective M&E implementation. This conclusion was informed by the large proportion of respondents who felt that stakeholder's participation in the implementation of M&E activities enhance the program success. However, he noted that only a third of the respondents were involved in the implementation of M&E activities implying that only a handful of the stakeholders are involved in the M&E implementation activities.

A study by Murungi (2015) on influence of project management practices on implementation of donor funded education projects in Kajiado County revealed that the key stakeholders in the project are important to project success. Thus, effective implementation of M&E activities require active participation of the stakeholders involved. The study noted that stakeholder's involvement promote project ownership and sustainability especially when they are involved throughout the life cycle of the project. The study recommended that stakeholders need to be engaged in the formulation and implementation processes, paying attention to their needs to ensure their maximum participation in the project. Donaldson and Lipesy (2003) added that engaging stakeholders in discussions about the what, how and why of program activities often empowers them and additionally, promotes inclusion and facilitates meaningful participation by diverse stakeholder's groups.

Chitere and Ireri (2004) averred that stakeholder participation means empowering the stakeholders especially beneficiaries in terms of resources and needs identification, planning on the use of resources and the actual implementation of development initiatives. Proudlock, Ramalingam and Sandison (2009) found out that the involvement of stakeholders' involvement can greatly improve the implementation of M&E activities which improve program performance. They further affirmed that stakeholder involvement improves ownership of the program. They noted that the beneficiaries are in charge of their development and the best judges of their own situation. They concluded that failure to involve stakeholders is a recipe for poor performance of programs. However, Patton (2008) cautioned that stakeholder involvement needs to be managed with care because too much stakeholder involvement could lead to undue influence on the evaluation, and too little could lead to evaluators dominate the process which results into poor implementation of M&E activities. They asserted that at whatever level the program is implemented, M&E results into successful implementation of the programs. However, cautioned that M&E process must be participatory to reflect the community needs and stimulate people's interest in its implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

According to the World Bank (2000) community-based projects in the African region have performed better than the region's projects. However, only one in five of the community–based development projects were likely to be sustainable. The World Bank's Community–Driven Development (CDD) team for Africa initiated a project in selected villages in Africa to help them sustain the results of their community development project. The premise being stakeholders" involvement fosters program ownership as they develop their own tools and resources which results in program success and limits reliance on external assistance. The report indicates that a simple community M&E framework enhanced the sustainability of community sub–projects. This reinforces the connections between the implementation of community development activities, monitoring of these activities, evaluation of community development, and re–adjustment of the local development indicators, to better suit community development needs.

2.3.3 Resource availability and implementation of M&E in water projects

The project budget should have allocation for monitoring and evaluation activities. Gyorkos (2003) and McCoy (2005) noted that the M&E budget can be specified within the overall project budget so as to give the monitoring and evaluation phase the due significance it has within the project management spectrum. Kelly and Magongo (2004) stress that monitoring and evaluation budget should be between 5 to 10 percent of the total budget. The Program Evaluation Standards also indicates that, evaluation budget could certainly be more carefully estimated and actual expenditure on the evaluation more carefully monitored.

The donors have mounted pressure for the inclusion of M&E budget before proposals approval in the recent times however, implementing agencies put little or no emphasis at all towards M&E and most of them try to resist having structures that can support M&E in their organizations. Mushori (2015) carried out a study on the determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation of county government funded infrastructural development projects in Nakuru East constituency, Nakuru County and found out that the budgetary allocation for M&E has significant influence on how M&E activities are implemented. He further noted that most projects were threatened by the low financial resources allocated to them concluding that management seemed to have closed their eyes on the significance of M&E to a project success.

2.3.4 Technical expertise and implementation of M&E in water projects

Vanessa and Gala (2011) noted that technical capacity of the organization in conducting evaluations and level of participation of its personnel influence the implementation of M&E greatly in that it determines decision making and how the evaluation's lessons are produced, communicated and perceived. Thus, having resourceful personnel is critical for the sustainability of the M&E system. This demands that the growing evaluators be technically equipped through M&E training and development. This affirms that both formal training and on-the-job experience are important in developing evaluators for effective implementation of M&E activities. Gladys, Katia, Lycia, and Helena (2010) reinforces that two key competencies for evaluators are cognitive capacity and communication skills. They further noted that program and senior managers also need technical training on M&E so as to trust and use M&E information and more specifically to encourage result-based culture within organizations (Gladys, *et. al*., 2010).

