ASSESSMENT OF CHALLENGES IN MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION IN MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FOREST AND CLIMATE CHANGE

BELAYNEH MELAK ALEMU

A RESEARCH PROJECT REPORT SUBMITTED TO ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS SCHOOL OF COMMERCE IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTERS DEGREE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT

2018

Addis Ababa

ASSESSMENT OF CHALLENGES IN MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION IN MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FOREST AND CLIMATE CHANGE

BY: BELAYNEH MELAK ALEMU

(STUDENT ID: GSD/4544/08)

ADVISOR: SOLOMON MARKOS (PhD)

A RESEARCH PROJECT REPORT SUBMITTED TO ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS SCHOOL OF COMMERCE IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTERS DEGREE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT

2018

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

MASTER OF ARTS IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT

ASSESSMENT OF CHALLENGES IN MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION IN MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FOREST AND CLIMATE CHANGE

BY: BELAYNEH MELAK ALEMU

Approved By Board of Examiners

External Examiner Signature_____Date_____

Internal Examiner Signature_____Date_____

Advisor Signature_____Date_____

DECLARATION

I declare that this Research Project Report entitled **''ASSESSMENT OF CHALLENGES IN MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION IN MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FOREST AND CLIMATE CHANGE''** is entirely my original work and has not been presented for academic award in this or any other University.

SIGNATURE: ……..…… DATE: ……..…….

BELAYNEH MELAK ALEMU

Reg.No. GSD/4544/08)

CERTIFICATION

This Research Project Report has been submitted for examination as with my approval as the University Supervisor.

SIGNATURE: …… DATE: ……..

SOLOMON MARKOS (PhD)
School of Commerce
College of Business and Economics
Addis Ababa University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank the almighty God for his protection, strength, health and provisions as I undertake this study. I wish to thank my supervisor Dr. Solomon Markos who tirelessly corrected and guided me in the formulation and execution of the whole process of completing this project work. Your suggestions and corrections gave my project report a course that led to it taking a professional form. I am truly grateful.

The success of this project wouldn't have been achieved without the support and contribution I received during the study from Belayneh Kebede at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. Thank you for your unreserved support during my study.

I am lucky beyond any means and forever grateful to my mother and father. It is with your spirit that I go forward every moment. I am honestly indebted. Finally forever remain grateful to my wife Habtam Atinafu Gerawork, it's through your love, patience, motivation, support and understanding made this lifelong dream possible, May God richly bless you.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

CLEAR: Centre for Learning and Evaluation Results

CRGE: Climate Resilient Green Economy

GHG: Green House Gases

IFAD: International Fund for Agricultural Development

M & E: Monitoring & Evaluation

MEFCC: Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change

PATH: Program for Appropriate Technology in Health

RBM: Result Based Management

SPSS: Statistical Package for Social Science

UNDP: United Nations Development Program

USAID: United States Agency for International Development

ABSTRACT

Monitoring and Evaluation is an integral part of project management and different conditions challenge its effective implementation. This study sought to assess challenges of M & E in projects implemented by Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. The objective of the study was to assess project M & E challenges related to budget allocation, top management support, M & E tools and approaches and human capacity. The study adopted a descriptive research design and quantitative research approach. The study targeted a population of 36 employees of Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change and 34 respondents were considered. The study conducted on twelve ongoing projects and three respondents were selected from each project. Due to their small number, a census survey was employed. The study utilized a questionnaire in collecting primary data. A pilot test was undertaken where questionnaires were administered to 5 respondents to assess the reliability and validity of the data instruments. The instrument's validity were determined through the help of expert judgment who assessed the instrument and found out it answered the phenomenon under study. Collected data was sorted, cleaned and coded for data analysis using SPSS statistical package. The findings were analyzed using means, standard deviation, percentages and frequencies then presented using tables. The findings indicated that the organization allocates insufficient funds to M&E activities less than (5-10% of overall projects budget) and did not ensure a separate budget to M & E activities. Funds allocated for M & E were not timely provided and specifically used for M&E activities and the organization did not ensure there is independency in the budgetary decisions for the monitoring and evaluation unit and utilization of the funds. The result of the study revealed that top management gives little commitment to M & E in that M&E activities are not carried out within schedule and did not ensure that staff are trained on M&E regularly. M&E Tools and Methods used by the organization lack measureable objective, baseline, performance indicator, target and periodic reporting tool. Initial baselines were not properly estimated against which progress at the end of the project will be compared. The study discovered that the organization practice inadequate effort on developing employees' skills and abilities on M & E so that they couldn't contribute to the organization to conduct an independent monitoring and evaluation exercise effectively and efficiently.

Key words: Monitoring and Evaluation, Challenges, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change,

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Monitoring and Evaluation of projects is usually one of the ingredients of good project performance. It provides means of accountability, demonstrating transparency to the stakeholders and facilitates organizational learning through documenting lessons learned in implementation of the projects and incorporating the same in the subsequent project planning and implementation or through sharing experience with other implementers (Gyorkos, 2003). Monitoring and Evaluation is about feed-back from implementation (Zwikael, 2008). The goal of M&E is to improve current and future management of outputs, outcomes and impact (UNDP, 2001). The ultimate purpose of Monitoring and Evaluation is change for the better. M&E are powerful management tools that can assist a government and state institutions to improve the manner in which tasks are undertaken to achieve a country's vision and mission (Mthethwa, 2016).

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are essential components of results based management (Charles, 2015). Results-based management (RBM) involves deliberately gathering empirical evidence in order to know the extent to which intended results are being achieved so that modifications to the design and delivery of activities can be made to improve and account for performance in achieving intended outcome. Furthermore, organizations successfully adopting RBM will need to have appropriate systems and procedures in place that collectively constitute an RBM regime (Mayne, 2007).

Project M & E 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 (Fitzgerald, 2009). Time, cost and quality are, however, the predominant performance evaluation dimensions. Another interesting way of evaluating project performance is through common sets of indicators (World Bank, 2004)

However, there are many misconceptions and myths surrounding M&E namely: it's difficult, it's expensive, it requires high level skills, it is time and resource intensive, it only comes at the end of a project and it is someone else's responsibility. There is often a sense of frustration because

expectations of M&E activities appear to outstrip resources and skill sets. This might relate to the context within which M&E is designed, who is responsible for designing the processes and who is responsible for the analysis. Many projects in third world countries fail to be successfully completed due to several reasons. Among these are lack of understanding of the need for monitoring and evaluation (FAOOTIENO, 2012).

According to an IFAD, (2008) annual report on results and impact, recurrent criticisms against M&E systems include: limited scope, complexity, low data quality, inadequate resources, weak institutional capacity, lack of baseline surveys and lack of use. Moreover, the most frequent criticism of M&E systems in IFAD projects relates to the type of information included in the system. Most of the IFAD projects collect and process information on the project activities. However, the average IFAD project did not provide information on results achieved at the purpose or impact level. In the Pakistan IFAD Country Programme Evaluation, cases were reported of contradictory logical frameworks combined with arbitrary and irrelevant indicators while in Belize, two different logical frameworks were generated which increased confusion and complexity. The Ethiopia IFAD Country Programme Evaluation found that project appraisal documents made limited provision for systematic baseline and subsequent beneficiaries surveys. For example in one project in Ethiopia, the baseline survey was carried out 2-3 years after projects start-up (IFAD, 2008) .

In a study report of an Australian NGO conducted by Spooner and Dermott (2008), staff reported that, as ways evolved over time, they were unsure about what works in the current system of monitoring and evaluation. Additionally, resources had not been dedicated to data analysis and the data was rarely analyzed. A further problem found with data analysis was that the responsibility of doing the analysis lay with program managers, who had little time to analyze data that was not required by funding bodies. Some of the staff stated that they are required to collect information and analyze it, but that their analysis is hampered because they have minimal research skills. Finally, some staff reported that there was no feedback loop built into the current system. So, while staff report on their activities to the management, they do not know what happens to the information once it is reported.

The Canadian M&E system has invested heavily in both evaluation and performance monitoring as key tools to support accountability and results-based management. Additionally, the current

state of the M&E system has evolved over time, as the central designers have recognized that the development and implementation of M&E is long term and iterative therefore putting emphasis on the "process" of implementation as an important mechanism in itself in developing an "evaluation culture" or "results culture" in an organization and across the entire system (Lahey, 2009).

The CLEAR (2012) report notes that the M&E mechanism of Benin relies on the national statistics system for measurement and data. The Benin system employees have considerable basic training, but there are not many of them and their knowledge is not regularly updated. Furthermore, access to data and information remains a great challenge, particularly access to data to be collected, but also with regard to data already processed. Finally, the CLEAR report argues that the information gathered through the Benin M&E system is not sufficiently taken into account. In Ghana, after several years of implementing the national M&E system, significant progress has been made (CLEAR, 2012). However, challenges include severe financial constraints; institutional, operational and technical capacity constraints; fragmented and uncoordinated information, particularly at the sector level.

To address these challenges the CLEAR report argues that the current institutional arrangements will have to be reinforced with adequate capacity to support and sustain effective monitoring and evaluation and existing M&E mechanisms must be strengthened, harmonized and effectively coordinated. A review carried out in 2007 reported several problems with Monitoring and Evaluation System. For instance, sector ministry outcomes and outputs, measurable indicators, baselines and targets were not clear. Again, there is no uniformity in evaluation standards within ministries.

Many third world countries have numerous projects in an attempt to improve their infrastructure and this improves the standard of living of its citizens. Huge sums of money are put into this activity and it is important to get value for money. Two aspects that would contribute towards ensuring these are monitoring and evaluation. Unfortunately, many project owners and managers do not recognize the need and usefulness of these two (FAOOTIENO, 2012). M&E structure, data quality, human resource capacity and use of the M&E methods influenced the performance of M&E system and leads to project failure (Nasambu, 2016).

M&E activities frequently failed to come up with useful, cost-effective, decision-making information, because of doubts about accuracy in collection, and/or failure to process and analyze, and/or missing decision deadlines (Cameron, 1993). Building and sustaining a result based monitoring and evaluation system is admittedly not an easy task for it requires continuous commitment, champions, time, effort and resources. In addition, it may take several attempts before the system can be tailored to suit a given governmental or organizational policy, program or project; but it is doable (Kusek, 2004). Hence, the implementation of monitoring and evaluation in the MEFCC have seen numerous challenges and as a result, the poor performance of the projects. The purpose of this study is to assess challenges of monitoring and evaluation in projects implemented by Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MEFCC). It highlights the common challenges and ways in which these challenges can be overcome.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Monitoring and evaluation when carried out correctly and at the right time and place are two of the most important aspects of ensuring the success of many projects. Unfortunately, these two although known to many project developers tend to be given little priority and as a result they are done simply for the sake of fulfilling the requirements of most funding agencies without the intention of using them as a mechanism of ensuring the success of the projects. Despite that proper monitoring and evaluation leads to project success, there are still cases of project failure. Projects fail despite heavy presence of monitoring and evaluation activities. Monitoring data is often inflated, requiring periodic quality checks (Madzorera, 2005). This therefore raises serious issues as to whether the monitoring and evaluation employed is effective enough to achieve project success. The monitoring team perhaps may be lacking the necessary capacity or strength to carry out their work effectively, or they may be approaching their work using incorrect methodologies. The project monitoring team may also be lacking the necessary management support. M&E is also viewed as a donor and not a management requirement (Shapiro, 2011).

