ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF COMMERCE

AN ASSESSMENT IN MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN THE CASE OF EIGHT TOWNS REHABLITATION PROGRAM IN ETHIOPIA ELECTRIC UTILITY

BY: SAMUEL DEMAS

Advisor: Tekelgiorgis A.(Ass. Prof.)

JUNE 2018

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF COMMERCE

DEPARTMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT

An Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Practices Of Eight Towns Distribution Rehabilitation Project: In the Case of Ethiopia Electric Utility

A Project Work Submitted to Addis Ababa University College of Business and Economics School of Commerce In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Project Management

By: Samuel Demas

June, 2018

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

SCHOOL OF COMMERCE

DEPARTMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT

An Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Practices Of Eight Towns Distribution Rehabilitation Project: In the Case of Ethiopia Electric Utility

Submitted to Addis Ababa University College of Business and Economics School of Commerce In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Project Management

By: Samuel Demas

Approved by:

Advisor	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Internal Examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
External Examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I sincerely acknowledge the dedicated intellectual guidance, supervision and academic support I have received from my advisor Ato Tekelgiogis A.(ass. Prof.). throughout the entire research with politeness and quick response. It is this guidance and support that enabled me to produce this project work.

My cordial thanks go to Ato Teffera Deribe head of the project office who is supporting me in distributing and cooperating the respondents and to those in my office who are willingly cooperated for the response and the valuable input they provide to the paper and all my colleagues for their valuable cooperation and contribution by providing me the important data and information.

Last, but not least, I would also like to thank my Respondents who gave their precious time and effort. This paper is not only my own effort but involvement of different peoples cooperation was contributed to accomplish my duty properly and thanks to all those who have contributed a valuable support.

Table of Contents Pages

Acknowledgement i
Table of content ii
List of Tables iv
Acronyms/Abbreviations iv
Abstract vi
Declaration vii

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION 1
1.1. Background of the study 1
1.2. Statement of the problem 2
1.3. Research Questions 3
1.4. Objectives of the study 3
1.4.1. General Objective 3
1.4.2. Specific Objectives 3
1.5. Significance of the study 4
1.6. Scope of the study 5
1.7 Organization of the Study 5
1.8 Limitation of the study 5
1.9 Operational Definitions 5
CHAPTER 2 RELATED LITERATURE REVIEW 6
2.1 Theoretical Literature Review 6
2.1.1 Overview 6
2.1.2 Implementation (Execution) 6
2.1.3 Monitoring and Evaluation 7
2.1.4 Purposes of Monitoring and Evaluation 8

2.1.5 Monitoring and Evaluation in the Context of RBM 8
2.1.6 Developing a Monitoring & Evaluation Plan 10
2.1.7 How to Develop a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan 10
2.1.8 Designing Project Monitoring and Evaluation 12
2.1.9 Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Tools, Methods and Approaches 15
2.1.9.1 How to collect monitoring information 16
2.1.10 How to use and learn from project evaluation 18
2.2 Empirical literature review 19
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 24
3.1 Research Design 24
3.1.1 Types of research methods 24
3.1.2 Target Population 24
3.1.3 Sampling and Sampling techniques 24
3.2. The research Process 25
3.2.1 Data Collection 25
3.2.1.1 Questionnaires 25
3.3 Data analysis method 25
3.4 Ethical consideration 25
3.5 Reliability and Validity 25
CHAPTER 4 PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRITATION OF DATA 26
4.1. Return Rate the responses 26
4.2 Demographic characteristics of the respondents 26
4.3. Expectation for the monitoring and evaluation 28
4.4. Monitoring and Evaluation Practice 30
4 .4.1.Monitoring and evaluation plan and design 31
4.4.2 Monitoring, Evaluation Process and Management 32
4.5 Summery of Findings 35

4.6 Analysis and Interpretations 36

4.7 Descriptive statics of independent variables 43

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 46

5.1. Conclusion 46

5.2. Recommendations 48

References 49

Appendices 52

List of tables

Table 4.1 Demographic characteristics

Table 4.2 Start end completed Date in terms of time and cost

Table 4.3 Expectation and practice Of Monitoring and evaluation

Table 4.4 monitoring and evaluation expectation

Table 4.5 Planning and design

Table 4.6 Process and management M&E

Table 4.7 Expectation correlation Matrix

Table 4.8 Planning and design Correlation Matrix

Table 4.9 Process management Correlation Matrix

Table 4.10 Mean and Standard Deviation of independent variables

Table 4.11 Expectation correlation

Table 4.12 Plan and Design correlation

Acronyms/Abbreviations

CSO- Civil Society organization

EEU- Ethiopia Electric Utility

GAS - Ghana Audit Service

GSAM- Ghana Strengthening Accountability Mechanisms

M & E- Monitoring and Evaluation

OBoFED - Oromia Bureau of Finance and Economic Development

PCC - Project coordination committee

ABSTRACT

This research project was mainly set out with general objective of assessing monitoring and evaluation practices of eight town distribution rehabilitation project of Ethiopia Electric Utility. To achieve its objective, the study employed descriptive research approach and secondary data was used. Questionnaires were used as data collection tools. Furthermore, it employed purposive sampling techniques. The generated data was analyzed using frequency, percentage and other statistical analysis methods such as stability and correlation. The study examined questionnaires, open ended questionnaire used better to identify the cases that respondents feel about the project. Most respondents described their feelings and understandings It was found out that there was lack of adequate and capable workforce on the project contractors and monitoring and evaluation group, lack of capacity building program, problems related with right off and interruption related issues are among some the respondents open ended responses, In addition the use of tools and techniques of evaluation, non presence of log frame, stakeholder involvement in planning and evaluation practices, non availability of separate budget for monitoring and evaluation are some of the drawback of the evaluation process. The result and analyses summarizes mentioned problems. In this analysis part the reliability and correlation between the variables also checked. Descriptive statistics was used to make the result and most of the analysis, but also tries to correlate the identified variables with negative response with each other and with the projects problem of not achieving the planned schedule and budget. Finally the discussion and recommendation is made in accordance with the findings and open ended responses. The recommendation part gives the main considerations that should be taken was emphasized to have effective implementation of project and real monitoring and evaluation process.

DECLARATION

I, Samuel Demas, declare that this work entitled—Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation practices in eight town's distribution rehabilitation project in the case of Ethiopia Electric Utility is the outcome of my own effort and study that all sources of materials used for the study have been duly acknowledged. I have produced it independently except for the guidance and suggestion of the research advisor.

This study has not been submitted for any degree in this University or any other University. It is offered for the partial fulfillment of the degree of Masters of Art in Project Management (MA).

By: Samuel Demas Signature _____ Date_____

Advisor: Tekelgiorgis A. (Ass. prof.) Signature_____ Date_____

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces about background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions and objectives, significance of the study, limitation of the study and definitions of terms used and organization of the study.

1.1 Background of the study

Chinese contractor commences work in Addis with USD 21Mil.The Ethiopian Electric Utility (EEU) has decided to rehabilitate, upgrade and expand electric power distribution networks of the country where eight major cities in Ethiopia are set to benefit from the nation-wide 85 million dollars project. The project is currently progressing from its design stages to its implementation phase. Out of the eight cities the Addis Ababa power distribution lines rehabilitation and upgrading project, in addition to the major rehabilitation works, will focus on upgrading the middle and low voltage feeders. A construction of 15KV express feeder that receives electric power from the Sululta, Legetafo and Gelan substations is to set commence. Currently, the capital has 330km low voltage electric distribution and 80km mid-voltage carrying lines transmitting power from the three main substations. In addition to Addis, Adama, Bahir Dar, Dessie, Dire Dawa, Hawassa and Jimma are the rest of the cities which will each get 300km of upgraded low voltage power distribution lines. The completion of the project will reduce significant power interruptions and blackouts which has been a challenge to these cities for many years. The project is also expected to address voltage drops and power loses during the time of transmissions and distributions (Birhanu Fikade, Reporter 2016).