Mushori (2015) carried out a study on the determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation of county government funded infrastructural development projects in Nakuru East constituency, Nakuru County and found out that technical expertise of the staff influence the implementation of monitoring and evaluation. He noted that the technical team has technical skills and they pass the same to other stakeholders through participatory approach to M&E activities. He further recommended that capacity building needs to be done to enhance effectiveness of M&E. Mibey (2011) study on factors affecting implementation of monitoring and evaluation programs in kazi kwa kijana project, recommends that capacity building should be added as a major component of the project across the country (Kenya), and this calls for enhanced investment in training and human resource development in the crucial technical area of monitoring and evaluation. A study by Mulandi (2013) on factors influencing performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of non-governmental organizations in governance in Nairobi County found out that technical expertise has significant influence on the implementation of M&E activities. The study further observed that the programme officers working in these NGOs had received the necessary training in monitoring and evaluation either formally or through in-service training besides having several

years of experience working with monitoring and evaluation systems. This augment the argument by Acevedo *et al.* (2010) that both formal training and on the job experience are important in developing evaluators.

A study by Wachamba (2013) on the determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation systems in non-governmental organizations within Nairobi County showed that technical expertise of the staff is crucial factor in the implementation of M&E activities. The study further revealed that quite a number of the NGOs lacked competent M&E officers to carry out the monitoring and evaluation phase of the project. Due to lack of enough competent M&E officers, the NGOs registered poor implementation of M&E activities with little to show for the program success. The study recommended that a professional association of M&E experts be started in order to develop and improve the quality and quantity of local M&E experts since the success of M&E depends on the competence of M&E officers.

2.3.5 Appropriate M&E tools and guidelines and implementation of M&E in water projects

For effective implementation of M&E activities, there is a framework that gives detailed guidelines on how to use various M&E tools. A framework is an essential guide to monitoring and evaluation as it explains how the project should work by laying the steps needed to achieve the desired results. A framework therefore increases the understanding of the project goals and objective by defining the relationships between factors key to implementation, as well as articulating the internal and external elements that could affect the project's success (Kerzner, 2003). A good M&E framework can assist with ideas through the project strategies and objectives on whether they are ideal and most appropriate to implement (Ending Violence 24 against Women and Girls Programming Essentials 2, 2013).

The M&E framework should also include details on budgeting and allocation of technical expertise, as well as inform donors and project management on the its implementation (Guijt *et al.*, 2002). M&E systems use different tools and approaches, some of which are either complementary or substitute to each other, while others are either broad or narrow (World Bank, 2002). An evaluator however may choose to use a combination of methods and sources of information in order to cross-validate data (Nabris, 2002). The M&E system tools include performance indicators, logical framework approach, theory-based evaluation, formal surveys, rapid appraisal methods, participatory methods, public expenditure tracking surveys, impact evaluation, cost benefit and cost effectiveness analysis. The selection of these tools however depend on the information needed, stakeholders and the cost involved (World Bank, 2002).

A study by Wachamba (2013) on the determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation systems in non-governmental organizations within Nairobi County showed that the selection of tools and techniques to be used in an M&E system determines its success or failure. The study also showed that NGOs used different tools and techniques in their M&E systems which included logical framework, participatory approaches, evaluation surveys, site visits and strategic planning frameworks. The study further showed that the tools and techniques greatly influence the implementation of M&E activities. However, a number of the NGOs did not use those tools and techniques explaining the poor implementation of M&E activities of various projects implemented by such NGOs. There is therefore a need to have consensus with all stakeholders on the kind of tools and techniques to be applied. The selection of tools and techniques also depends on information needed and available finances (World Bank, 2002). Mathis *et al.,* (2001) showed that employing the recognized standards and practices by linking M&E to strategic plans and work

plans, focusing on efficiency and cost effectiveness, employing a participatory approach to monitoring and evaluation progress, utilizing both international and local expertise, disseminating results widely, using data from multiple sources, and facilitating the use of data for program improvement improve program success through effective implementation of M&E activities. This is because the M&E system that are set based on best practices promote evidence-based decision-making and public confidence.