As Ribe (2008) also noted, quality monitoring programs do not provide the necessary information as the measure the wrong variables at inadequate location with an insufficient frequency. Moreover, monitoring and evaluation can sometimes be seen as a much lower priority at the project's inception, as all efforts are aimed at launching the project. This may be due in part to the

limited resources available even for project start-up and delivery. Interpreting data is often challenging and requires significant expertise and capacity that may not be available in-house. The other challenge is not the making of an M & E system or framework but to perform an effective monitoring and evaluation (Nyabuto, 2010). Once an M & E system is in place, the required resources has to be adjusted for effectiveness. As Kelly and Magongo (2004) noted, monitoring and evaluation budget should be about 5 to 10 percent of the entire budget, depending on the goals and objectives of the program, scope and type of intervention and activities. The project budget should provide a clear and adequate provision for monitoring and evaluation events. Given the important role that sound monitoring and evaluation can play to improve the effectiveness of an intervention, factoring in adequate funds is a worthwhile investment.

Since its establishment in 2013, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MEFCC) continues to conduct several donor funded projects. Huge amounts of money have been spent on these projects by donors to solve environmental degradation and the recurrent food shortages experienced by Ethiopian community. However, these projects have not been able to solve these problems in the country, meaning that they did not achieve the desired success due to several challenges regarding monitoring and evaluation. Ethiopia embarked Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) strategy in 2011 with a vision to achieve middle income status by 2025 in a climate-resilient green economy. Ethiopia aims to achieve middle-income status by 2025 while developing a green economy. Following the conventional development path would, among other adverse effects, result in a sharp increase in Green House Gases (GHG) emissions and unsustainable use of natural resources. To avoid such negative effects, the government has developed a strategy to build a green economy. Although the strategy encompasses several organizations, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change took the leading role and launched several projects to realize the Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) strategy.

In a preliminary interview with key informants, project managers and monitoring and evaluation specialists, these projects currently implemented by MEFCC lack appropriately designed logical framework in earlier phases to facilitate monitoring and evaluation of projects. As Cameron (1993) noted, logical frameworks must be drafted at the identification phase and refined in design and appraisal, and formal and informal measurement best practices will have to be combined. Certain

projects are still constrained by time and budget to conduct monitoring and evaluation effectively. According to informants, M & E budgets are not sufficient and not allocated on time. Monitoring and evaluation efforts are limited by financial and staff resources. These projects also have no adequate project monitoring and evaluation specialists and not enhanced by training on monitoring and evaluation. There are huge gaps in technical knowledge with regard to defining performance indicators, the retrieval, collection, preparation and interpretation of data. Certain evaluation methods that are commonly used to assess the impact of interventions are unethical. Monitoring and evaluation in these projects are not conducted regularly and consistently. In addition, these projects do not use scientifically valid standards of monitoring and evaluation tools, methods and approaches. Accurate records are not kept to learn from past project experiences. Communicating M & E results within project staffs is still meager.

Peersman (2014) agrees on the common challenges in data collection and analysis can relate to poor choices of methods as well as poor implementation of methods. Within the real- life context of implementing M&E, there simply may not be enough funding, staff, time, or political will to support all of the M&E activities a program wants to implement (PATH, 2013). Kelly and Magongo (2004) recommend the amount allocated to be between 5-10% of the projects budget. Insufficient M & E budget led to poor performance of the M&E system leading to poor performance and failure of projects (Chaplowe, 2008). As revealed by Wanjiru (2013), the technical team's ability to conduct monitoring and evaluations can be huge determinants of how the M&E lessons are learnt, communicated and perceived. Organizations that ignore the training aspect in M & E find themselves faced with a number of challenges (Alex, 2016).

MEFCC's 2016 annual report for National Improved Cook stoves Program (NICSP) indicated that there was poor quality of communication between national and regional level partners due to capacity gaps in the regions for monitoring and evaluation. According to the report, initial baselines are not properly estimated against which progress at the end of the project will be compared. In addition, relevant stakeholders are not participated and are alienated from monitoring and evaluation process.

These show that the M&E systems are not performing satisfactorily in projects at MEFCC. They are facing challenges that are contributing to their insufficiency and which calls for intervention.

These challenge has to be addressed when establishing a monitoring and evaluation system, either through the definition of objectives and indicators in logical framework or by selecting alternative approaches, which allow for a flexible definition of objectives through the target group. Monitoring and evaluation provides the only consolidated source of information showcasing project progress. This thesis therefore assesses challenges of monitoring and evaluation in projects implemented by MEFCC. The findings of the study attempted to provide a solution to the stated problem by precisely digging out challenges that impede effective monitoring and evaluation of projects. The study was intended to identify and assess challenges affecting monitoring and evaluation faced by project managers, project coordinators, monitoring and evaluation specialists for project success.

1.3 Research Questions

How does budget allocation challenge monitoring and evaluation of projects in Federal Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change?

How top management challenge monitoring and evaluation of projects implemented in Federal Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change?

How do M & E tools and methods challenge monitoring and evaluation of projects in Federal Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change?

How does human capacity challenge monitoring and evaluation of projects in Federal Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change?

Objectives of the study

1.3.1 General Objectives

The general objective of this study is to assess challenges of monitoring and evaluation in projects implemented by federal ministry of environment, forest and climate change.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

- To assess budget allocation related challenges of monitoring and evaluation of projects
- To determine top management support related challenges of monitoring and evaluation of projects
- To identify M & E tools and methods related challenges of monitoring and evaluation of projects
- To assess human capacity related challenges of monitoring and evaluation of projects

1.4 Significance of the study

The findings of the study particularly helps and benefit Federal Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MEFCC) to improve monitoring and evaluation systems for its projects. Other organizations could also use the study to provide a framework for strengthening existing monitoring and evaluation systems. It is hoped that the study has of significance to organizations by contributing to a better understanding and knowledge of strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems. Information generated from this study is of much value to a number of stakeholders, including academics, policy makers, development managers and practitioners as well as the general public interested in issues of development programmes management.

By analyzing the effectiveness of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in projects, programme managers in government and policy makers will be enlightened by experiences, practice and operations in these organizations whose technical and organizational capacities are usually way ahead of many governments. So good practice in development agencies may lead to sensitization at political and policy levels, which may further lead to the installation of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in key decision-making centers of government. This also means that there would also be legal and budgetary support for the institutionalization of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in government projects and programmes. Moreover, when a Monitoring and Evaluation System is institutionalized it serves as an integral part of the development policy or programme cycle to improve performance accountability and to provide effective feedback to improve planning, budgeting and policymaking to achieve effectiveness in development (Nasambu, 2016).

This study will be relevant and useful because it will demonstrates that a prerequisite to the success of a project is its identification and assessment challenges for monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring and Evaluation Systems are a relatively new concept. Hence, not much literature exists on the subject. In a way, it is a new area that has emerged with the calls for results-based management and/or performance-related management. So, to the academia this study will add to the small existing body of literature on the subject. To development managers and programmes personnel, results of the study will help in the replication and maximization of strengths of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems, as well as seek remedy for shortfalls in these systems

design, implementation and maintenance. The general public will also benefit from knowing the importance of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems as management tools in development programmes.

1.5 Scope of the study

The study was conducted at 12 ongoing projects implemented at Federal Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MEFFC) head office found in Addis Ababa. The study was predominantly focus on assessing challenges of project monitoring and evaluation by the above mentioned organization. The study is limited to challenges of monitoring and evaluation related to budget allocation, top management support, M & E tools and methods and human capacity. The study was limited to descriptive design and data was collected using questionnaire.

1.6 Limitation of the study

The main challenge during this project work was time and resource constraint that limited the study to focus only on quantitative study. Some respondents were unavailable and others didn't have enough time to fill and return the required questionnaire due to their busy schedule which hindered effective data collection and findings. However, the researcher addressed this problem by making a follow-up to allow them respond at their most convenient time.

1.7 Definition of Key Terms

Budget Allocation: is the amount of funding designated to M & E expenditure line.

Top management: upper management, or a management team is generally a team of individuals at the highest level of management of an organization who have the day-to-day tasks of managing that organization

M & E Tools and Methods: are measures of inputs, processes, approaches to track progress, demonstrate results, and take corrective action to improve service delivery.

Monitoring: is a continuous function that uses the systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.

Evaluation: is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, program or policy, including its design, implementation and results.

Logical frame work: a useful tool, both in the planning, monitoring and evaluation management of development projects. It is one of the most commonly used tool for project planning and using such a tool encourages the discipline of clear and specific thinking about what the project aims to do and how, and highlighting those aspects upon which success depends.

Results-based management: is an approach to project/programme management based on clearly defined results, and the methodologies and tools to measure and achieve them. RBM supports better performance and greater accountability by applying a clear, logical framework to plan, manage and measure an intervention with a focus on the results you want to achieve

Indicators: a quantitative and/or qualitative variable that allows the measurement and verification of changes produced by an intervention relative to what was planned.

1.9 Organization of the Study

This study was organized into five chapters; chapter one deal introduction, giving a background of the study while putting the topic of study in perspective. It gives the statement of the problem and the significance of the study. This chapter also outlines the objectives, limitations, scope and definition of key terms.

Chapter two presents the literature review on concepts of monitoring and evaluation and challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation related to budget allocation, top management support, M & E tools and approaches and human capacity. Chapter three outlines the overall methodology that was used in the study. This included the research design and approach, data types and sources, target population, data collection methods, measurement, validity and reliability, data analysis and presentation and ethical considerations.

Chapter four outlined how data was analyzed, results presented and discussion of findings according to the data collected. Chapter five outlined the summary in line with the objectives of the study, conclusion and recommendations of the study. References and appendices were at the end of the paper.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the literature review on challenges of M & E in projects implemented at MEFCC. The chapter will also review the concept of monitoring and evaluation process and its relationship with overall project performance. It mainly focused on the challenges of monitoring and evaluation in relation to budget allocation, top management support, M & E Tools and methods and human capacity.