Evaluation has a crucial role to play in today's results-based culture and in the context of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (Brighton, 2006). Governments and organisations face increasing internal and external pressures to demonstrate accountability, transparency and results. Results-based monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems are a powerful public management tool to achieve these objectives (Kusek, J., and Rist, R., 2004). Establishing international standards for methodological rigour, ethical practice and efficient management processes in M&E is another critical challenge. The international context for M&E is changing, with increasing focus on measuring results and critically analyzing aid

effectiveness. While there has been tangible progress in recent years, such as a growth in resources committed to M&E and growing independence of evaluation bodies, several challenges remain. Ethiopia is conducting a number of similar projects. Literatures indicate the importance of monitoring and evaluation for such developmental projects. Similar project monitoring and evaluation challenges are not unusual in our countries projects in general and in the companies project of EEP. Therefore an assessment of projects monitoring and evaluation practices in such projects will provide us important feedback about the evaluation of the project so that corrective action can be taken for similar projects undertaken at present and in the future.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Badly designed and managed evaluations can do more harm than good: misleading results can undermine the effective channelling of resources for poverty reduction. Designing effective M&E systems is not enough. Implementation, which include selecting appropriate indicators, establishing baselines, collecting quality data, and reporting and using findings effectively. Sustaining an M&E system within an organisation also presents considerable ongoing challenges (UNDP, 2009). An effective evaluation process is an integral part of any project. Conducting the evaluation itself is only one part of an ongoing process requiring stakeholder backing and the highest professional and ethical standards from all involved(UNEG, 2005). Why is monitoring and evaluation (M&E) still not being carried out effectively? (James Morton,2009). Development programmes are part of a political agenda. Evaluation can be extremely challenging, as it may confirm or confront the programme concerned, its underlying values, supporters and opponents (Bamberger et al,2006). Strong governance, accountability and transparency must all be considered when evaluating the likelihood of the long-term sustainability of public management policies and programmes(World Bank, 2005).

The M&ES of all the studied projects are based on the logical framework approach where the project identifies the inputs and processes as well as desired outputs, outcomes and impacts and then defines indicators that are used to monitor the progress towards these goals (World Bank, 2004). In the case of our countries also there are a number of projects which are undertaken starting from the past few years. Absence of adequate experience in the implementation and specially monitoring and evaluation is an observed fact of these projects

so that most of them are fail to achieve their objective as planned in terms of schedule cost and quality. This fact is also observed in the case of Ethiopia Electric Utility project of eight towns distribution rehabilitation projects(Birhanu Fikade, Reporter 2016)**..** Therefore it becomes very important to access the monitoring and evaluation of this project.

1.3 Research Questions

The research questions that has to be addressed by this literature are:-

1. How is the monitoring and evaluation expectations of concerned parties?
2. Is there a planning of monitoring and evaluation program in the project office?
3. What are the major monitoring and evaluation practices in the monitoring and evaluation process?

1.4 Objectives of the study

In consideration of the above stated statement of the problem and research questions, this study entails the following general and specific objectives.

1.4.1. General Objective

The general objective of this research is assessing the main monitoring and evaluation practices of the project from the monitoring and evaluation concept point of view.

1.4.2. Specific Objectives

Based on the general objective of the study and the research questions above, this study has the following specific objectives.

- To investigate the monitoring and evaluation expectations of concerned parties
- To explore how effectively the planning of M&E activities are implemented in the project.
- To analyze the monitoring and evaluation practices of the project.

1.5 Significance of the study

Evaluations can be a cost-effective way of improving the performance and impact of development activities (World Bank, 2004). Assessing the monitoring and evaluation of this specific project can contribute vital lesson to the other similar projects in the company and other projects the country as a whole. This study is believed to fill the existing gaps in applying effective projects monitoring and evaluation program. Therefore assessing the monitoring and evaluation process of such projects by comparing and contracting with literatures about the Knowledge area provides basic concepts and analysis of the gap and taking corrective action.

It is important to:

- Produce targeted lessons and recommendations for specific audiences, make better use of new technologies and talk candidly about success and failure
- Enhance the technical skills and specialized knowledge of personnel in agencies and partner countries and of consultants
- Involve development partners more centrally in the evaluation process: both in programme design and in using the results and ensuring that follow up action is implemented.

Therefore

- The research findings would serve as a useful source of information for project managers, development planners, practitioners, researchers and academician who are engaged in project M&E.
- The research findings would serve as a useful mirror for public sectors to enhance development projects by filling identified projects monitoring and evaluation gaps;
- The research findings would also be a useful source of information for researchers, graduate program students, public policy formulators and analysts while conducting studies on related topics.

- The research has also great methodological contribution for the upcoming post graduate students in that they can adapt the methodology employed in this study to their own research.

1.6 Scope of the study

The research is conducted on one distribution rehabilitation eight town project of Ethiopia Electric Utility. And the research conducted by questionnaire survey method on the project office of the project, own consultants and internal concerned stack holders of EEU.

1.7 Organization of the Study

This thesis has five chapters; The first chapter of the study is concerned with the introductory part of the study, The second chapter was devoted to related literature review. The third chapter is concerned with the research methodologies. The fourth chapter presents result and discussion and summary of the major findings. And, Chapter Five deals with conclusions and recommendations.

1.8 Limitation of the study

The study was conducted in a single project so as to have general characteristic. It was conducted using only questionnaires with limited number of respondents so that it may lack in depth analysis about the project monitoring and evaluation practices and take as general conclusion about monitoring and evaluation of other projects. Further investigation needs to be conducted using these findings so as to have basic general concept of monitoring and evaluation effect on the success of projects.

1.9 Operational Definitions

Monitoring:- It is usually an internal management activity conducted by the implementing agency.

Evaluation:- The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results.

CHAPTER 2

RELATED LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Literature Review

2.1.1 Overview

The project management plan provides a basis for evaluating the performance of the project during its implementation (Brahima Sanou). During implementation the Log Frame serves as a useful tool to review progress and take corrective action (World bank,2004)

2.1.2 Implementation (Execution)

Progress is continuously monitored and appropriate adjustments are made and recorded as variances from the original plan. The project manager uses this information to maintain control over the direction of the project by comparing the progress reports with the project plan to measure the performance of the project activities and take corrective action as needed. (Bpayne and Adrienne Watt,2017, Shelley Hen,2017)Throughout this step, project sponsors and other key stakeholders should be kept informed of the project's status according to the agreed-on frequency and format of communication. Status reports should always emphasize the anticipated end point in terms of cost, schedule, and quality of deliverables. (Bpayne and Adrienne Watt,2017, Shelley Hen,2017).

According to David Goulden Execution involves too much uncertainty, the execution phase of project management consists of following a set of preordained steps that will assist the team in the completion of all deliverables. He describes that the project will be on track towards a successful completion, as long as the team works effectively and adheres to the project plan.

Executing and monitoring stages include a continuous process of controlling so that planned activities take place and results are achieved as anticipated. The project coordinator could monitor the implementation of the project and ensure appropriate guidance where

necessary, including providing feedback after reception of quarterly progress report. This also will facilitate the project evaluation phase, and prevent potential problems in implementation(David Goulden,2017).

2.1.3 Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is a powerful public management tool that can be used to improve the way governments and organizations achieve results (Görgens, Marelize,2009)

OECD defines monitoring and evaluation as follows: (public service commission,2008)

"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 ongoing or completed project, program, or policy, including its design, implementation, and results. Monitoring gives information on where a policy, program, or project is at any given time (and over an extended period) relative to its targets and outcome goals. It is descriptive. Evaluation gives evidence about why targets and outcomes are, or are not, being achieved (OECD, 2010). One level focuses on the outputs, which are the specific products and services that emerge from processing inputs through programme, project and other activities such as through ad hoc soft assistance delivered outside of projects and programmes (OECD,2010). The other level focuses on the outcomes of development efforts, which are the changes in development conditions that an intervention aims to achieve through its projects and programmes. Outcomes incorporate the production of outputs and the contributions of partners(OECD,2010).

Feedback may consist of findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons from experience. It can be used to improve performance and as a basis for decision-making and the promotion of learning in an organization(OECD,2010). It is learning from experience.