A case study conducted by Khatiala (2013) on the influence of monitoring & evaluation tools and techniques on project delivery capability of HIV/AIDS interventions in Nairobi and Nyanza regions showed that monitoring and evaluation tools enhance project completion and success. The study recognized the importance of M&E protocols by highlighting the need to heighten the training of M&E officers as well as creating awareness on Monitoring and Evaluation processes and procedures, enforcing of the existing structures, documentation of lessons learned and the tailoring of Monitoring and Evaluation solutions to the local setting. The study concluded by suggesting further studies on other M&E tools as well as other sectors of the economy.

2.4 Governing Policies and Performance of Community Development Projects

Community development projects are governed by different policies from different governing bodies including the donor agencies, the government of the land, and the project management committees including those at the community level. These policies place different demands on the project (Muller, 2009). The World Bank as a donor agency has developed policies that govern its projects and activities; these are termed as operational policies designed to ensure that the projects are economically, financially socially and environmentally sound. These policies include policies on business products and instruments that provide rules for the bank products, policies on safeguarding the environment while establishing and undertaking the projects, fiduciary policies which provide rules for governing financial management, procurement and disbursement and management policies covering areas on project monitoring and evaluation. These policies were put in place to ensure that all World Bank projects in different locations maintain a positive progress without causing harm to the surroundings. This has however been varied in different countries owing to the difference in the government policies.

The inability to implement policies or plans is widely recognized as a major weakness of contemporary planning in developing countries. Usman, Kamau & Mireri (2014) reported that government policies and procedures in Nigeria put in place to guide in the national development initiatives have not been effectively implemented. This has been characterized by delays by government officials to undertake their duties. Projects have therefore succumbed to lack of achievement of set objectives and goals. This in turn results to lack of confidence by the donor agencies in the event that it's a donor funded project since they operate in specific time allocations. Performance of these development projects is also challenged as the project schedule is halted by the government delays.

In Kenya, the Non-Governmental Organizations Co-ordination Board does not only register the national and international NGOs but is also in charge of providing policy guidelines in their operation in Kenya in order to harmonize their activities to the national development plan of Kenya. Some of the guiding policies include; must be transparent and accountable to its donors, the Government and its beneficiaries, in its use of resources, must be willing to share relevant activity-related reports with the Government, other relevant organizations, beneficiaries and other interested parties (NGOs Co-ordination Board, 2016). The development of these guiding principles

without the contribution of the people they are meant to guide may pose a challenge when development practitioners or even the community find gaps when adopting them in the community development initiatives (Binswanger, Jacomina, Spector & Bank, 2010).

3.0 Performance of community Development project

Performance of community development Performance is a multi-dimensional concept. On the most basic level, James (2011) distinguishes between task and contextual performance. Task performance refers to an individual's proficiency with which he or she performs activities which contribute to the organization's 'technical core'. This contribution can be both direct (e.g., in the case of production workers), or indirect (e.g., in the case of managers or staff personnel). Contextual performance refers to activities which do not contribute to the technical core but which support the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which organizational goals are pursued. Contextual performance includes not only behaviors such as helping coworkers or being a reliable member of the organization, but also making suggestions about how to improve work procedures. Three basic assumptions are associated with the differentiation between task and contextual performance (Coryn, Noakes, Westine, & Schröter, 2011).

Activities relevant for task performance vary between jobs whereas contextual performance activities are relatively similar across jobs; task performance is related to ability, whereas contextual performance is related to personality and motivation; task performance is more prescribed and constitutes in-role behavior, whereas contextual performance is more discretionary and extra-role (Barnett & Gregorowski, 2013). Individual performance is not stable over time. Variability in an individual's performance over time reflects (1) learning processes and other long-term changes and (2) temporary cha initially increases with increasing time spent in a specific job and later reaches a plateau (Chris *et.al.,* 2011). Moreover, the processes underlying performance change over time. During early phases of skill acquisition, performance relies largely on 'controlled processing', the availability of declarative knowledge and the optimal allocation of limited attentional resources, whereas later in the skill acquisition process, performance largely relies on automatic processing, procedural knowledge, and psychomotor abilities.