2.2. Concept of Project Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring can be defined as the ongoing process by which stakeholders obtain regular feedback on the progress being made towards achieving their goals and objectives and Evaluation is a rigorous and independent assessment of either completed or ongoing activities to determine the extent to which they are achieving stated objectives and contributing to decision making.(UNDP, 2009). Both project monitoring and project evaluation present shareholders and top managers with constant feedback about execution, interim and terminal evaluations (Cameron, 1993).

Monitoring and Evaluation of projects is usually one of the ingredients of good project performance (Chaplowe, 2008). It provides means of accountability, demonstrating transparency to the stakeholders and facilitates organizational learning through documenting lessons learned in implementation of the projects and incorporating the same in the subsequent project planning and implementation or through sharing experience with other implementers (Gyorkos, 2003). Monitoring and Evaluation is about feed-back from implementation (Zwikael, 2008). The goal of M&E is to improve current and future management of outputs, outcomes and impact (UNDP, 2001). The ultimate purpose of Monitoring and Evaluation is change for the better. M&E are powerful management tools that can assist a government and state institutions to improve the manner in which tasks are undertaken to achieve a country's vision and mission (Mthethwa, 2016).

M&E structure, data quality, human resource capacity and use of the M&E methods influenced the performance of M&E system and leads to project failure (Nasambu, 2016). M&E activities frequently failed to come up with useful, cost-effective, decision-making information, because of doubts about accuracy in collection, and/or failure to process and analyze, and/or missing decision deadlines (Cameron, 1993).

2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation challenges

Despite all of the M&E resources that are available, program managers and monitoring and evaluation specialists still face numerous practical M&E challenges. Peersman (2014) agrees on the common challenges in data collection and analysis can relate to poor choices of methods as well as poor implementation of methods. Within the real- life context of implementing M&E, there simply may not be enough funding, staff, time, or political will to support all of the M&E activities a program wants to implement (PATH, 2013). Accordingly PATH, (2013) identified lack of baseline data, budget, little time available for evaluation, weak political will to support comprehensive evaluation as a challenge for M&E and listed their practical field-tested ideas to overcome them. There are several practical challenges that encounter project M & E for successful project performance, but the study focuses on challenges of project M & E related to budget allocation, top management support, M & E tools and approaches and human capacity.

2.3.1. Challenges Related to Budget Allocation

Most projects at MEFCC are likely to have less budgetary allocation for monitoring and evaluation. Based on 2016 MEFCC's annual report, in some projects, there are no funds specifically allocated for M&E despite having sufficient funds for the projects. Monitoring and evaluation actions have been limited by budgetary constraints: either costs are underestimated or funds originally allocated to monitoring and evaluation are transferred to other activities (UNDP, 1997). This has led to poor performance of the M&E system leading to poor performance and failure of projects (Chaplowe, 2008). Lack of adequate M & E budget is an impediment to the success of the system and process and organizations should ensure they have set aside sufficient funds to support monitoring and evaluation activities (Gwadoya, 2011). Oluoch (2012) also noted that lack of sufficient funds hinders performance of the monitoring and evaluation systems.

IFAD (2002) observed that most developing countries are being faced with the challenge of implementing a sound monitoring and evaluation due to lack of control on their financial resources. Therefore, donors need to put more emphasis on the establishment of sound monitoring and evaluation systems through factoring this in the funding (World Bank, 2002). Wateridge (1998) states that due to their limited funds, projects face notably greater challenges to conduct monitoring and evaluation activities effectively.

According MEFCC's 2016 annual report, sufficient M & E budget provide a clear picture of whether or not project milestones can be achieved successfully. Essentially, project monitoring and evaluation budget is a plan that should be incorporated in the allocation of resources to various work packages along with a schedule to ensure that MEFCC is in a position to achieve project goals. Weak linkage between planning and budgeting on the one hand and project monitoring and evaluation on the other will adversely affect the ultimate aim of M & E (Callistusa and Clinton, 2016). Developing M & E budget involves estimation of costs, subsequent analyses, frequent revisions, and, to a certain extent, intuition. This is the only way to ensure that projects achieve set goals and have lasting and sustainable impacts on the beneficiaries (Njama, 2015). Barasa (2014) in his study observed that inclusion of M&E budget in the strategic plan is crucial and some projects had stalled or performed poorly due to underfunding. He also noted that M & E budget should be all-inclusive taking into account all cost and expenses likely to be incurred. Meaningful M & E budgets are developed through frequent interaction among concerned parties, and require data input from a variety of sources. According to Wong (2012), the more participatory M&E is, the higher its budget. On time and sufficient budget availability is key to implementing and operating a strong and effective monitoring and evaluation system.

MEFCC's 2016 annual report for National Improved Cook stoves Program (NICSP) indicated that the allocated budget for M & E was estimated to be only 1.85% of the total project budget. According to review of project documents of the 12 ongoing projects, sufficient budget is allocated for these projects. But, the budget allocated for Monitoring and Evaluation is inadequate, which ranges between 1.13% and 2.7% of the total project budget. The M & E budget should provide a clear and adequate provision for monitoring and evaluation events. The M&E budgetary allocation should clearly be delineated from the main project budget so that M&E unit is accorded some autonomy in utilization of its resources (Gyorkos, 2003). Kelly and Magongo (2004) argued that monitoring and evaluation budgets should be about five to ten percent of the total project budget. However, according to Gitonga (2012), there is no specific percentage to be allocated for M&E but normally varies between 2.5% and 10% depending with the overall budget and the project. Frankel and Gage (2007) agree with Gitonga by stating that there is no set formula for proportion of project's budget to be allocated to M&E. According to Njama (2015), most donors and organizations recommend between 3 to 10 percent of the project's budget. The general rule of

thumb is that the M&E budget should not be too little as to affect the accuracy and credibility of results and neither should it consume much resources to the extent of interfering with other projects activities (Njama, 2015).

M&E activities and their cost should be estimated and properly be planned for to ensure funds needed are sufficiently allocated on time. This should be done at the project design stage so that funds are allocated specifically to M&E and are available to implement M&E tasks (Chaplowe, 2008). Resources allocation should be undertaken within organizations towards their monitoring and evaluation system in a controlled manner to ensure that this does not pose a challenge to the implementation of their strategy (Mugambi and Kanda, 2013).

2.3.2. Top Management Support Related Challenges

Senior managers provide an important input to the process of monitoring and evaluation (Igbokwe and Chinyeaka, 2013). Top management support is known to have a positive influence on project success. Top management support facilitate smooth implementation of project monitoring and evaluation by involving expertise in M&E planning and methodology, participating in and providing support to project design activities including development of project theories of change and strategic frameworks (Results Frameworks, Log Frames), developing a Monitoring and Evaluation plan, helping determine performance and impact indicators and targets, and providing support to proposal development for M&E components. However, many senior managers are not aware of, or prefer to ignore, the different impact various supporting processes have on monitoring and evaluation (Zwikael, 2008). As a result, they pay similar attention to critical support processes and to support processes that have low impact on project success including monitoring and evaluation. Most senior managers choose to focus on developing project management procedures instead of defining clear and realistic project monitoring and evaluation systems (Wachaiyu, 2016).

Project leaders often indicate that senior management support and commitment is unclear and subject to waxing and waning over the project life cycle (Kerzner, 2009). This behavior can result in an uneasy feeling among team members and lead to low levels of enthusiasm and project commitment (Callistusa and Clinton, 2016). Two other common problems are that senior management often does not help set the right environment for the project team at the outset, nor do they give the team timely feedback on their performance and activities during the life of the

project (Cameron, 1993). Zwikael (2008), stated that executives can improve project monitoring and evaluation results by investing more effort in critical top management support processes.

Methodologies by themselves do not manage projects; people do. It is the corporate culture that executes the methodology. Senior management must create a corporate culture that supports project monitoring and evaluation and demonstrates faith in the methodology (Zwikael, 2008). If this is done successfully, then better decision-making process and lower overall project risk (Chaplowe, 2008). There would also be more time available for value-added efforts, rather than internal politics and internal competition for monitoring and evaluation (Kerzner, 2009). Providing support and strengthening of M&E team is a sign of good governance and is expected to perform a major role in ensuring that the M&E team adds value to the organizations operations (Naidoo, 2011). There is need for management to show commitment towards implementing a strong and sustainable monitoring and evaluation systems for effectiveness of their projects. This will eventually lead to the allocation of proper budget to cater for the enormous monitoring and evaluation needs (Cameron, 1993), leading to trained staff with relevant skills for monitoring and evaluation (IFAD, 2002). A motivated team usually achieves high performance (Wong, 2012). This implies that the more a team is strengthened, the better the performance and value addition to the organization. This also applies to the monitoring and evaluation teams in project management.

Top management support highly influences the tools project managers decide to use in projects (Besner and Hobbs, 2008). A project manager is accountable for delivering project outputs. However, as a project is a complex endeavor, project managers can expect support from senior management in the organisation. Particularly the active involvement of senior managers of the performing M & E can help project managers to successfully complete the project. Consistently, top management support positively contribute to success of monitoring and evaluation (Besner and Hobbs, 2008). These studies show that top management support is considered to be among project management critical success factors (CSFs). This means that the more top management processes are practiced in organizations, the higher the level of project success is. However, with executive limited time and resources, it is also important to identify the most effective support processes for different project scenarios.

2.3.3. M & E Tools and Methods Related Challenges

According to MEFCC's annual report in 2016, the logical framework approach is the principal M & E tool. Effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation is dependent on the approach of M&E (Kamau and Mohamed, 2015). They also noted that lack of monitoring and evaluation framework has a negative effect on the project success. In a preliminary interview with key informants, project managers and monitoring and evaluation specialists, these projects currently implemented by MEFCC lack appropriately designed logical framework in earlier phases to facilitate monitoring and evaluation of projects. As Cameron (1993) distinguished, logical frameworks must be drafted at the identification phase and refined in design and appraisal, and formal and informal measurement practices will have to be combined. Alex (2016) also noted projects require different M&E tools and methods depending on the operating context, implementing agency capacity and donor requirements. It is therefore important when preparing an M&E plan to identify methods, procedures, and tools to be used to meet the project's M&E needs (Chaplowe, 2008). There are many tools and techniques used to aid project managers in planning and controlling project activities which include: project selection and risk management tools and techniques; project initiation tools and techniques; project management planning tools and techniques; project management executing tools and techniques; and project management monitoring and controlling tools and techniques (Alex, 2016).