The lessons learned from an activity through evaluation are considered evaluative knowledge, which stakeholders are more likely to internalize if they have been involved in the evaluation

process. Lessons learned can reveal "good practices" that suggest how and why different strategies work in different situations—valuable information that needs to be documented(OECD,2010).

2.1.4. Purposes of Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation help improve performance and achieve results. More precisely, the overall purpose of monitoring and evaluation is the measurement and assessment of performance in order to more effectively manage the outcomes and outputs known as development results. Performance is defined as progress towards and achievement of results. (Görgens, Marelize,2009).

According to Görgens, Marelize,2009 learning from the past contributes to more informed decision-making. Better decisions lead to greater accountability to stakeholders. Better decisions also improve performance.

Partnering closely with key stakeholders throughout this process also promotes shared knowledge creation and learning, helps transfer skills, and develops the capacity of projects for planning, monitoring and evaluation. These stakeholders also provide valuable feedback that can be used to improve performance and learning. In this way, good practices at the heart of monitoring and evaluation are continually reinforced, making a positive contribution to the overall effectiveness of development. (UNDP, 2002)

2.1.5 Monitoring and Evaluation in the Context of RBM

In an organization, results based management (RBM) aims to ensure that activities and resources contribute to the achievement of desired results, in terms of outputs, outcomes and the expected impact. A key component of RBM is monitoring the performance that helps to measure objectively how well the results are being achieved and report on measures taken to improve them. «It is said that if you do not know where you are going to, any road will take you there. This lack of direction is what Results-Based Management is supposed to avoid. It is

about choosing a direction and destination first, deciding on the route and the milestones, checking progress with a map and making direction adjustments as required in order to achieve the desired objectives.» (ITU,2013)

Outcome monitoring is a continual and systematic process of collecting and analyzing data to measure the performance of interventions towards achievement of outcomes at country level. While the process of outcome monitoring is continual in the sense that it is not a time-bound activity, outcome monitoring must be periodic, so that change can be perceived. In other words, offices will accumulate information on an ongoing basis regarding progress towards an outcome, and then will periodically compare the current situation against the baseline for outcome indicators and assess and analyze the situation. (ITU 2013, UNDP 2002)

How do Programme Managers carry out outcome monitoring? They track the outputs and measure their contributions to outcomes by assessing the change from baseline conditions. Programme Managers need to keep an eye on key outputs (the specific products and services that emerge from processing inputs through project/programme or non-project/programme activities) because they can indicate whether a strategy is relevant and efficient or not. Relevance in a results-based context refers to whether or not an intervention contributes to the achievement of a key outcome, supports national development priorities and targets appropriate groups(UNDP,2002, IFRC,2010)

To conduct effective outcome monitoring, Programme Managers need to establish baseline data, select outcome indicators of performance, and design mechanisms that include planned actions such as field visits, stakeholder meetings and systematic analysis or reports. Project Managers in particular will still be expected to monitor the implementation of their projects. This monitoring should be planned and integrated with any outcome monitoring to avoid duplication and to lower transaction costs. (ITU 2013, UNDP,2002)

An outcome evaluation is an evaluation that covers a set of related projects, programmes and strategies intended to bring about a certain outcome. Such evaluations assess how and why outcomes are or are not being achieved in a given context. They may also help to clarify underlying factors affecting the situation, highlight unintended consequences (positive and negative), recommend actions to improve performance in future programming, and generate lessons learned. These periodic and in-depth assessments use “before and after” monitoring data. Outcome evaluations may fulfill different needs at different times throughout the

programming cycle. If conducted early in the cycle, they can supply information about potential impediments; if conducted halfway through the cycle, they can suggest mid-course adjustments; and if conducted at the end, they can contribute to lessons learned that could guide work in the outcome during the next cycle. An outcome evaluation extracts lessons learned, findings and recommendations by assessing Progress towards the outcome; Factors contributing to the outcome (substantive influences); Key contributions (outputs, including those produced through "soft" assistance) to outcomes; The partnership strategy (how the intervention works with its partners) (UNDP,2002).

2.1.6 Developing a Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

A Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan is a guide as to what you should evaluate, what information you need, and who you are evaluating for. The plan outlines the key evaluation questions and the detailed monitoring questions that help answer the evaluation questions. This allows to identify the information you need to collect, and how you can collect it.(Damien Sweeney and Martin Pritchard,2010).

The plan should be able to be picked up by anyone involved in the project at anytime and be clear as to what is happening in terms of monitoring and evaluation. An evaluation plan should ideally be done at the planning stage of a project, before you commence implementation. This will allow you to plan ahead of time and data collection activities that you may need to undertake, such as pre-intervention surveys. However, it is never too late to develop an M&E plan. (Damien Sweeney and Martin Pritchard,2010).

2.1.7 How to Develop a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Identify who the evaluation audience or stakeholders are. The evaluation audience include the people or organizations that require an evaluation to be conducted. There may be multiple audiences, each with their own requirements. Typically, this includes the funding agency, and may also include partner organizations, the Council (or Councilors), the project team, and the project's participants or target group. Evaluation is generally undertaken for accountability, or learning, and preferably both together. If you have limited funds for evaluation, you may have to priorities your evaluation by identifying who are the most important people to report to(Damien Sweeney and Martin Pritchard,2010).

Evaluation questions should be developed up-front, and in collaboration with the primary audience(s) and other stakeholders who you intend to report to. Evaluation questions go beyond measurements to ask the higher order questions such as whether the intervention is worth it, or could if have been achieved in another way. Overall, evaluation questions should lead to further action such as project improvement, project mainstreaming, or project redesign. You should also identify at this stage whether the evaluation audience has specific timelines by which it requires an evaluation report. This will be a major factor in deciding what you can and cannot collect(Damien Sweeney and Martin Pritchard,2010).

In order to answer evaluation questions, monitoring questions must be developed that will inform what data will be collected through the monitoring process. Monitoring questions are quite specific in what they ask, compared to evaluation questions. The monitoring questions will ideally be answered through the collection of quantitative and qualitative data. It is important to not leap straight into the collection of data, without thinking about the evaluation questions. Jumping straight in may lead to collecting data that provides no useful information, which is a waste of time and money. If you have developed a program logic, you can use this to start identifying relevant monitoring questions and indicators. Once you have identified monitoring question in your program logic, you can transfer them into your M&E Plan Template (Damien Sweeney and Martin Pritchard 2010).

The next step is to identify what information you need to answer your monitoring questions (indicators) and where this information will come from (data sources). It is important to consider data collection, in terms of the type of data and any type of research design. Data sources could be participant themselves, or people's homes (eg. audit of lighting types) or metering, or even literature. You can then decide on the most appropriate method to collect the data from the data source (Damien Sweeney and Martin Pritchard 2010).

It is advisable to assign responsibility for the data collection so that everyone is clear of their roles and responsibilities. This also allows new staff to come onto the project and get a sense of who is responsible for what, and what they may have to take on and when. Collection of monitoring data may occur regularly over short intervals, or less regularly, such as half-yearly or annually. Again, assigning timelines limits the excuse of 'not knowing'. You may also want to note any requirements that are needed to collect the data (staff, budget etc). It is

advisable to have some idea of the cost associated with monitoring, as you may have great ideas to collect a lot of information, only to find out that you cannot afford it all. In such a case, you will have to either priorities or find some money elsewhere(Damien Sweeney and Martin Pritchard,2010).

Identify who will evaluate the data, how it will be reported, and when. This step is optional but highly recommended, as it will round off the M&E plan as a complete document. Remembering that evaluation is the subjective assessment of a project's worth, it is important to identify who will be making this 'subjective assessment'. (Damien Sweeney and Martin Pritchard,2010)

Once completed M&E plan, highlight data sources that appear frequently. Considering re-ordering the M&E plan in several ways, for example, by data source, or by data collection timeframe.(Damien Sweeney and Martin Pritchard,2010).

2.1.8 Designing Project Monitoring and Evaluation

Good monitoring and evaluation design during project preparation is a much broader exercise than just the development of indicators. Good design has five components:

Clear statements of measurable objectives for the project and its components, for which indicators can be defined; A structured set of indicators, covering outputs of goods and services generated by the project and their impact on beneficiaries;

Provisions for collecting data and managing project records so that the data required for indicators are compatible with existing statistics, and are available at reasonable cost; Institutional arrangements for gathering, analyzing, and reporting project data, and for investing in capacity building, to sustain the M&E service; Proposals for the ways in which M&E findings will be fed back into decision making. (Bamberger, Michael and Hewitt Eleanor,1986).