4.0 Conclusion

The provision of safe and adequate drinking water to rural communities is a basic necessity. It is obvious from the results of this study that water projects are facing a number of challenges. However, projects members and the government should show serious attention and commitment for the success of water projects. Therefore, governments should address the major issues constraining the proper implementation of the water projects in the area in order to improve performance in the community water projects. Specifically, the government must create the desired awareness on how the water projects can be successful by use of personnel who have done research on water projects. The more rural people are involved in addressing their own development, the more confidence and successful level associated with their water projects. For the successful performance of the community water projects these recommendations should be observed; Emphasis on community effective participation in the development and management of a community water projects is a sure sign that the project has a bright chance of functioning optimally on a sustainable basis. Project leaders and members should be trained on effective use of water taps to reduce the loss in quantity or quality of water as it flows from its source through water projects pipes for use to eventual disposal. Leaders to increasing the ability of the water system to continue to serve society during times when water is limited like use bole hole and solar

system to pump water to the main tank connected with projects pipes. Managing of water projects through monitoring and controlling the quantity or improving the quality of water needed in accomplishing a particular task. Shifting the time of use from peak hours to off peak periods to make water more equitable: Because of less water in river during dry seasons.

References

Acevedo, G. L., Rivera, K., Lima, L, & Hwang, H. (Eds.). (2010). Challenges in monitoring and evaluation: An opportunity to institutionalize M &E systems. Fifth conference of the Latin America and the Caribbean Monitoring and Evaluation Network. Washington DC, World Bank.

Bacharova, L., Mozos, I., & Palkovicova, L. (2011). Building the international network of mentors and young scientists: *The international Scientific Summer School in Romania 2011*/Genç bilim adamlari ve yöneticilerinin uluslararasi aginin kurulmasi: Uluslararasi Bilimsel Yaz Okulu, Romanya, 2011. *Anadulu Kardiyoloji Dergisi: AKD*, *11*(6), 568.

Barnett, C., & Gregorowski, R. (2013). Learning about theories of change for the monitoring and evaluation of research uptake.

Binswanger, H. P., Jacomina, R. P., Spector, S., & Bank, W. (2010). *Local and Community Driven Development: Moving to Scale in Theory and Practice.* Washington D.C: New fronntiers of social policy.

Bunnet, W. (2009). *Principles and Practice of Marketing*, 2nd Edition Jennifer Pegg Cambridge, USA

Campos, M. (2008). *Making sustainable water and sanitation in the Peruvian Andes*: An Intervention Model. Journal of Water and Health 6 (1) 2008.

Cheung, O. Suen, H. Cheung, K. (2004). PPMS: a Web-based construction project performance monitoring system, *Automation in Construction* 13: 361–376

Chikozho, C. & Latham, C. J. K. (2005). *Implications of customary law for implementing integrated water resources management in Zimbabwe: Considerations of Shona customary law as an institutional alternative.* Paper presented at the workshop on 'African Water Laws: Plural Legislative Frameworks for Rural Water Management in Africa', Johannesburg, 26–27 January.

Chitere, O.P & Ireri, O.N (2004). District Focus for Rural Development in Kenya: It's Limitations as a Decentralization and participatory planning strategy and prospects for the future. Nairobi: *Institute for Policy Analysis and Research.*

Coryn, C. L., Noakes, L. A., Westine, C. D., & Schröter, D. C. (2011). A systematic review of theory-driven evaluation practice from 1990 to 2009. *American journal of Evaluation*, *32*(2), 199-226.

Diy, A. (2015). A Guide to Engaging the Community in Your Project. Toronto: Artscape DIY.

Donaldson, S. I., & Lipsey, M. W. (2006). Roles for theory in contemporary evaluation practice: Developing practical knowledge. *The handbook of evaluation: Policies, programs, and practices*, 56-75.

Ending Violence against Women and Girls Programming Essentials 2. (2013). Retrieved from: http://www.endvawnow.org/uploads/modules/pdf/1360104822.pdf

Fielmua, N. (2011). The role of the community ownership and management strategy towards sustainable access to water in Ghana: A case of Nadowli district. *Journal for sustainable development* Vol4, No.3

Gebrehiwot, M. (2006). An Assessment of Challenges of Sustainable Rural Water Supply: The Case of OflaWoreda in Tigray Region. Msc Thesis, Regional and Local Development Study (RLDS). A.A.U. Ethiopia.

Gizachew, G. (2005) *Innovation*: The Attacker's Advantage. New York, NY; Summit Books.