Madzorera (2005) established that some of the monitoring and evaluation approaches that may be applied by project managers and monitoring teams include: basic research; accounting and certification; status assessment; and effectiveness measurement. Gyorkos (2003) also established a two layers approach for the assessment of Private-Public Partnership projects. The first stage was based on evaluation of project ultimate objectives from the standpoint of each stakeholder, i.e. profitability for private sector, effectiveness and value for money for public sector, and level of service for users. The Balanced Scorecard is another approach that can be employed in evaluating projects. Balanced score card evaluates projects on the basis of four perspectives which are, the financial perspective, customer perspective, Internal Business Process, and Learning &Growth.

Naidoo (2011) expresses that a pragmatic approach to M&E is ideal however in the real world practitioners may be limited by constraints that will prevent their continued use of either a log

frame or some overly pragmatic approach to M&E. He further explains that whatever the approach used, at least the basic principles for M&E which are measureable objective, performance indicator, target and periodic reporting should be used in a reporting tool. Other approaches include stochastic methods, Fuzzy logic model, and miscellaneous methods. Of all the methods, the Earned Value Analysis (EVA) has remarkable advantages in accuracy, flexibility, and adaptability for project complexity (Kamau and Mohamed, 2015).

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 (Madzorera, 2005). The M&E systems tools and approaches include performance indicators, logical framework approach, theory-based evaluation, and formal surveys, rapid appraisal methods, and participatory methods, public expenditure tracking surveys, impact evaluation, cost benefit and cost effectiveness analysis. The choice of which is appropriate for any given context will depend on a range of considerations. These include the uses for which M&E is intended, the main stakeholders who have an interest in the M&E findings, the speed with which the information is needed, and the cost World Bank (2004).

Projects in MEFCC need methodologies for planning, managing and evaluating using tools to enhance participation and transparency and to improve orientation towards project objectives. Within the development community there is a strong focus on results— this helps explain the growing interest in M&E. Yet there is often confusion about what M&E entails (World Bank, 2004). There are also two main methods of data collection which are formal and less formal methods (Madzorera, 2005). Formal methods although expensive, have a high degree of reliability and validity and include surveys, participatory observations, and direct measurements among others. Less formal methods which are rich in information, subjective and intuitive, hence less precise in conclusion, they include, field visits and unstructured interviews. In order to increase the effectiveness of an M&E systems, the monitoring and evaluation plan and design need to be prepared as an integral part of the project (Wateridge, 1998).

Organizations like United States Agency for International Development (USAID) policy on M & E require that their grant recipients document their M&E systems in a Performance Management

Plan, which is a tool designed to help them set up and manage the process of monitoring, analyzing, evaluating and reporting progress towards achieving objectives (USAID, 2000). The performance management plan also serves as a reference document that contains targets, a detailed definition of each project indicator, the methods and frequency of data collection, as well as who is responsible for collecting the data. It will also provide details on how data will be analyzed and evaluations required to complement monitoring data. M&E systems vary with type, sector and country of application, (Koffi-Tessio, 2002 and Fitzgerald et al., 2009). A successful M&E systems therefore should be modified to specific setting with allowance for flexibility and imagination (Barasa, 2014). When establishing an M&E systems, organizations should also consider experiences from other organizations (Fitzgerald, 2009).

There is therefore need to realizing the role and use of M&E systems as well as involvement of stakeholders since M&E has many audiences, who include managers, donor, field staff, partners, policy makers and program participants (CARE, 2012), thus the need for it to effectively communicate. A well prepared and executed M&E will contribute to both project outcomes and international standards of doing things (Barasa, 2014). In most cases the practice of M & E is a routine process with no much expected from it (Kusters, 2011), and is a way of pleasing donors (World bank, 2004) and the production of quality results is not seen (UNDP, 2001). There is no allocation of staff specific to the monitoring and evaluation department and thus the level of specialization is low (Chaplowe, 2008).

2.3.4. Human Capacity Related Challenges

MEFCC normally assigns individuals to projects as project manager, project coordinators and monitoring and evaluation specialists. Understanding their technical capacity plays a major role on how they handle M & E in projects they are executing. An organization without the right people with the right training in M & E is as good as dead (Wanjiru (2013). As revealed by Wanjiru (2013), the technical team's ability to conduct monitoring and evaluations and the value of participation of human resources in policymaking process, motivation to impact decisions can be huge determinants of how the M&E lessons are learnt, communicated and perceived.

The skills and capacities needed for monitoring and evaluation are the same as those expected for other key office functions (UNDP, 2001). Organizations that ignore the training aspect in M & E

find themselves faced with a number of challenges (Alex, 2016). Untrained staff will have a challenge in implementation of M&E thus poor results whereas trained and knowledgeable teams or stakeholders are key in ensuring quality M&E (Ole, 2015). Some monitoring and evaluation staff often invest too much time and resources in gathering data which they frequently fail to interpret and present in a form that will convey the meaning of the progress made (FAOOTIENO, 2012). Appropriate skill training should be put in place and used accordingly. According to Driv (2005), people knowledgeable in work need to plan the work and hence be able to work. Technical capacity is the most important in the project management because without it no completion of the project will be possible. The technical work of any project need to be done by qualified staff so that the quality of work is of high standard. MEFCC's annual report in 2016 showed that there is lack of professional and technical supervision, which has led to poor project quality. There is also inadequate technical skills to conduct and analyze M & E results. In addition there is low community participation in monitoring and evaluation due to the in adequacy of data and general information about implementation process in an organization.

Providing support and strengthening of M & E personnel is a sign of good governance (Wachaiyu, 2016). The first step in planning for M & E is to determine the available M & E staff experience within the team, partner organizations, target communities and any other potential participants in the M & E system with a view to identifying any gaps between the project M & E needs and available personnel, which will inform the need for capacity building so as to enhance their technical capacity to undertake the exercise (Igbokwe and Chinyeaka, 2013). If their skills and expertise is inadequate, training for relevant skills should be organized especially for those projects where staff have to go out and do project activities on their own (Igbokwe and Chinyeaka, 2013).The major focus of organizations should be on developing employee skills and abilities so that they can contribute to the organizations effectively and enable them conduct an independent monitoring and evaluation exercise.

Developing an M&E plan requires a proper understanding of the project, inputs, processes, output and outcomes according to (Kelly and Magongo, 2004). The inputs required would include human resources with M&E technical capacity and resources, authority and mandate to develop the M&E plan and technology infrastructure as noted by (Gwadoya, 2011). The process would involve

advocating for the need for M&E, assessing strategic information needs (including planning for M&E utilization dissemination), achieving consensus and commitment among stakeholders, particularly on indicators and reporting structure & tools, developing mechanism for M&E plan review, and preparing document for final approval (Mugambi and Kanda, 2013).

In order to carry out monitoring evaluation efficiently, there are some critical factors that essential be taken into the version (Ole, 2015). These comprise use of pertinent skills, sound methods, adequate resources and accountability, in order to be a quality (Kariungi, 2014). The resources include skilled personnel and financial resources. Rogers (2009) suggests the use of multi-stakeholders' dialogs in data collection, hypothesis testing and in the intervention, in order to let bigger involvement and recognize the differences that may arise. Human resource is vital for an effective monitoring and evaluation, by stating that staff working should possess the required technical expertise in the area in order to ensure high-quality monitoring and evaluation (UNDP, 2009).

Implementing of an effective M&E demands for the staff to undergo training as well as possess skills in research and project management, hence capacity building is critical (Wateridge, 1998). Capacity building of institutions is relevant, not just for the immediate correction of poor performance, but also for the involvement based on a broad aim and result analysis (Kelly and Magongo, 2004). Implementation of project monitoring and evaluation is therefore challenged with weak institutional capacity (Callistusa and Clinton, 2016). In-turn numerous training manuals, handbooks and toolkits have been developed for NGO staffs working in project, in order to provide them with practical tools that will enhance result-based management by strengthening awareness in M&E (Kariungi, 2009). They also give many practical examples and exercises, which are useful since they provide the staff with ways of becoming efficient, effective and have impact on the projects (Shapiro, 2011).

Providing support and strengthening of M&E team will also play a key role in ensuring that the M & E team adds value to the organizations operations (Naidoo, 2011). A motivated team usually achieves high performance (Wong, 2012). This implies that the more a team is strengthened, the better the performance and value addition to the organization. This also applies to the monitoring and evaluation teams in project management.

The execution stage is the most risky stage where the probability of not achieving project success is at its peak due to numerous project activities and it is during this stage that the project M&E team should be most active in monitoring and providing timely feedback (Wachaiyu 2016). For projects using staff that are referred out in the field to carry out project monitoring and evaluation on their own there is need for constant and intensive onsite support to the field staff (Oluoch, 2012). Hence, to carry out efficient monitoring evaluation, some critical factors that are important be taken into account. These comprise use of pertinent skills, sound tools and methods, adequate resources and accountability in order to be a quality M & E (Kariungi, 2009).

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the overall methodology that were used in the study. These include description of the study area, the research design and approach, data types, sources of data, target population, data collection methods, measurement, validity and reliability, data analysis and presentation and ethical considerations.

3.2 Description of the study area

The Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change is the Federal institution for managing the Environment of Ethiopia. It is established as minster organization in 2013 and before that it was called Environmental Protection Authority. It is now responsible to ensure the realization of the environmental rights, goals, objectives and basic principles enshrined in the Constitution as well as the Environment Policy of Ethiopia through coordinating appropriate measures, establishing systems, developing programmes and mechanisms for the welfare of humans and the safety of the environment. The major duties and responsibilities of the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change as stated in the Proclamation No. 916/2015.

Ethiopia embarked Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) strategy in 2011 with a vision to achieve middle income status by 2025 in a climate-resilient green economy. Although the strategy encompasses several organizations, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change took the leading role to facilitate the realization of strategies and goals. To realize strategies, goals, programmes and objectives, the organization launched several projects with huge amount of money funded from donors and government budget. Currently, 12 projects are under implementation in different operation areas like food security, environmental rehabilitation, alternative energy, forestry, biodiversity conservation and climate smart agriculture.

3.3. Research Design and Approach

Descriptive research design was used in this study because of the need for sufficient and precise data relevant to meet the specific objectives of the study by guarding against bias and ensure maximum reliability as Kothari (1999) recommends. As Babbie (2004) also point out,

descriptive research design is more precise and accurate since it involved description of events in a carefully planned way. This design refers to a set of methods and procedures that describe variables. It involves gathering data that describe events and then organizes, tabulates, depicts, and describes the data. Therefore, descriptive research design was used so as to assess challenges of M & E in projects at MEFCC. Descriptive research design provides information which could be used as a basis for important decisions that are to be made on challenges of M & E in projects. It is used to describe the current status of an identified challenges of M & E in projects.