Projects are designed to further long-term sect oral goals, but their immediate objectives, at least, should be readily measurable. Input indicators are quantified and time-bound statements of resources to be provided. Information on these indicators comes largely from accounting and management records. A good accounting system is needed to keep track of expenditures

and provide cost data for performance analysis of outputs. Input indicators are used mainly by managers closest to the tasks of implementation, and are consulted frequently, as often as daily or weekly(Derck Poate1996, Appleton, Simon 1996, Casley, Dennis J. and Kfishna Kumar 1987, World Bank 1994).

Process indicators measure what happens during implementation. Often, they are tabulated as a set of contracted completions or milestone events taken from an activity plan. Output indicators show the immediate physical and financial outputs of the project: physical quantities, organizational strengthening, initial flows of services. They include performance measures based on cost or operational ratios(Derck Poate 1996, Appleton, Simon 1996, Casley, Dennis J. and Kfishna Kumar 1987, World Bank 1994). Impact indicators refers to medium or long-term developmental change. (Some writers also refer to a further class of outcome indicators, more specific to project activities than impact indicators, which may be sect oral statistics, and deal more with the direct effect of project outputs on beneficiaries.) Measures of change often involve complex statistics about economic or social welfare and depend on data that are gathered from beneficiaries. Early indications of impact may be obtained by surveying beneficiaries' perceptions about project services. This type of leading indicator has the twin benefits of consultation with stakeholders and advance warning of problems that might arise **(**Appleton, Simon 1996, Casley, Dennis J. and Kfishna Kumar 1987, World Bank 1994). Performance indicators are measures of inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes, and impacts for development projects, programs, or strategies. When supported with sound data collection perhaps involving formal surveys—analysis and reporting, indicators enable managers to track progress, demonstrate results, and take corrective action to improve service delivery. Participation of key stakeholders in defining indicators is important because they are then more likely to understand and use indicators for management decision-making (World bank,2004).

The achievement of project objectives normally depends on how project beneficiaries respond to the goods or services delivered by the project. Evidence of their response and the benefits they derive requires consultation and data collection that may be outside the scope of management. It is important to identify how beneficiaries are expected to respond to project services, because managers will need evidence of that response if they are to modify their

activities and strategy. Indications that beneficiaries have access to, are using, and are satisfied with project services give early indication that the project is offering relevant services and that direct objectives are likely to be met(Derck Poate 1996, Appleton, Simon 1996, Casley, Dennis J. and Kfishna Kumar 1987, World Bank 1994).

To measure output and impact may require the collection of data from sample surveys or special studies (including, where appropriate, participatory methods). Studies to investigate specific topics may call for staff skills and training beyond those needed for regular collection of data to create a time series. In the project plan, proposals to collect data for studies should include a discussion of: the objectives of the study or survey; the source of data; choices and proposed method of collection; and likely reliability of the data(Derck Poate, 1996).

Before data from sources are chosen as indicators of project impact the designer needs to confirm that the data systems are in place and reliable and that the data are valid for the administrative area in question and for any control areas. To give the comparability needed for evaluation, study proposals should explain and justify the proposed approach and ensure consistency in methods. The complexity of the statistics and problems of attributing causality mean that often it is more appropriate to use the delivery of services and beneficiary response as proxy indicators than to attempt to measure impact(Derck Poate 1996, Appleton, Simon 1996, Casley, Dennis J. and Kfishna Kumar 1987, World Bank 1994). Participatory methods of data collection can bring new insights into peoples' needs for project planning and implementation, but are no less demanding on skills than questionnaire surveys. They are time-consuming and require substantial talent in communication and negotiation between planners and participants(Appleton, Simon 1996, Casley, Dennis J. and Kfishna Kumar 1987, World Bank 1994).

Institutional arrangements; capacity building

Upgrading skills in monitoring and evaluation, which include project analysis, design of indicators and reporting systems, socioeconomic data collection, and information management; improving procedures, to create functional systems that seek out and use

information for decisions; and strengthening organizations to develop skilled staff in appropriate positions, accountable for their actions.

How Monitoring and Evaluation Findings Can Be Fed Back into Decision Making

In projects where operating performance standards are quoted as an objective, or where decentralized processes call for localized capacity to plan and manage work programs and budgets, designers will need to describe how and when M&E findings will be used to shape work plans and contribute to program or policy development(Derck Poate1996, World Bank 1994).

The analysis of implementation will depend on the functioning of a central database about sub-projects, created in each state from standardized data sheets. The database will produce the reports required for the project approval procedures, giving an incentive to field staff to use the system. Results from the implementation database will be analyzed in order to target field reviews and a mid-term review. The project has no specific monitoring and evaluation unit. Instead, each management sub-unit responsible for technical oversight of a component is responsible for ensuring the quality and timeliness of data collection, and for producing and analyzing reports. These reports will be presented by project component and be used to help diagnose technical and institutional implementation issues, propose and conduct studies, and plan institutional development and training (Derck Poate 1996, World Bank 1994).

2.1.9 Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Tools, Methods and Approaches

According to World Bank 2002 Some of the tools and approaches are complementary or substitutes; some are broad in scope, others narrower. The nine M&E methods are:

- Performance indicators. These measure inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes and impacts of development interventions. They are used for setting targets and measuring progress towards them.
- The logical framework (Log Frame) approach. This identifies objectives and expected causal links and risks along the results chain. It is a vehicle for engaging partners and can help improve program design.

- Theory-based evaluation. Similar to the Log Frame approach, this provides a deeper understanding of the workings of a complex intervention. It helps planning and management by identifying critical success factors.
- Formal surveys. These are used to collect standardized information from a sample of people or households. They are useful for understanding actual conditions and changes over time.
- Rapid appraisal methods. These are quick, cheap ways of providing decision-makers with views and feedback from beneficiaries and stakeholders. They include interviewing, focus groups and field observation.
- Participatory methods. These allow stakeholders to be actively involved in decision-making. They generate a sense of ownership of M&E results and recommendations, and build local capacity.
- Public expenditure tracking surveys. These trace the flow of public funds and assess whether resources reach the intended recipients. They can help diagnose service-delivery problems and improve accountability.
- Cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis. These tools assess whether the cost of an activity is justified by its impact. Cost-benefit measures inputs and outputs in monetary terms, whereas cost-effectiveness looks at outputs in non-monetary terms.

Impact evaluation

This is the systematic identification of the effects of an intervention on households, institutions and the environment, using some of the above methods. It can be used to gauge the effectiveness of activities in reaching the poor (World Bank ,2002)

2.1.91 How to collect monitoring information

Before embarking on data collection it is necessary to be clear on what the mentoring or befriending project does and what it wants to achieve. Know the kind of information looking to collect from the indicators. These will help to monitor and assess progress(World Bank ,2002)

Monitoring information should be collected regularly and systematically so you can check that your mentoring or befriending project is running as it should be. For your outcome indicators you will need a baseline so you can measure progress. Collect information from your service users when you first meet them – you can use this as your baseline. You can then gather information as frequently as you think best, however this should be at least twice. Bear in mind your resources and how much time you are able to spend on monitoring and evaluation*(World Bank ,2002).*

Choose tools that will work for you and your service users Think through the type of information you need and which tools will provide this. You must also be mindful of who you are collecting information from and what methods are appropriate (World Bank ,2002). Tools you can think about using include: records and forms such as case notes, registration forms, feedback forms, meeting minutes, observation sheets to observe interactions between people or record change in behaviour or attitudes of mentees or befriendees, questionnaires to be completed online, on paper or over the phone, interviews which can be structured around specific questions or unstructured, group discussions such as focus groups or meetings ,participatory/visual tools such as photographs, videos, relationship maps, body maps, coments wall *(World Bank ,2002).*

Using and adapting tools that have already been developed can save you time and many have been tried and tested. You might want to ask other mentoring or befriending organisations about the tools they use. However, you need to make sure that the tools are appropriate for your mentoring or befriending project. They will need to help measure the outcomes you have identified. If you use the tools of other organisations you will probably need to tailor them to your project*(World Bank ,2002).*

It is always a good idea to test data collection tools before using them *(World Bank ,2002)*

.