Gladys, L. A., Katia, R., Lycia, L. & Helena, H. (2010). Challenges in Monitoring and Evaluation: An Opportunity to Institutionalize M&E Systems

GoK. (2009). *Kenya National Environment Action Plan (2009-2013). National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources (MEMR), Government of Kenya (GoK), Nairobi*

Gómez-Navarro Tomás, Baviera-Puig Amparo, García-Martínez, Gabriel, (2013). *Assessing the Corporate Social Responsibility Reports Based on Communication Indicators*: An ANP Aproach, XII International Symposium on the Analytic Hierarchy Process. Kuala Lumpur. Malasia.

Guijt, I., Randwijk and Woodhill, J. (2002). A Guide for project M&E: Managing for Impact in Rural Development. International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD), Office of Evaluation and Studies (OE)

Gyorkos, T. (2003). Monitoring and Evaluation of large scale Helminth control programs. *Acta Tropic*, 86(2): 275-282

Hakacova, N., Baysan, O., & Bell, S. J. (2010). Problem-oriented education and cross-cultural collaboration: experiences and comments on the Scientific Summer School in Turkey 2010/Probleme-dayali egitim ve kulturler-arasi isbirligi: Turkiye-2010 Bilimsel Yaz Okulundaki deneyim ve yorumlar. *The Anatolian Journal of Cardiology (Anadolu Kardiyoloji Dergisi)*, *10*(4), 387-389.

Harvey, P.A. and Reed, R.A. (2007). Community-Managed Water Supplies in Africa: Sustainable or Dispensable?' *Community Development Journal* 42(3): 365.

IFAD. (2002). *Practical Guide on Monitoring and Evaluation of Rural Development Projects*. Rome.

Jackson, E. T. (2013). Evaluating social impact bonds: questions, challenges, innovations, and possibilities in measuring outcomes in impact investing. *Community Development*, *44*(5), 608-616.

Jackson, E. T. (2013). Interrogating the theory of change: evaluating impact investing where it matters most. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, *3*(2), 95-110.

Jameel, A.L., (2009). Community Participation, Poverty Action Lab www.povertyactionlab.org/policy-lessons, Retrieved *on 19.03.2014*

James, C. (2011). *Theory of change review*. A report commissioned by Comic Relief. Comic Relief.

Keen. J. J. (2007). Methods of initiating community participation in water supply and sanitation programs

Kelly & Magongo, (2004). Factors Affecting The Effectiveness Of Monitoring And Evaluation Of Constituency Development Fund Projects in Changamwe Constituency, Kenya. *Unpublished.*

Kerzner, H. (2003). *Project Management*: *A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling (8th Ed.)*. Wiley.

Khatiala, P. (2012). The influence of monitoring & evaluation tools and techniques on project delivery capability: a case of HIV/AIDS interventions in Nairobi and Nyanza regions, Kenya (*Unpublished master's thesis*). University of Nairobi, Kenya

Kioko, J., (2010). *Project Management; Monitoring and Evaluation*. Richmond Designers and Printers

Knapke, J. M., Tsevat, J., Succop, P. A., Djawe, K., Kuhnell, P., & Haynes, E. N. (2013). Publication track records as a metric of clinical research training effectiveness. *Clinical and translational science*, *6*(6), 458-462.

Leviton, L. C. (2003). Evaluation use: Advances, challenges and applications. *American Journal of Evaluation, 24*(4), 525–535.

Mathias J., Senelet P., Topcuoglu E., Kose R. and Tsui A. (2001). Best Practices in Monitoring and Evaluation: Lessons from the USAID Turkey Population Program. *USAID*

Mayberry, J. F. (2013). The development of medical education in Eastern Europe during the 20th century and the emergence of 'English parallel'courses. *Scottish medical journal*, *58*(1), 46-52.

McHugh, O., & Hogan, M. (2011). Investigating the rationale for adopting an internationally-recognised project management methodology in Ireland: The view of the project manager. *International Journal of Project Management*, *29*(5), 637-646.

Meredith, Jack R., & Mantel, Samuel J. (2010). *Project Management: A Managerial Approach* (7 Ed.). New York: John Wiley.

Mibey, H. K. (2011). Factors affecting Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation Programs in Kazi kwa Vijana Project by government ministries in Kakamega Central District, Kenya. *Unpublished master's thesis*. University of Nairobi, Kenya.