Quantitative design approach was used, so that numerical data were analyzed using statistical procedures. Quantitative research approach provides the fundamental connection between empirical observation and mathematical expression of quantitative relationships. In quantitative research approach, the data analyzed with the help of statistics and the numbers yield an unbiased result that can be generalized to some larger population.

3.4 Data Types and Sources of Data

Primary and secondary data sources were used for the study. Primary data were collected through questionnaire. Closed-ended and open ended questions were administered to respondents. Reliable, adequate, and appropriate published secondary data sources were used including publications of governmental and non-governmental organizations, journals and articles prepared by research scholars.

3.5 Method of Data Collection

The main data collection instruments that was used in this study is questionnaire. This is used for the purpose of collecting primary quantitative data. Data from questionnaire were collected by sending printed questionnaire to project managers, project coordinators and monitoring and evaluation specialists.

3.6 Target Population of the study

During the study, there were twelve ongoing projects at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. The focus areas of these projects are forest, environmental rehabilitation, biodiversity conservation, climate change adaptation, alternative energy and food security. These projects have project managers, project coordinators and M & E specialists. The study was

conducted on 12 ongoing projects at MEFCC which constituted the target population. Three respondents are deliberately selected from each project. The study therefore targeted a population of 36 respondents from twelve ongoing projects at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. These respondents were project managers, project coordinators and M & E specialists who are responsible for most aspect project monitoring and evaluation. Therefore, census survey was employed for the study where all of these 12 ongoing projects at MEFCC were selected and all project managers, project coordinators, and monitoring and evaluation experts in each and every project were selected for the study.

3.7 Measurement

Data were collected through a questionnaire with questions where respondents indicated responses on statements in a Likert scale. Challenges of M & E related to budget allocation, top management support, M&E tools and approaches and human capacity were measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. Questionnaire was administered to 36 respondents from twelve ongoing or active projects at MEFCC and the respondents were project managers, project coordinators, monitoring and evaluation specialists.

3.8. Validity and Reliability

Validity and reliability measurements are carried out whether instruments meet standards. The researcher determined the instrument's content and construct validity through the help of expert judgment (the supervisor) who assessed and evaluated the instrument and found out it answered the phenomenon under study. A pilot test was also undertaken where questionnaires were administered to 5 respondents from other programmes to assess the reliability and validity of the data instruments. The researcher removed bias in the research instrument by constructing it in line with the objectives of the study. The instrument used contains a representative sample of the population and gave equal chance to ensure freedom from bias.

In addition to the primary data, documentary evidence such as policies, minutes of meetings, project planning records, published and unpublished documents, books, articles, periodic reports and other related resources were used to supplement and triangulate the study. In this study the data obtained from questionnaire were also triangulated by document analysis.

3.9 Data Analysis and Presentation

The study made use of quantitative data analysis. Numeric data collected from questionnaire from ongoing projects at MEFCC were quantitatively analyzed using statistical procedures. After the coding process was completed, the quantitative data analysis was carried out using software programs such as Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS V 21.0) and Excel 2013. The results of the data were quantitatively presented in the form of percentages, frequencies, mean and standard deviation. The result of the questionnaires were finally combined to analyze challenges of monitoring and evaluation in projects implemented by MEFCC.

3.10 Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted in an ethical manner. The researcher explained to the respondents the purpose of the study and assured them that the information given would be treated as confidential and their names would not be disclosed. All who participated were not coerced into participating in the research. Informed consent was sought from all the participants that agreed to participate in the research. The researcher ensured that guarantees to the participants concerning confidentiality were given and strictly observed. Information was not made available to anyone who was not directly involved in the study. The researcher honored patents, copyrights, and other forms of intellectual property by accrediting and acknowledging of contributions from various parties.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

The current chapter present the results of the primary data which was collected through the use of questionnaire. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the data. Response rate, demographic information and the findings on the key objective areas of the study have been presented and interpreted to assess Monitoring and Evaluation challenges of projects at MEFCC in relation to budget allocation, top management support, human capacity and M & E tools and approaches. The findings presented in tabular summaries and their implications discussed.

4.2 Response Rate

Out of 36 questionnaires which were issued 34 were correctly filled and returned thus they formed a response rate of 94.4%. The response rate was appropriate since according to Kothari (2007) a response rate of more than 70% is appropriate for analysis.

Table 4:1: Response rate

Sample size	Number	**Percent**
Correctly filled and returned	34	94.4
Not returned	2	5.6
Total	36	**100.0**

4.3 Demographic Information

The study sought the demographic characteristics of the respondents in the study, specifically the gender, age, highest level of education and work experience in M & E.

4.3.1 Gender of the Respondents

The study sought to assess the gender of the respondents. The information collected is as shown in table below.

Table 4:2: Gender of respondents

Gender	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Male	29	85.3
Female	5	14.7
Total	**34**	**100.0**

The findings in table 4.2 above show that majority of the respondents were male which is 85.3% (29) and only 14.7% (5) were female, this implies that there was almost an unequal gender representation among those who took part in M&E of development projects in Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. The results indicated larger percentage of men were involved in filling the questionnaires as compared to that of female thus implying that a large number of male working for MEFCC participated in the study. This overrepresentation of male employees is a clear indication of gender imbalance in staff distribution at MEFCC especially in M&E. Majority of the respondents were from the M&E unit which is an area generally dominated by men. This is may be due to the nature of the work which involves a lot of field work and travelling and many women tend to shy away from such jobs.

4.3.2 Age Brackets of Respondents

The respondents were further asked to indicate their ages with the aim of establishing the age bracket. Table 4.3 shows the age distribution of the respondents.

Table 4:3: Age of Respondents

Age	Frequency	Percent
Below 30	0	0
31-40	16	47.1
41-50	13	38.2
Above 50	5	14.7
Total	**34**	**100**

The findings reveal that 47.1% (16) of the respondents aged 31- 40 years, followed by 38.2% (13) who are aged between 41-50 years and 14.7% (5) are aged above 50 years. There were no respondents aged below 30 years. The findings therefore reveal that majority of employees at MEFCC are at their most productive age bracket and are mature people who are advantaged with knowledge in M&E and thus can help in determining effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation system of projects.

4.3.3 Level of Education of Respondents

The respondents were asked to indicate their academic background. Table 4.4 shows the study findings on the respondents' academic background.

Table 4:4: Respondents' Education Level

Level of education	Frequency	Percentage
Undergraduate	19	55.9
Masters	13	38.2
PhDs	2	5.9
Total	34	100

Regarding the level of education, majority of the respondents had attained Undergraduate qualification which account 55.9% (19), followed by 38.2% (13) who had Masters Qualification. In addition, 5.9% (2) of respondents had PhDs qualification. This implies that there were heterogeneous skills in projects implemented by Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change indicating employees had the knowledge, capacity, skills and management expertise to conduct M&E activities successfully.

4.3.4 Work Experience of Respondents in M & E

The respondents were requested to indicate how long they had been working for M & E. The findings are illustrated in Table 4.5.

Table 4:5: Work Experience of Respondents in M & E

Work Experience	Frequency	Percentage
Less than one year	1	2.9
1-4	3	8.8
5-8	15	44.1
9-12	11	32.4
Above 12	4	11.8
Total	34	100

From the findings, majority of the respondents, 44.1% (15) stated that they had worked in M & E for a period of 5-8 years followed by respondents who worked between 9-12 years these were 32.4% (11). Other respondents, 11.8% (4) and 8.8% (3) stated that they had worked in M & E for

a period of above 12 years and 1-4 years respectively. Only one respondent (2.9%) indicated who worked for less than 1 year. The results indicate that most employees, 88.2% (30), had worked in M & E for a long duration of 5 years and above and thus had sufficient information on allocation of funds, role of top management support, M&E tools and approaches and human capacity which influences effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation systems.

4.4 Budget Allocation for Monitoring and Evaluation

The study sought to assess challenges related to budget allocation in Monitoring and Evaluation of projects in federal ministry of environment, forest and climate change. To assess budget allocation related challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation of projects respondents are requested to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with the following statements concerning budget allocation challenges for M&E in relation to the organization's projects. The responses were rated on a five point Likert scale where: 5 – Strongly agree, 4 – Agree, 3 – Not sure, 2 – Disagree, 1 – Strongly disagree. Table 4.6 shows the mean and standard deviations.

Table 4:6: Budget allocation challenges for M & E

Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
The organization provides sufficient funds for monitoring and evaluation activities (about 5% -10% of projects budget)	1.44	0.991
The organization ensures there is timely provision of funds for M&E	2.18	1.267
Monitoring and evaluation budget can be obviously delineated within the overall project budget to give the monitoring and evaluation function the due recognition it plays in project running	2.41	1.258
There is autonomy in the budgetary decisions for the monitoring and evaluation unit	2.53	1.212
Funds allocated are used for M&E activities only	2.38	1.326
Overall Mean	2.19	

From the findings, majority (76.5%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement that the organization provides sufficient funds for the monitoring and evaluation activities (5% - 10% of project budget) with a mean score of 1.44. Other 38.2% of respondents disagreed that with the

statement the organization ensures there is timely provision of funds for M&E with mean scores of 2.18. 35% of respondents disagreed with the statements there is autonomy in the budgetary decisions for the monitoring and evaluation unit, monitoring and evaluation budget can be obviously delineated within the overall project budget to give the monitoring and evaluation function the due recognition it plays in project running and funds allocated are used for M&E activities only with mean scores of 2.53, 2.41, and 2.38 respectively. The overall mean of challenges related to budget allocation is 2.19.

Lack of adequate M & E budget is an impediment to the success of the system and process and organizations should ensure they have set aside sufficient funds to support monitoring and evaluation activities (Gwadoya, 2011). Oluoch (2012) also noted that lack of sufficient funds hinders performance of the monitoring and evaluation systems. Wateridge (1998) states that due to their limited funds, projects face notably greater challenges to conduct monitoring and evaluation activities effectively. Insufficient M & E budget led to poor performance of the M&E system leading to poor performance and failure of projects (Chaplowe, 2008). Hence, Kelly and Magongo (2004) recommend the amount allocated to be between 5-10% of the projects budget.

4.5 Top Management support for monitoring and Evaluation

The study sought to determine top management support related challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation of projects in federal ministry of environment, forest and climate change. To assess top management support related challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation of projects respondents are inquired to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with the following statements concerning top management support in M&E in relation to the organization's projects. The responses were rated on a five point Likert scale where: 5 – Strongly agree, 4 – Agree, 3 - Not sure, 2 – Disagree, 1 – Strongly disagree. Table 4.8 shows the mean and standard deviations.