2.1.10 How to use and learn from project evaluation

One of the most important things you can do when evaluating your mentoring or befriending project is to learn from the findings and act on them. The evaluation might highlight that an aspect of your project isn't working as well as you thought or isn't making the difference you hoped for. What could you do differently to improve your project? If you are going to make changes make sure you communicate this internally, including with your mentors and befrienders, and explain why they are happening(World Bank ,2002).

Make the most of your evaluation findings and share them with others outside your organization *(World Bank ,2002).*

It is always a good idea to reflect on how you are monitoring and evaluating your project and how you could improve it *(World Bank ,2002).*

If you would like to review and improve the way you plan, evidence, communicate and learn from your evaluation *(World Bank ,2002)*..

2.2 Empirical literature review

Empirical research is any research that is based on experimentation or observation or quantitative measurement. It can be research in health, natural, and social sciences. The idea is as old as ancient Greece, when empiricists rejected the prevailing thought that theory and abstract reasoning were all that were necessary. Tied into the idea of "empirical research" is the scientific method of working of testing a hypothesis through observation and experiment (John Henderson)

The review presented here tries to support the study issues by related Empirical literatures even if there is lack of studies about the knowledge area or getting of them. The researcher tries to present related literatures to have clear understanding about the subject mater from some of empirical studies. The first empirical study which have related issue is GMagali Simarda*, Danielle Labergea in their case study about Governance representations in temporary organization: a case of governance sense making which is a case study that took place in a large IT business project, which was planned to bring business process changes.

They have explored in more depth the governance of the multidisciplinary coordination performed within the PCC. The study indicates that middle-managers and supervisors do participate in the operationalization of the project strategy coming from the top managers, and to its monitoring. They explore the operationalization of project governance by these delegated bodies which are called project coordination committee (PCC). It was assumed having different disciplines from different sectors of the permanent company will have a positive effect for project performance. But from their case study, these managers were isolated from the project day-to-day and dependent upon their chain of command to get information and action. Additionally, the project manager was lacking formal power, especially on resources. According to some literatures, mentioned in the case study, like Mintzberg , the matrix model is prone to conflicts. Larson & Gobeli , among several authors, are adding that matrix mode is inefficient. However, organizations are still using matrix modes in projects, and according to Pettigrew and al., projects do not replace existing organizational forms; they overlap with them in the permanent organizations, thus bringing additional complexity to the way we organize. It is the impact to be envisioned for the project manager role? The practice was ambiguous so that non-collaboration between the permanent and temporary organizations and produces significant negative impacts in the project. The importance of studying in more depth the project governance was also suggested, especially at the intersection and the juxtaposition of governance and coordination. They describe that literature states that project governance structures tend to be horizontal, informal; that they are coordination mechanism. However, in parallel, in order for coordination to happen, accountability is needed, which usually implies some form of governance.

Second review is research conducted by the title End Line Impact Evaluation conducted on Ghana strengthening accountability mechanism (GSAM) project. A USAID/Ghana contracted Social Impact, Inc. to conduct an impact evaluation of USAID's Ghana Strengthening Accountability Mechanisms (GSAM) program, which aims to increase accountability of local District Assemblies in Ghana. The randomized-controlled trial, impact evaluation tests the effect of two distinct efforts to increase accountability and improve service delivery outcomes at the district level.

They hypothesized that GSAM programming (both CSO and GAS interventions) would have the following effects: Improvement in the quality of capital projects and service

delivery provided at the district level; Improvement in the quality of district governance; Increased government accountability and citizen engagement.

The study utilizes a randomized control trial design to test the impacts of each intervention of the program. To assess the individual effect of each intervention, the evaluation design is a three-arm district-clustered, triplet-blocked randomized control trial. The three treatment arms of the IE, consisting of the different interventions received (GAS Performance Audits with information campaign, CSO Social Audits with information campaign, or pure control). Districts were randomized into these three treatments across Ghana's 10 regions. A comparison of findings in GAS districts versus control and CSO versus control provides the average program impact on each of the components laid out in the hypotheses above. Baseline, midline and end line data collection include: (1) a household survey, (2) an administrator survey, (3) a politician survey, and (4) administrative data, including Annual Progress Reports issued by district governments and the GAS's 2016 report on financial irregularities in the districts. For baseline and end line data collection, the household, politician and administrator surveys are structured quantitative instruments. They organize their presentation of results by the data source, (a) household results, (b) administrator results, (c) politician results, and district outcomes, and by the three outcome families, (a) development projects and service delivery, (b) district governance quality, and (c) accountability and citizen engagement. They also examine program effects on awareness of GSAM. CSO programming has generally had more effects on citizen than GAS programming, while GAS programming has had a bigger effect on governance quality. Across treatment arms, program effects have generally been stronger on citizen perceptions of district governments and their stated willingness to hold DA officials accountable, even if that has not been accompanied with more activism or participation. GSAM has 44 GSAM End line Impact Evaluation limited effects specifically on the governance of development projects, but GAS programming has encouraging effects on overall governance quality, particularly the incidence of partisan manipulation of public resources.

Both CSO and GAS programming generally reduce citizen satisfaction with projects and services, but this is largely driven by districts that receive negative audit reports. That citizens are correctly attributing bad audit performance to poor-performing DAs is encouraging from the point of view of accountability. This progress with citizens has not, however, translated

into many substantial changes in how administrators or politicians manage projects or project budgets.

As discussed below, changing deep institutional practices bearing on project completion rates and financial irregularities will likely require more sustained institutional and fiscal change than is possible with a program like GSAM. Nevertheless, the overall results are consistent with some important improvements in accountability and project outcomes—citizens are sensitive to negative project outcomes and report increased willingness to hold DAs accountable. At the same time, DAs have somewhat reduced partisan manipulation of budgets and increased responsiveness to citizens. In short, GSAM has had some positive effects on the citizen-led, demand side of accountability, and some on the supply side of governance.

In the case of Ethiopia A research with a title An Assessment of Public Project Monitoring and Evaluation Practices of Oromia: the Case of Oromia Bureau of Finance and Economic Development(OBoFED)**(**Geremew Dida Wirtu, 2016) is conducted with the general objective to assess the public project monitoring and evaluation system by taking monitoring and evaluation practice of OBoFED in relation to the implementation of public projects in the region. A qualitative approach was adopted and information was collected through an in-depth interview; focus group discussion; and semi-structured questionnaires distributed to the respondents by the researcher. A target populations were all employees of OBoFED those working as managers, directors, M&E experts/officers and other experts (such as planners). The researcher confirmed that all of the respondents had ample work experience, position, educational background to deliver rational information to the study and they met the standard assumed to have a minimum of 3 years work experience to be considerable respondent. The discussion was finalized by forwarding some suggestions such as, OBoFED should pay attention to its due responsibility of M&E and capacitate its existing experts while recruiting skilled people, should develop a coherent plan and implement it appropriately. While reviewing whether there was a monitoring and evaluation plan at regional level, it was identified that at regional level, there were no monitoring and evaluation plan, clear policy guideline, separate budget allocated to M&E activities. M&E works were only based on the sectors‟ monitoring and evaluation plan to deliver monitorial and evaluation reports. The researcher then summarizes Presence of designed project monitoring and evaluation tools like checklists, review of administrative records and files, interview, questionnaires, focus group

discussion, case studies and cost-benefits analysis; The presence of evaluation indicators criteria which include: efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, feasibility, socio-economic and impacts; The general public project monitoring and evaluation practices were participatory in nature; At regional level, public project monitoring and evaluation tasks were conducted in a planned and regular manner. Both at regional and district levels public projects steering committee utilize monitoring and evaluation reports to take the requested corrective measures to enhance project performance;

The weaknesses of public project monitoring and evaluation practices were found out Lack of conducting outcomes evaluation; Monitoring and evaluation practices were unplanned and conducted in irregular bases; Lack of project evaluation principles and standards; Limitation of professional manpower, specially, the absences of engineers to deliver knowledge-based monitoring and evaluation for construction sub-components; Lack of separate budget and plan for project M&E activities.