Mogaka, H., Gichere, S., Davis, R., & Hirji, R. (2005). *Climate variability and water resources degradation in Kenya: improving water resources development and management*. The World Bank.

Mulandi, N. M. (2013). Factors influencing performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of non-governmental organizations in governance: a case of Nairobi, Kenya. *University of Nairobi*.

Müller, R. (2009). *Project Governance (Fundamentals of project management)*. Ashgate Publishing Group.

Murungi, M. N. (2015). *Influence of project management practices on implementation of donor funded education projects in Kajiado County, Kenya*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nairobi.

Mushori, J. (2015). Determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation of county government funded infrastructural development projects, Nakuru East Constituency, Nakuru County, Kenya. *Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nairobi.*

Mushtaq A. M. (2004). *Community participation in water supply and sanitation schemes around Hyderabad, Pakistan.*

Mwangi. (2012). Influence of Financial Management on the Sustainability of Community Managed Water Supply Projects in Kieni West District, Nyeri County, Kenya*: Unpublished Thesis of the University of Nairobi*.

Nabris, K. (2002). Monitoring and Evaluation. Palestinian Academic Society for the Study of International Affairs (PASSIA)

NEMA. (2011). *Kenya: State of the Environment and Outlook 2010*. NEMA: Nairobi.

NGO Management School Switzerland (2014). Community Participation in Development Projects Enabling Communities to Participate Effectively in Development Work. Available on: http://ngomanager.org/ngoms/course-programme/community-participation-in-development-projects-5- days/. Accessed on 25.07.2015

NGOs Co-ordination Board. (2016, January 22). *NGOs Co-ordination Board*. Retrieved January 22, 2016, from NGO Bureau: http://www.ngobureau.or.ke/

OECD. (2012). *Performance Management in Government: Performance Management and Results Oriented Management*. Occasional Paper Number 12

Okungu, J, (2008), The beauty and shame of Kenya's Constituency Development Fund. [Online]Available:http:/www.afroarticles.com/articledashboardarticle.php?id=637&act=print.

Patton, M. Q. (2008) 'State of the Art in Measuring Development Assistance'. Address to the World Bank Independent Evaluation Group, 10 April, Washington, DC

Pérez-Gladish, B., Benson, K., & Faff, R. (2012). Profiling socially responsible investors: Australian evidence. *Australian Journal of Management*, *37*(2), 189-209.

Proudlock, K. and Ramalingam, B. with Sandison, P. (2009) 'Improving humanitarian impact evaluation: Bridging theory and practice' in ALNAP (ed.), ALNAP 8th Review of Humanitarian Action: Performance, Impact and Innovation. London: Overseas Development Institute

Quinn Patton, M., & Patrizi, P. A. (2010). Strategy as the focus for evaluation. *New directions for evaluation*, *2010*(128), 5-28.

Radoli, M. (2008). "CDF- A double-edged sword." The CDF Insight. Nairobi, Kenya.

Schwartz, R. (2002). Organization of Projects, 2nd Edition, *Gretonleer Publishers*. Sydney, Australia

Stein, D., & Valters, C. (2012). Understanding theory of change in international development.

Taplin, D. H., Clark, H., Collins, E., & Colby, D. C. (2013). Theory of change. *Technical Papers: A Series of Papers to Support Development of Theories of Change Based on Practice in the Field. Available online: http://www. acknowledge. org/resources/documents/ToC-Tech-Papers. pdf (accessed on 27 October 2016).*

Turner, J.R. & Müller, R. (2005). The project manager's leadership style as a success factor on projects: a literature review. *Project management journal.*36 (1). pp. 49-61.

Usman, N. D., Kamau, P. K., & Mireri, C. (2014). The impact of Policy and Procedural Framework on Project Perfomance Within the Building Industry in Abuja Nigeria. *International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT), Vol 3 Issue 5*, 2086-2091.

Vanesa, W. & Gala, D. (2011). Sound Expectations: From Impact Evaluations to Policy Change. Center for the Implementation of Public Policies Promoting Equity and Growth (CIPPEC)

Wachamba, E. W. (2013). *Determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation Systems in non-governmental organizations within Nairobi County, Kenya*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Kenyatta University

World Bank (2000). *Key Performance Indicator Handbook.* Washington, D.C.

World Bank (2002). Monitoring & Evaluation: some tools, methods and approaches. *The World Bank*, Washington, D.C.