Table 4:7: Top Management Support in M & E

Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
Senior management take active part in designing the M&E systems	3.06	1.516
Top management ensure that staff are trained on M&E regularly	2.68	1.387
The organization uses M&E findings in decision making	3.24	1.499
Top management always and clearly communicate M&E results	2.76	1.519

Top management allocate sufficient resource for M & E	2.65	1.323
Organizational policy supports M&E	2.88	1.552
There is supportive supervision and guidance from leaders	3.00	1.537
The M & E activities are carried out within schedule	2.59	1.459
Overall Mean	2.86	

From the findings, 26.5% of respondents disagreed with the statements that organizational policy supports M&E, top management always and clearly communicate M&E results and top management ensure that staff are trained on M&E regularly with a mean score of 2.88, 2.76 and 2.68 respectively. 29.4% of respondents also disagreed that top management allocate sufficient resource for M & E with mean score of 2.65. In addition, 32.4% of respondents disagreed with the statements that M&E activities are carried out within schedule with mean score of 2.59.

23.5% of respondents were not sure with the statement that senior management take active part in designing the M&E systems with mean score of 3.06. 32.4% of respondents were not sure with the statement that the organization uses M&E findings in decision making with mean scores of 3.24. 35.3% of the respondents were not sure with the statement that there is supportive supervision and guidance from leaders with mean scores of 3.00.

Top management support is another critical project M & E challenge with overall mean score of 2.86. Providing support and strengthening of M&E team will also play a key role in ensuring that the M & E team adds value to the organizations operations (Naidoo, 2011). Senior managers provide an important input to the process of monitoring and evaluation (Igbokwe and Chinyeaka, 2013). This will eventually lead to the allocation of proper budget to cater for the enormous monitoring and evaluation needs (Cameron, 1993), leading to trained staff with relevant skills for monitoring and evaluation (IFAD, 2002).

4.6 M & E tools and approaches

The study also sought how M & E tools and methods affect Monitoring and Evaluation of projects in federal ministry of environment, forest and climate change. To identify M & E tools and approaches related challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation of projects in ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, respondents agree or disagree with the following statements concerning M&E tools and approaches in relation to the organization's projects. The

responses were rated on a five point Likert scale where: 5 – Strongly agree, 4 – Agree, 3 - Not sure, 2 – Disagree, 1 – Strongly disagree. Table 4.10 shows the mean and standard deviations.

Table 4:8: M & E Tools and Approaches

Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
M&E Tools and Methods are difficult to use	3.35	1.475
Projects use scientifically valid standards of monitoring and evaluation tools, methods and approaches	3.09	1.464
Logical frameworks are drafted at the design phase	3.12	1.320
The logical frameworks provides the intended outcomes of projects	4.18	0.968
The logical frameworks provides the planned outputs of projects	4.00	1.155
M&E Tools and Methods use measureable objective, baseline, performance indicator, target and periodic reporting tool	2.56	1.541
The logical frameworks clearly defines the indicators to track progress of projects	4.09	1.083
Overall Mean	3.48	

From the findings, 32.4% of the respondents were not sure with the statements that M&E Tools and Methods are difficult to use and projects use scientifically valid standards of monitoring and evaluation tools, methods and approaches with a mean score of 3.35 and 3.09 respectively. 35.3% of respondents were not also sure with the statement that Logical frameworks are drafted at the design phase with mean score of 3.12.

47.1% of respondents agreed with the statement that the logical frameworks provides the intended outcomes of projects a mean score of 4.18. 44.1% of respondents also agreed with the statement that the logical frameworks provides the planned outputs of projects with mean score of 4.00. 38.2% of respondents disagreed with the statement that M&E Tools and Methods use measureable objective, baseline, performance indicator, target and periodic reporting tool with a mean score of 2.56. 38.2% of respondents agreed with the statement that the logical frameworks clearly defines the indicators to track progress of projects with a mean score of 4.09.

Unless project M & E tools and methods use measurable baselines and indicators, changes will not be possible to compare. Alex (2016) noted projects require different M&E tools and methods

depending on the operating context, implementing agency capacity and donor requirements. It is therefore important when preparing an M&E plan to identify methods, procedures, and tools to be used to meet the project's M&E needs (Chaplowe, 2008).

4.7 Human Capacity for monitoring and evaluation

The study sought how does human capacity related challenges influence Monitoring and Evaluation of projects implemented by federal ministry of environment, forest and climate change. To assess human capacity related challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation of projects in MEFCC, the study requested the respondents to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with human capacity for M & E in the following aspects of M&E process. The responses were rated on a five point Likert scale where: 5 – Strongly agree, 4 – Agree, 3 - Not sure, 2 – Disagree, 1 – Strongly disagree. The mean and standard deviations are indicated in Table 4.12.

Table 4:9: Human Capacity for Monitoring and Evaluation

Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
Numerous training manuals, handbooks and toolkits have been developed for staffs working in M & E	2.50	1.354
The organization has skilled personnel with adequate capacity to analyze data	3.44	1.460
The monitoring and evaluation officers are knowledgeable in the day-to-day management of monitoring and evaluation systems	2.74	1.504
Proper training and experience is vital for M&E results	4.68	0.475
There are huge gaps in technical knowledge with regard to defining performance indicators, the retrieval, collection, preparation and interpretation of data	4.06	1.254
The organization engage in training of the employees on monitoring and evaluation systems	2.62	1.633
Staffs in M & E have defined role and responsibilities	4.03	1.218
Overall Mean	3.44	

From the findings, 35.3% of the respondents disagreed with the statements that the organization engage in training of the employees on monitoring and evaluation systems and numerous training manuals, handbooks and toolkits have been developed for staffs working in M & E with mean scores of 2.62 and 2.50 respectively. 29.4% of respondents also disagreed that monitoring and

evaluation officers are knowledgeable in the day-to-day management of monitoring and evaluation systems with mean score of 2.74.

67.6% of respondents strongly agreed that proper training and experience is vital for M&E results with mean scores of 4.68. 50% of respondents agreed that there are huge gaps in technical knowledge with regard to defining performance indicators, the retrieval, collection, preparation and interpretation of data with mean scores of 4.06. 44.1% of respondents also agreed with the statement that staffs in M & E have defined role and responsibilities with mean scores 4.03. 32.4% of respondents were not sure with the statements that the organization has skilled personnel with adequate capacity to analyze data with mean scores of 3.44.

Human resource is vital for an effective monitoring and evaluation, by stating that staff working should possess the required technical expertise in the area in order to ensure high-quality monitoring and evaluation (UNDP, 2009).

As presented above, the study thoroughly assessed project monitoring and evaluation challenges in projects implemented at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change related to budget allocation, top management support, M & E tools and approaches and human capacity. Based on the study, M & E tools and approaches, human capacity, top management support and budget allocation have an overall mean scores of 3.48, 3.44, 2.86 and 2.19 respectively. Hence, monitoring and evaluation challenges related to top management support and budget allocation are more critical challenges than others with overall mean scores of 2.86 and 2.19 respectively.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the study findings, discussions, conclusions and recommendations. It also makes suggestions for further research. The findings are summarized in line with the objectives of the study which was to assess challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects implemented at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change.

5.2 Summary of the Findings

The findings of this study indicate the challenges of M & E related to budget allocation, top management support, M & E tools and approaches and human capacity in projects at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. For challenges related to budget allocation, 76.5% of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statements that the organization provides sufficient funds for the monitoring and evaluation activities (5% - 10% of project budget) with mean score of 1.44. The findings show that the organization provide inadequate funds for the monitoring and evaluation activities (5%-10% of project budget). Sufficient funding is therefore very crucial for the system to be effective and M & E process to take place. Other 38.2% of respondents disagreed that with the statement the organization ensures there is timely provision of funds for M&E with mean scores of 2.18. 35% of respondents disagreed with the statements there is autonomy in the budgetary decisions for the monitoring and evaluation unit, monitoring and evaluation budget can be obviously delineated within the overall project budget to give the monitoring and evaluation function the due recognition it plays in project running and funds allocated are used for M&E activities only with mean scores of 2.53, 2.41, and 2.38 respectively.

The result therefore showed that there is no adequate and timely provision of separate budget allocation for M&E system and there is no independency in the budgetary decisions for the monitoring and evaluation unit.

Regarding top management support, from the findings, 26.5% of respondents disagreed with the statements that organizational policy supports M&E, top management always and clearly communicate M&E results and top management ensure that staff are trained on M&E regularly with a mean score of 2.88, 2.76 and 2.68 respectively. 29.4% of respondents also disagreed that

top management allocate sufficient resource for M & E with mean score of 2.65. In addition, 32.4% of respondents disagreed with the statements that M&E activities are carried out within schedule with mean score of 2.59.

The results therefore indicate that top management offer insufficient concern on M&E activities for projects at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. The study revealed that leaders do not always and clearly communicate M&E results, not ensure that staffs are trained on M&E regularly and not take active part in designing the M & E systems. Top management also allocates insufficient budget and not ensure that M&E activities are carried out within schedule.

For challenges related to M & E tools and approaches, from the findings, 38.2% of respondents disagreed with the statement that M&E Tools and Methods use measureable objective, baseline, performance indicator, target and periodic reporting tool with a mean score of 2.56.

The findings show that M&E Tools and Methods do not use measureable objective, baseline, performance indicator, target and periodic reporting tool and projects currently implemented by MEFCC lack appropriately designed logical framework in earlier phases to facilitate monitoring and evaluation of projects. In addition, initial baselines were not properly estimated against which progress at the end of the project will be compared.

Regarding human capacity related challenges of M & E, the finding show that 35.3% of the respondents disagreed with the statements that the organization engage in training of the employees on monitoring and evaluation systems and numerous training manuals, handbooks and toolkits have been developed for staffs working in M & E with mean scores of 2.62 and 2.50 respectively. 29.4% of respondents also disagreed that monitoring and evaluation officers are knowledgeable in the day-to-day management of monitoring and evaluation systems with mean score of 2.74.

The result showed that the organization practice minor engagement in training of the employees on monitoring and evaluation. Staffs working in M & E are not provided with numerous training manuals, handbooks and toolkits. The findings show that appropriate skill training on M&E did not put in place and used accordingly and the organization should focus on developing employees' skills and abilities on M & E.

5.3 Discussion of the Findings

For the first objective of the study was to assess budget allocation related challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation of projects at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. From the findings, 76.5% of the respondents strongly disagreed that the organization provides sufficient funds for the monitoring and evaluation activities (5% - 10% of project budget). This shows that the organization allocates insufficient budget for M & E. The amount allocated was not between 5-10% of the projects budget as Kelly and Magongo (2004) recommends and the funds were not used specifically for M&E activities. This indicates that sufficient funding is very crucial for the system to be effective and M & E process to take place. Lack of adequate M & E budget is a hindrance to the success of the system and process and organizations should ensure they have set aside sufficient funds to support monitoring and evaluation activities. Therefore, sufficient funding plays a crucial role in M & E project function in that enough funds are required for the process to be carried out successfully and effectively.