The recommendations forwarded are the needs to reconsider the human resource structure during project design for future public project implementation and the composition of the human resource alignment with sub-projects and their nature enable the implementing agent to deliver professional monitoring and evaluation. coordination office to utilize the project resources only for project purposes requires continuous M&E; Involving all key stakeholders in all phases of the project starting from conception up to the operation improves its monitoring and incorporating project evaluation principles and standards into the M&E guideline helps to be consistent; Since planning not having separate plan and budget for M&E of public projects can affect the success of project it is suggested to have separate plan and proportional budget.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research methodology is a way to systematically solve the research problem. It may be understood as a science of studying how research is done scientifically. Researchers need to understand the assumptions underlying various techniques and they need to know the criteria by which they can decide that certain techniques and procedures will be applicable to certain problems and others will not. All this means that it is necessary for the researcher to design his methodology for his problem as the same may differ from problem to problem. when we talk of research methodology we not only talk of the research methods but also consider the logic behind the methods we use in the context of our research study and explain why we are using a particular method or technique and why we are not using others so that research results are capable of being evaluated either by the researcher himself or by others(C.R. Kothari,2014, Dr.I.Selvaraj). It is therefore mandatory to have select the appropriate ways of conducting a research in order to reach reliable conclusion and recommendation.

3.1 Research Design

A sufficiently formulated research design would ensure that the information gathered is consistent with the study objectives and that the data are collected by accurate procedures (G. Rajasekhar,2014) Decisions regarding what, where, when, how much, by what means concerning an inquiry or a research study constitute a research design. "A research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure." In fact, the research design is the conceptual structure within which research is conducted; it constitutes the blueprint for the collection, measurement and analysis of data(C.R. Kothari,2015).

3.1.1 Types of research methods

This is an applied type of research since it is applying the existing knowledge to solve a certain problem. It is also a descriptive type since we are attempting to describe certain categories of application by identifying certain problem areas (C.R. Kothari,2015). It is also identified Several Methods(viz., observation, questionnaires, interviewing, examination of records, etc.), when conducting descriptive research. It is also a quantitative method of

research from their definition quantitative research is based on the measurement of quantity or amount. It is applicable to phenomena that can be expressed in terms of quantity.

3.1.2 Target Population

For this research, the target populations were those who are involved in managing (Sponsor organization, Contractor and sub contractor and consultants (own force at this time). They were selected from the EEU project sponsor office team workers, supervisors, officials, and managerial level officials and project heads, consultants and their staff members(In this case own force consultants) and those concerned parties and higher officials about the project for the questionnaire. 50 questionnaires are expected to be responded.

3.1.3 Sampling and Sampling techniques

Researchers usually cannot make direct observations of every individual in the population they are studying. Instead, they collect data from a subset of individuals – a *sample* – and use those observations to make inferences about the entire population. Therefore in this research Non-probability (deliberate sampling, purposive sampling) is used because items for the sample are deliberately and purposively selected because the sampling size is very small to represent the entire population efficiently and not exposed to sampling error (C.R. Kothari,2015, G.RAJASEKHAR 2015).

3.2. The research Process

3.2.1 Data Collection

The task of data collection begins after a research problem has been defined and research design/ plan chalked out. While deciding about the method of data collection to be used for the study, the researcher keep in mind primary. The primary data are those which are collected afresh and for the first time, and thus happen to be original in character(C.R. Kothari,2015). This research used primary data collection of types questionnaires as a data collection tools.

3.2.1.1 Questionnaires

A questionnaire is defined as a formalized schedule for collecting data from respondents. It may be called as a schedule, interview form or measuring instrument(G.Rajasekhar,2014). We use questionnaire because it is vital for the survey in order to have a true reflection of the M&E practices of the project area. The questionnaires are arranged by closed ended, likert

scale and open ended type so that full information can be obtained from the respondents for triangulation of the response.

3.2 Data analysis method

A researcher's important function is the appropriate interpretation of different types of statistical data with the help of his tools. The preliminary statistical work consists of collection, classification, tabulation, presentation and analysis of data. The most important part of the statistical work consists in the proper use of the statistical tools in the interpretation of data(C.R. Kothari 2017).The quantitative data obtained through the use of the survey questionnaire in this study was analyzed by using the tables, frequencies, percentages, correlation and other descriptive analysis methods.

3.3 Ethical consideration

The researcher will took into account the ethical obligations to the professionals in the industry whose input from the research questionnaire were kept confidential and will only be used for academic purposes. Respondents to the questionnaire had the right not to answer questions that they felt were not appropriate without any intimidation. Respondents were given assurance about anonymity of their responses.

3.4 Reliability and Validity

The validity of the questionnaires was proved by researchers who are conducting on the same issues(Geremew Dida Wirtu,2016) and conceptual point of view of the literature review . The questionnaires are used by customizing and changing the content in accordance with the issue of the paper and according to literatures. Reliability was checked using statistical reliability test.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRITATION OF DATA

This chapter deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data obtained through questionnaire. The results are depicted in the form of figures, tables and also using descriptive statistical procedures MS-excel, tables and percentages. Analysis, major findings and discussion are also included. Basically, for the sake of clarity and coherence, the data gathered through different tools have been presented separately in different sub-sections. This section with analysis of questionnaires administered to EEU M&E experts/workers own force consultants and internal stakeholder of EEU concerned parties. The data was collected from Project management M&E experts/officers, EEU UEAP (own force consultant substitute), and Internal stake holders , concerned parties, working in related areas. The analysis is made with Non parametric test because there is not Known parameters about the data. For analysis of descriptive statistics of five Likert scale according to Zaidaton & Bagheri (2009) the mean score below 3.39 considered to be low, score from 3.40 up to 3.79 moderate and score above 3.79 huge. After checking the reliability test for each likert scale and using descriptive analysis of the likert scale, analysis is made by the percentage value and the mean calculated value.

4.1. Return Rate the responses

For the purpose of gathering a primary data, questionnaires were distributed to sample public project M&E experts. Accordingly, from 50 of the questionnaires distributed to the respondents 80 percent was collected.

4.2 Demographic characteristics of the respondents

Table 4.1. Demographic characteristics

Descriptions	Category	Count/ frequency	Percent
Sex	Male	33	85
	Female	6	15
	Total	39	100
Age	21-30	7	18
	31-40	20	51
	41-50	9	23
	above 40	3	8
	Total	39	100
Current academic Qualification	Ma/Msc	7	18
	BA/BSC	28	72
	Diploma	4	10
	Total	39	100
Position in the organization	Middle Manager	17	44
	Project Manager	2	5
	M&E expert/officer	3	7
	Other	17	44
	Total	39	100
Service year in the organization	Below 5 years	5	13
	5-10	17	44
	10.01- 20	7	18
	Above 20 years	10	25
	Total	39	100

Source: own computation, June, 2018

As can be observed from table 4.1, 85 percent of the respondents are male and 15 percent female. Regarding respondents education level, 72 percent of them hold their first degree, while 18 percent hold Master's degree, 10 percent diploma, and none of the respondents hold Doctorate degree. Regarding respondents position both middle management and Other are 44 percent each, 5 percent project managers were 7 percent M&E experts/officers. Regarding the general work experience of the respondents, 44 percent of the respondents had 5- 10 years of work experience. 13 percent below 5 years of experience, and 18 percent from 10-20 experience and the rest 25 percent above 20 years. Thus, it is possible to consider that all of

the respondents had a good experience, Age and Educational background to give reasonable response. From this, it is possible to conclude that these respondents were able to provide reliable information about monitoring and evaluation that were practiced in the project, just because of their high level experience with the project and to the theme of the study

Table 4.2. Start end completed Date in terms of time and cost

Descriptions	Category	Frequency	Percent
Projects in eight towns start and completed as per planned in terms of time and cost	Yes	3	7.7
	No	36	92.3
	Partially	0	0
	Total	39	100

Source: own computation, June 2018

As the report indicates 92 percent of the respondents agree the project was not successful with respect to time and cost. The mean and standard deviation 1.92 and .27 which is below the median value 2 indicating there is no success in the project with respect to time and cost.