35% of the respondents also disagreed that there is autonomy in the budgetary decisions for the monitoring and evaluation unit and monitoring and evaluation budget can be obviously delineated within the overall project budget to give the monitoring and evaluation function the due recognition it plays in project running. They also disagreed that funds allocated are used for M&E activities only and the organization ensures there is timely provision of funds for M&E. This shows that there is no timely separate budget allocation for M&E system and there is no independency in the budgetary decisions for the monitoring and evaluation unit. Some projects management activities which are not part of M&E are also funded from monitoring and evaluation allocation. As Gyorkos (2003) noted that M&E budgetary allocation should clearly be delineated from the main project budget so that M&E unit is accorded some autonomy in utilization of its resources. Funds also should be timely provided and specifically used for M&E activities.

The second objective of the study was to determine and assess top management support related challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation of projects implemented at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. From the findings, 32.4% of the respondents disagreed that M&E activities are carried out within schedule, 29.4% of respondents disagreed that top management allocate sufficient resource for M & E and top management ensure that staff are trained on M&E regularly. They also disagreed that top management always and clearly communicate M&E results

and organizational policy supports M&E. Some of the respondents were not sure with the statements that there is supportive supervision and guidance from leaders, senior management take active part in designing the M&E systems and the organization uses M&E findings in decision making.

The results therefore indicate that top management give inadequate support to M & E that M&E activities are not carried out within schedule, top management does not allocate sufficient resource for M & E and top management does not ensured that staff are trained on M&E regularly. Top management must demonstrate strong commitment towards implementing a strong and sustainable monitoring and evaluation systems for effectiveness of their projects. This will eventually lead to the allocation of proper budget to cater for the enormous monitoring and evaluation needs (Cameron, 1993), leading to trained staff with relevant skills for monitoring and evaluation (IFAD, 2002). Finally, majority of the respondents disagreed that top management always and clearly communicate M&E results and organizational policy supports M&E. As Zwikael (2008) recommends, senior management must create a corporate culture that supports project monitoring and evaluation. This implies that the more top management support M & E processes, the better the performance and value addition to the organization. Top management support facilitate smooth implementation of project monitoring and evaluation by involving expertise in M&E planning and methodology, participating in and providing support to project design activities including development of project theories of change and strategic frameworks (Results Frameworks, Log Frames), developing a Monitoring and Evaluation plan, helping determine performance and impact indicators and targets, and providing support to proposal development for M&E components.

For the third objective of the study was to identify and assess M & E tools and approaches related challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation of projects at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. From the findings, 44.1% of respondents also agreed that the logical frameworks provide the planned outputs of projects. 38.2% of respondents agreed the logical frameworks clearly defines the indicators to track progress of projects and 47.1% of the respondents agreed the logical frameworks provides the intended outcomes of projects. 32.4% of the respondents were not sure with the statements that projects use scientifically valid standards of monitoring and evaluation tools, methods and approaches. 35.3% of respondents were not also sure with the statement that Logical frameworks are drafted at the design phase while 32.4% of the respondents

were not sure with the statements that M&E Tools and Methods are difficult to use. From the findings, majority of the respondents disagreed that M&E Tools and Methods use measureable objective, baseline, performance indicator, target and periodic reporting tool.

The results of the study therefore indicate that most staff employees working for projects at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change disagreed that M&E Tools and Methods use measureable objective, baseline, performance indicator, target and periodic reporting tool. Hence, initial baselines ought to be properly estimated against which progress at the end of the project will be compared. M&E Tools and approaches should provide measurable indicators, baselines and targets must be clear and designed at the initial phase of projects. As Cameron (1993) distinguished, logical frameworks must be drafted at the identification phase and formal and informal measurement practices will have to be combined. Projects require various M&E tools and methods depending on the operational context, executing agency ability and donor requirements. It is therefore important when preparing an M&E plan to identify methods, procedures, and tools to be used to meet the project's M&E needs.

For the fourth objective of the study was to assess human capacity related challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation of projects at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. From the findings, majority (67.6%) of the respondents agreed that proper training and experience is vital for M&E results since there are huge gaps in technical knowledge with regard to defining performance indicators, the retrieval, collection, preparation and interpretation of data. 32.4% of the respondents were not sure that the organization has skilled personnel with adequate capacity to analyze data and staffs in M & E have defined role and responsibilities. 29.4% of the respondents disagreed that monitoring and evaluation officers are knowledgeable in the day-to-day management of monitoring and evaluation systems, while 35.3% of the respondents disagreed the organization engage in training of the employees on monitoring and evaluation systems and numerous training manuals, handbooks and toolkits have been developed for staffs working in M & E.

The result of the findings therefore show that human capacity for M & E is one the most important challenge in project M & E at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change because without it no completion of the project will be possible. The monitoring and evaluation personnel should have the right training skills on M & E to effectively implement M & E. The M & E work

of any project need to be done by qualified staff so that the quality of work is of high standard. As revealed by Wanjiru (2013), the technical team's ability to conduct monitoring and evaluations can be huge determinants of how the M&E lessons are learnt, communicated and perceived. As Kariungi (2009) also recommends numerous training manuals, handbooks and toolkits have been developed for staffs working in project in order to provide them with practical tools that will enhance result-based management by strengthening awareness in M&E. Technical capacity on M&E is the most important in the project management because without it no understanding of the project performance will be possible. Organizations that ignore the training aspect in M & E find themselves faced with a number of challenges (Alex, 2016). If their skills and expertise is inadequate, training for relevant skills should be prepared especially for those projects where staff have to go out and do project activities on their own (Igbokwe and Chinyeaka, 2013).The major focus of the organization should be on developing employee skills and abilities so that they can contribute to the organization effectively and enable them conduct an independent monitoring and evaluation exercise.

5.4 Conclusion

As per the findings of the study it can be concluded that M & E challenges related to budget allocation, top management support, M & E tools and approaches and human capacity are the most significant challenges at projects implemented by Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. Regarding budget allocation, the organization allocates insufficient budget and does not provide timely a separate budget to M & E activities. There is also no independency in the budgetary decisions for the monitoring and evaluation unit and utilization of the funds. According to the study, top management gives minor commitment to M & E in that M&E activities are not carried out within schedule, top management does not allocate sufficient resource for M & E and top management does not ensured that staff are trained on M&E regularly. Concerning M & E tools and approaches, projects do not use scientifically valid standards of monitoring and evaluation tools and approaches, logical frameworks are not drafted at the design phase. M&E Tools and Methods also do not use measureable objective, baseline, performance indicator, target and periodic reporting tool. About human capacity in M & E, monitoring and evaluation officers are not knowledgeable in the day-to-day management of monitoring and evaluation systems and the organization practice little attention on developing skills and knowledge on M&E.

5.5 Recommendation

The following are recommendations based on the findings of the study:

1. The study showed that M & E challenge related to budget allocation is the most critical challenge. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change should allocate sufficient funds to M&E by correctly estimating the cost of M & E activities and ensure a separate budget to M & E activities. During the design stage, M&E activities and their cost should be estimated and properly be planned for to ensure funds needed are sufficiently allocated on time.
2. Top management at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change should allocate sufficient resource for M & E and ensure staffs are trained on M&E regularly. Senior management should take active part in designing M & E system and offer timely support and guidance to projects' staff and ensure M&E activities are well executed within schedule.
3. Organization's M&E Tools and Methods should use measureable objective, baseline, performance indicator, target and periodic reporting tool. Initial baselines ought to be properly estimated against which progress at the end of the project will be compared. M&E Tools and approaches should provide measurable indicators, baselines and targets must be clear and designed at the initial phase of projects.
4. The organization should focus on developing employees' skills and abilities on M & E so that they can contribute to the organization effectively and enable them conduct an independent monitoring and evaluation exercise effectively and efficiently. Therefore, appropriate skill training on M&E should be put in place and used accordingly.

5.6 Suggestion for Further Study

The study was limited M & E challenges only related to budget allocation, top management support, M&E tools and approaches and human capacity. The study properly assessed these challenges on the monitoring and evaluation of projects. There are other numerous factors that have the potential to affect M&E performance of projects including political influence, technology, and projects' policy frameworks among others. Future studies should examine other factors that have the potential of affecting monitoring and evaluation of development projects at Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. The methodology that has been chosen to achieve the research objectives was limited to questionnaires. As such, future research could build on this study by examining monitoring practices in different sectors and agencies in both qualitative and quantitative way by using other various methodologies that have not been used in this study.

References

Alex, A. J. (2016). *Assessment of Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems at Caritas Torit, In South Sudan.*

Barasa, M. (2014) *Influence of M&E tools on project completion in Kenya: a case of constituency development fund projects in Kakamega County, Kenya*.

Besner, C. and Hobbs, B. (2008). *Project management practice, generic or contextual: a reality check*. Project Management Journal, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 16-33.

Callistusa, T. & Clintonb, A. (2016). *Evaluating barriers to effective implementation of project monitoring and evaluation in the Ghanaian construction industry*. Creative Construction Conference 2016, CCC 2016, 25-28.

Cameron, J. (1993). *The challenges for monitoring and evaluation in the 1990s, Project Appraisal*, 8:2, 91-96.

CARE. (2012). *A Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation for result based:* CARE program South Sudan, Juba.

Chaplowe, S. G. (2008). *Monitoring & Evaluation Planning*: American Red Cross/CRS M&E Module Series. American Red Cross and Catholic Relief Services (CRS), Washington, DC and Baltimore, MD.

Charles, G. K. (2015). *Efficacy of Monitoring and Evaluation Function in Achieving Project Success in Kenya: A Conceptual Framework*. Human Bin Mohamed Science Journal of Business and Management, 3(3): 82-94.

CLEAR. (2012). *Mid Term Evaluation, Final Evaluation Report*. Universalia Management Group, e-Pact, Oxford Policy. Itad.

Driv, D. (2005). *Transferring projects to their final users: The effect of planning and preparations for commissioning on projects success.* International journal of projects management 23, 257-265.

FAOOTIENO (2012). *The Roles of Monitoring and Evaluation in Projects*. Engineering Programme Group, Technikon, Southern Africa.

Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MEFCC), *(2016). National Improved Cook stoves Program (NICSP). Annual Report.* Grant Reference: No. 4453. Report No.: 03/2016.

Fitzgerald, M. (2009). *A Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation of NGO Capacity Building Interventions in Conflict Affected Settings*. JSI Research and Training Institute, Inc.

Frankel, N. & Gage, N. (2007). *M&E Fundamentals: A Self-Guided Minicourse*. United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Washington, DC.

Mugambi, F. & Kanda, E. (2013). *Determinants of Effective Monitoring and Evaluation of Strategy Implementation of Community Based Projects*. International Journal of Innovative Research and Development, Vol. 2 Issue 11.

Gwadoya, R. A. (2011). *Factors Influencing Effective Implementation of monitoring and Evaluation Practices in Donor Funded projects In Kenya. A Case of Turkana District*. Kenyatta University.

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

IFAD. (2008). *Project level monitoring and evaluation: who really wants to know*. Office of Evaluation. The annual report on results and impact of IFAD operations.

IFAD. (2002). *Local Initiative Support Project Evaluation Report*, Rome: Office of the Evaluation Studies.

Igbokwe, I., & Chinyeaka, J. (2013). *Issues and Challenges in Local Government Project Monitoring and Evaluation in Nigeria: The way forward.* European Scientific Journal, August 2013 edition.

Kamau, C. G. & Mohamed, H. B. (2015). *Efficacy of Monitoring and Evaluation Function in Achieving Project Success in Kenya: A Conceptual Framework*. Science Journal of Business and Management. Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 82-94.

Kariungi, S. M. (2014). *Determinants of Timely Completion of Projects in Kenya: A case of Kenya Power & Lighting Company Thika.* ABC Journal of Advanced Research. 3(2), 9-19

Kelly, K. & Magongo, B. (2004). *Report on Assessment of Monitoring and evaluation capacity of HIV /Aids organization in Swaziland*. Swaziland: NERCHA 35.

Kerzner, H. (2009). *Project Management, A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 10th Ed.

Koffi-Tessio, B. (2002). *Efficacy and efficiency of Monitoring-Evaluation (MES) for Projects Financed by the Bank Group*, African Development Bank Group.

Kothari, C. R. (1999). *Research Methodology*. Wishwa Prakashan, New Delhi.

Kusek, J. Z. (2004). *Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System*. Washington D. C.

Lahey, R. (2009). *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Government of Canada. Lessons Learned*. From 30 years of M&E development.

Madzorera, I. (2005). *Recent Experience in the Monitoring and Evaluation of Nutrition Related Projects in Developing Countries: Nine Lessons Learned*. Gerald J and Dorothy R Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy, Tufts University Boston, Massachusetts USA Food Policy and Applied Nutrition Program Discussion Paper No. 28.

Mayne, J. (2007). *Best Practices in Results-Based Management: A Review of Experience, A Report for the United Nations Secretariat*. Geneva: Volume1: Main Report. UN Workshop on Best Practices in Results-Based Management.

Mthethwa, R. M. (2016). *Challenges in Implementing Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E): The Case of the Mfolozi Municipality.* School of Public Management and Administration, University of Pretoria, South Africa.

Naidoo, L., A. (2011). *The Role of Monitoring and Evaluation in Promoting Good Governance in South Africa: A Case Study of the Department of Social Development (Doctoral Dissertation*, University of Witwatersrand).

Nasambu, J. (2016). Factors Influencing the Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in Non-Government Organizations in Lira District, Northern Uganda.

Njama, A. W. (2015). *Determinants of Effectiveness of a Monitoring and Evaluation System for Projects: A Case of AMREF Kenya WASH Programme*.

Nyabuto, N. (2010). *Factors Influencing Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation Of Projects In NGOs: A Case of East Africa Wild Life Society.* MA PPM thesis.

Ole, N. L. (2015). *Factors Influencing Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation of Government Projects in Kenya: A Case of Constituency Development Fund Projects in Narok East Sub-County, Kenya*.

Oluoch, S. O. (2012). *Determinant of Effective Monitoring and Evaluation systems A Case Study of National Youth Service empowerment Projects (Nairobi Region).* Kenyatta University.

PATH. (2013). Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation of Advocacy, Communication, and Social Mobilization to Support Tuberculosis Prevention and Care. USAID.

Peersman, G. (2014).Overview: Data Collection and Analysis Methods in Impact Evaluation, Methodological Briefs: Impact Evaluation 10, UNICEF Office of Research, Florence.

Rogers, P. (2009). *Matching Impact Evaluation Design to the Nature of the Intervention and the purpose of the Evaluation in Designing impact evaluations: different perspectives*. Working paper 4.London.

Shapiro, J. (2013). *Monitoring and Evaluation Approaches*. Johannesburg. S.A. CIVICUS.

Spooner, C. McDermott, S. (2008). M*onitoring and evaluation framework for Waverley Action for Youth Service* Social Policy Research Centre Report. University of New South Wales.

UNDP. (1997). *Overview of Support Cost Arrangements under the Successor Programming Arrangements* (issued 23). January 1997.

UNDP. (2001.*Managing for Results: Monitoring and Evaluation in UNDP*. A Results-Oriented Framework.

UNDP. (2009). *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*. New York, USA: UNDP.

USAIDS. (2000, June), *A Guide to Monitoring & Evaluation*. Geneva: Joint United Nations Programme.

Wachaiyu, V. W. (2016). *Monitoring and evaluation factors influencing success of development projects: A Case of Starehe Sub-County, Kenya*.

Wanjiru, W. E. (2013). *Determinants of Effective Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in Non-Governmental Organizations within Nairobi County, Kenya*. Kenyatta University Masters Dissertation.

Wateridge, J (1998). *How can IS/IT projects be measured for success?* Internal journal of projects management, 16(1), 59-63.

Wong, C. (2012). *Toward Building performance-Oriented management in China: The critical role of monitoring and evaluation in the long road ahead. Evaluation Capacity Development*. Washington DC: 2012 Independent Evaluation Group, the World Bank Group.

World Bank, (2002). *Monitoring & Evaluation: Some Tools, Methods and Approaches*. The World Bank, Washington, D.C.

World Bank, (2004). *Monitoring and Evaluation. Some methods, Tools and Approaches*. World Bank: Washington DC.

Zwikael, O. (2008). *Top management involvement in project management. A cross country study of the software industry.* Victoria Management School, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. International Journal of Managing Projects in Business Vol. 1 No. 4, 2008.

Appendix

QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear respondent,

1 am **Belayneh Melak Alemu**, a student of Addis Ababa University pursuing a Masters in Project Management. I am currently conducting a study on**: Assessment of challenges of monitoring and evaluation in projects implemented by Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change**. In this regard you have been selected to take part in this study as a respondent. Your participation is important for the success of this study. Kindly respond to all items to reflect your opinion and experience. The information provided will be only used for academic purpose and will be treated with utmost confidentiality. Please ticks the appropriate boxes which best suit your view and fill in the blanks where necessary.

Thanking you in advance.

Instruction: Read carefully and give appropriate answers by ticking the appropriate box. The information provided will only be for the purpose of this study.

Section A: General information.

1. Gender of respondents
   1. Male ( )
   2. Female ( )
2. Age of respondents
   1. Below 30 ( )
   2. 31-40 ( )
   3. 41-50 ( )
   4. Above 50 ( )
3. Highest level of Education so far attained
   1. Ph.Ds. ( )
   2. Masters ( )
   3. Undergraduate ( )
   4. Diploma ( )
   5. Certificate ( )

4. What is your current position in the organization?
   1. Monitoring & Evaluation Officer/specialist ( )
   2. Program manager ( )
   3. Project Manager ( )
   4. Field Officer ( )
   5. Project Coordinator ( )
   6. other, please specify ( )
5. Your work experience in monitoring and evaluation activities.
   1. Less than one year ( )
   2. 1-4 ( )
   3. 5-8 ( )
   4. 9-12 ( )
   5. Above 12 ( )

Section B: You are requested to respond to most of the items in the subsequent sections using the following scale by ticking the appropriate option.

1. SD	Strongly Disagree
2. D	Disagree
3. N	Not sure
4. A	Agree
5. SA	Strongly Agree

Budget Allocation related challenges for M & E

No	Statement	SD	D	NS	A	SA
1	The organization provides sufficient funds for monitoring and evaluation activities (about 5% -10% of projects budget)					
2	The organization ensures there is timely provision of funds for M&E					
3	Monitoring and evaluation budget can be obviously delineated within the overall project budget to give the monitoring and evaluation function the due recognition it plays in project running,					
4	There is autonomy in the budgetary decisions for the monitoring and evaluation unit					
5	Funds allocated are used for M&E activities only					

Top Management Support related challenges for M & E

No	Statement	SD	D	NS	A	SA
1	Senior management take active part in designing the M&E systems					
2	Top management ensure that staff are trained on M&E regularly					
3	The organization uses M&E findings in decision making					
4	Top management always and clearly communicate M&E results					
5	Top management allocate sufficient resource for M & E					
6	Organizational policy supports M&E					
7	There is supportive supervision and guidance from leaders					
8	The M&E activities are carried out within schedule					

M & E Tools and Methods used by MEFCC

a) What are some of the tools and methods used in monitoring and evaluation systems at MEFCC?

i)……

ii)……

b) Do you think there is any difficulty experienced in using the M&E Tools and Methods Used by MEFCC? Yes ( ) No ( )

c) If yes, what do you think is contributing to the difficulty?

i) The tools and Methods used ( )

ii) Influence of Management ( )

iii) Lack of Training of employees on M&E systems ( )

iv) Stakeholders Involvement ( )

v) Others ( ) Please specify……

d) What other tools and methods would you recommend for M&E systems at MEFCC?

i. ……..…

ii. ……....

iii. ……

M & E Tools and Methods related challenges for M & E

No	Statement	SD	D	NS	A	SA
1	M&E Tools and Methods are difficult to use					
2	Projects use scientifically valid standards of monitoring and evaluation tools, methods and approaches					
3	Logical frameworks are drafted at the design phase					
4	The logical frameworks provides the intended outcomes of projects					
5	The logical frameworks provides the planned outputs of projects					
6	M&E Tools and Methods use measureable objective, baseline, performance indicator, target and periodic reporting tool					
7	The logical frameworks clearly defines the indicators to track progress of projects					

Human Capacity related challenges for M & E

No	Statement	SD	D	NS	A	SA
1	Numerous training manuals, handbooks and toolkits have been developed for staffs working in M & E					
2	The organization has skilled personnel with adequate capacity to analyze data					
3	The monitoring and evaluation officers are knowledgeable in the day-to-day management of monitoring and evaluation systems					
4	Proper training and experience is vital for M&E results					
5	There are huge gaps in technical knowledge with regard to defining performance indicators, the retrieval, collection, preparation and interpretation of data					
6	The organization engage in training of the employees on monitoring and evaluation systems					
7	Staffs in M & E have defined role and responsibilities					

End

Thank you for your response