4.3. Expectation for the monitoring and evaluation

Table 4.3. Monitoring and evaluation Expectations

Descriptions	Category	Frequency	Percent
M&E reporting expectations from Management, Government and loaners	Very strict	4	10
	Strict	19	49
	Lenient	14	36
	Very Lenient	1	3
	Total	38	98
Practice of report from the government, societies and local administration side.	Very strict	2	5
	Strict	14	36
	Lenient	20	51
	Very Lenient	3	8
	Total	39	100

Source: own computation June, 2018

The reliability of the scale was tested with statistical reliability analysis method of SPSS and got a Cronbach's Alpha value of .899 because of near to 1 that indicate it is reliable. Normally distribution checked by non parametric test.39 respondents for the governments and loan expectation for monitoring and evaluation. Then 10 percent said it is very strict 49 percent believe to be strict expectation, 36 percent of the respondents very lenient expectation of government and loaners only 3 percent believe expectation to be very lenient. For the second question about societies, Government and local administration practice of report only 5 percent said very strict, 36 percent strict and 51percent lenient and 8 percent very lenient. This implies that there is strong expectation but practice of report is lenient. Ten quantity of Five level scale that are capable of measuring the existence of expectations are included in the questionnaire so that the respondents response described by descriptive statistics central tendency measurements and presented as follows.

Table 4.4 Monitoring and evaluation expectation

Description	Mean	Std. Deviation	Strongly Disagree Count (%)	Disagree Count (%)	Neither Agree Nor Disagree Count (%)	Agree Count (%)
Presence of Project management office M & E Program	3.31	1.004	2 (5.1%)	7 (17.9%)	9 (23.1%)	19 (48.7%)
Adequate and Capable workforce for the project Office	2.95	1.075	4 (10.3%)	9 (23.1%)	13 (33.3%)	11 (28.2%)
Allocates resources(Human resource, Budget) for M&E	3.28	.887	1 (2.6%)	7 (17.9%)	12 (30.8%)	18 (46.2%)
Development of Capacity building program for M&E	2.69	1.080	4 (10.3%)	15 (38.5%)	12 (30.8%)	5 (12.8%)
Installed data acquisition plan	3.00	.959	1 (2.6%)	12 (30.8%)	13 (33.3%)	10 (25.6%)
Stake holders involvement in M&E	2.87	1.080	3 (7.7%)	14 (35.9)	11 (28.2)	9 (23.1)
Standardized Data collection Analyzing Method	2.82	1.048	2 (5.1%)	7 (17.9%)	10 (25.6%)	19 (48.7%)

Documentation and information sharing	3.26	.966	2 (5.1%)	7 (17.9%)	10 (25.6%)	19 (48.7%)
Culture of disseminating M&E findings	2.90	.852	2 (5.1%)	10 (25.6%)	17 (43.6%)	10 (25.6%)
There is a policy legal framework of M&E	3.03	1.038	3.03	1.038	13 (33.3)	10 (25.6%)

Source: own computation, June 2018

As can be seen from the table respondents agree on the presence of Project management office M & E Program, Allocates resources(Human resource, Budget) for M&E, Standardized Data collection Analyzing Method, Culture of disseminating M&E findings. They disagree and strongly disagree for Development of Capacity building program for M&E, Stake holder involvement in M&E. Those items in dilemma are Adequate and Capable workforce for the project Office with 28.2 percent agreement and 23.1 percent disagreement and mean value 2.95 which is below median of 3 and have tendency of disagreement of not having adequate capable work force , Installed data acquisition plan with 25.6 percent agreement and 30.8 percent disagreement and mean value of 3.00 and have a tendency of disagreement installed data acquisition plan, Culture of disseminating M&E findings with 25.6 percent agreement and 25.6 percent disagreement with a mean value of 2.9 and indicative of the non existence.

4.4. Monitoring and Evaluation Practice

4 .4.1.Monitoring and evaluation plan and design

Here it was addressed the practice of monitoring and evaluation in terms of design and plan and the responds summarized using descriptive statistics frequency with percentage values as shown below.

Table 4.5 Planning and design

Description	Mean	Std. Deviation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree
Do stakeholder involved in the planning of the M&E processes?	2.77	1.012	4 (10.3%)	12 (30.8%)	13 (33.3%)	9 (23.1%)
Involvement of stakeholders in the M&E activities?	2.97	.986	3 (7.7%)	8 (20.5%)	17 (43.6%)	9 (23.1%)
Are there indicators linked to the objectives of the program/project?	3.29	.835	8 (20.5%)	12 (30.8%)	17 (43.6%)	1 (2.6%)

Frequency of data collection defined	3.39	.887	1 (2.6%)	5 (12.8%)	12 (30.8%)	18 (46.2%)
Individual(s) in charge of M&E	3.32	.662	0 (0%)	4 (10.3%)	18 (46.2%)	16 (41.0%)
Schedule of M&E activities	3.38	.815	0 (0%)	6 (15.4%)	14 (35.9%)	17 (43.6%)
Plan/schedule for dissemination/ reporting of findings	3.24	.852	1 (2.6%)	6 (15.4%)	15 (38.5%)	15 (38.5%)
Resources needed for M&E	3.46	.913	2 (5.1%)	3 (7.7%)	11 (28.2%)	21 (53.8%)
Roles and responsibility of staff in M&E clearly stated	2.85	.933	3 (7.7%)	10 (25.6%)	17 (43.6%)	8 (20.8%)
Presence of separate budget project M&E activities	2.90	1.021	2 (5.1%)	14 (35.9%)	11 (28.2%)	10 (25.6%)
Is there logical framework approach (log frame) in its project planning stages so as to help M&E activities accordingly?	2.72	.916	2 (5.1%)	15 (38.5%)	16 (41.0%%)	4 (10.3)
Are M&E indicators linked to inputs, outputs, outcomes and impact	3.08	.929	2 (5.1%)	7 (17.9%)	18 (46.2%)	10 (25.6%)

Source: *own computation*, June 2018

- Presence of high reliability confirmed from the reliability test. Normally distribution checked by non parametric test.
- Higher value of 30.8 percent of the respondents disagree on the presence of stakeholder involvement in the planning of M&E processes with 33.33 percent of neither agree nor disagree and mean value of 2.77 which is indicative of non presence.
- Higher value of 35.9 percent of the respondents are disagreed in Presence of separate budget for project M&E activities and mean value of 2.9 indicative of non existence.
- Higher value of 35.9 percent of the respondents are disagreed in the presence of logical framework and mean of 2.72 which is an indicative of non existence.
- Higher value of 38.5 percent disagree with 41.6 percent neither agree nor disagree in the approach (log frame) in its project planning stages with a mean value of 2.72 which can be indicative of the

non presence.

- The other elements agreed to their presence are Schedule of M&E activities with an agreed amount of 43.6, Frequency of data collection defined with 46.2 percent agreed and 40.8 percent neither agree nor disagree, Presence of Resources needed for M&E 53.8 and 28.2 percent agreed and neither agree nor disagree respectively
    - In this findings the stakeholder involvement in the planning of the M&E processes, Presence of indicators linked to the objectives of the program/project, Presence of separate budget project M&E activities and presence of logical framework approach (log frame) in its project planning stages are the main drawbacks of the project in the planning and design for monitoring and evaluation practices.

4.4.2 Monitoring, Evaluation Process and Management

This part also intends to investigate the management and process of monitoring and evaluation so that the practice of monitoring and evaluation can be accessed from this point of view. Reliability is confirmed because of the Cronbach's Alpha .893 which implies it is reliable.

Table 4.6 M & E Process and management

Description	Mean	Std. Deviation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree
Use of data collection tools and techniques (questionnaires, Interview etc)	2.67	1.108	5 (12.8%)	15 (38.5%)	9 (23.1 %)	8 (20.5 %)
Experience sharing and adoption of best practices	2.87	.923	3 (7.6%)	10 (25.6%)	15 (38.5 %)	11 (28.2 %)
Documenting Monitoring and evaluation Documents permanently	3.41	.785	0 (0%)	5 (12.8%)	15 (38.5 %)	17 (43.6 %)
Disseminate M&E findings to decision making	3.05	.826	1 (2.6)	9 (23.1)	16 (41.0)	13 (33.3)
Measurement of schedule performance	3.05	.916	3 (7.6%)	6 (15.4%)	16 (41.0 %)	14 (35.9 %)

Measurement of financial performance of the projects	3.21	.801	1 (2.6%)	6 (15.4%)	16 (41.0%)	16 (41.0%)
Monitoring over all progress of the projects	3.56	.641	0 (0%)	3 (7.6%)	11 (28.2%)	25 (64.1%)
Monitoring quality of the projects	3.41	.818	0 (0%)	7 (17.9%)	10 (25.6%)	21 (63.6%)
Conduction of Ex-ante evaluation	2.95	.793	0 (0%)	13 (33.3%)	15 (38.5%)	11 (28.2%)
Conducting of Midterm (interim) evaluation	3.44	.788	1 (2.6%)	3 (7.6%)	14 (35.9%)	20 (51.3%)
Presence of Summative evaluation (end of project) plan	3.03	.903	2 (5.1%)	9 (23.1%)	14 (35.9%)	14 (35.9%)
Presence of Impact evaluation(after sometime of project completion) plan	3.08	.900	2 (5.1%)	7 (17.9%)	17 (43.6%)	12 (30.8%)
Analyze data in order to assess achievements and challenges	3.10	.882	1 (2.6%)	10 (25.6)	12 (30.8)	16 (41.0)
Document findings and information on project execution	3.36	.778	1 (2.6%)	4 (10.3)	14 (35.9)	20 (51.3)
Share lessons learned on project M&E internally	3.21	.833	1 (2.6%)	7 (17.9%)	14 (35.9%)	17 (43.6%)
Share lessons learned on project M&E externally	2.77	.810	2 (5.2%)	12 (30.8%)	18 (46.2%)	7 (17.9%)

- Use of data collection tools and techniques (questionnaires, Interview etc) 38.5 and 23.1 percent disagrees and neither agree and disagree respectively and the mean also lower than the median value of 3. This is an indicative of not having use of tools and techniques.
- Experience sharing and adoption of best practices, disagree by 25.6 percent neither agrees nor disagrees by 38.5 and agree by 28.2 percent, and the mean, 2.87 is smaller than the median value of 3. Indicative of non existence of experience sharing.
- Documenting Monitoring and evaluation documents permanently 12.8, 38.5 and 43.6 percent agree, neither agree nor disagree and agree respectively. More respondents

agree and the mean is above the median value of 3. There is documentation of M&E documents.

- For the disseminate M&E findings to decision making respondents disagree, neither agree nor disagree and agree by 23.1, 41.0 and 33.3 percent respectively. The mean is slightly higher than the median value which leads us to the positive response of the presence of dissemination of M&E.
- In measurement of schedule performance respondents disagree, neither agree nor disagree and agree by 15.4, 41.0 and 35.9 percent respectively, the mean,3.05, is slightly higher than the median value which leads us to the positive response of having measurement of schedule performance.
- Measurement of financial performance of the projects respondents disagree, neither agree nor disagree and agree by 15.4, 41.0 and 41.0 percent respectively with high level of agreement, the mean, 3.21, is higher than the median value which leads us to the positive response of having financial performance measure.
- Monitoring over all progress of the projects respondents disagree, neither agree nor disagree and agree by 7.6, 28.2 and 64.1 percent respectively with high agreement level, the mean, 3.56, is higher than the median value which leads us to the positive response of having monitoring of overall progress.
- Monitoring quality of the projects respondents disagree, neither agree nor disagree and agree by 17.9, 25.6 and 63.6 percent respectively with high level of agreement , the mean, 3.41, is higher than the median value which leads us to the positive response of having monitoring of overall progress.
- In Conduction of Ex-ante evaluation respondents disagree, neither agree nor disagree and agree by 33.3, 38.5 and 28.2 percent respectively, the mean, 29.5, is lower than the median value which leads us to the negative response of not having Conduction of Ex-ante evaluation.
- In Conducting of Midterm (interim) evaluation respondents disagree, neither agree nor disagree and agree by 7.6, 35.6 and 51.3 percent respectively with high level of agreement, the mean, 3.44, is higher than the median value which leads us to the positive response of having Conducting of Midterm (interim) evaluation.

- Presence of Summative evaluation (end of project) plan respondents disagree, neither agree nor disagree and agree by 23.1, 35.9 and 35.9 percent respectively with high level of agreement, the mean, 3.03, is higher than the median value which leads us to the positive response of having Presence of Summative evaluation (end of project) plan.
- Presence of Impact evaluation(after sometime of project completion) plan respondents disagree, neither agree nor disagree and agree by 17.9, 43.6 and 30.8 percent respectively, the mean, 3.08, is higher than the median value which leads us to the positive response of having Presence of Impact evaluation(after sometime of project completion) plan.
- Analyze data in order to assess achievements and challenges respondents disagree, neither agree nor disagree and agree by 25.6, 30.8 and 41.0 percent respectively with high level of agreement, the mean, 3.08, is higher than the median value which leads us to the positive response of having Presence of Impact evaluation(after sometime of project completion) plan.
- Document findings and information on project execution respondents disagree, neither agree nor disagree and agree by 10.3, 35.9 and 51.3 percent respectively with high level of agreement, and he mean, 3.08, is higher than the median value which leads us to the positive response of having document findings and information on project execution.
- Share lessons learned on project M&E internally respondents disagree, neither agree nor disagree and agree by 17.9, 35.9 and 43.6 percent respectively with high level of agreement, and the mean, 3.21, is higher than the median value which leads us to the positive response of having Share lessons learned on project M&E internally.
- Share lessons learned on project M&E externally respondents disagree, neither agree nor disagree and agree by 23.1, 35.9 and 35.9 percent respectively, and the mean, 2.77, is lower than the median value which leads us to the negative response of not having lessons learned externally.

4.5 Summery of Findings

Most of the respondents believe the project was not met the goal in schedule and cost as planned is determined. Some of the problems identified in the structure of the office adequate and capable work force which is also supported by respondents open ended questions, and the

absence of capacity building program also reflected in the open ended respondents description. So that it identified which has a possibility of creating weak management of M & E so as project failure in achieving the objective in schedule and cost.

Absence of stake holder involvement in the M & E program and it can contribute to the project delay because one of the reason for project delay as was mentioned in the open ended question was right of way, compensation related, problem which is an effect of stakeholder involvement in the execution and even in the planning and activity of the project.

Absence of logical frame work that means according to literatures that is discussed the monitoring group does not identified what to measure in its M & E activity so that couldn't contribute to project success to achieve its objectives. Finally Absence of use of data collection tools and techniques as literatures indicate an important part of monitoring and evaluation because these tools help to achieve the intended goal of M & E.

4.6 Analysis and Interpretations

Expectation for the monitoring and evaluation

- Adequate and Capable workforce for the project Office is correlated with coefficient -.199* (negative) and is significant effect on project start and completion as per planned in terms of time and cost which is also supported by the open ended response.
- Development of Capacity building program for M&E correlated with coefficient -.185* (negative) and is significant effect on the project start and completion as per planned in terms of time and cost also supported by open ended response.
- Stake holders involvement in M&E correlated with coefficient -.199* (negative) and is significant to the project in start and completion as per planned in terms of time and cost. Respondents also explain the existence of right off problem in the project which is a problem of lack of stake holders involvement in the planning phase.

- Standardized Data collection Analyzing Method correlated with coefficient -.199*(negative) and not significant to projects start and completion as per planned in terms of time and cost.
- Inter item correlation can also be seen between each from the graph.

Table 4.7. Expectation correlation

	Spearman's rho													
	Adequate and Capable workforce for the project Office			Development of Capacity building program for M&E			Stake holders involvement in M&E			Standardized Data collection Analyzing Method			projects in eight towns start and completed as per planned in terms of time and cost		
	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Adequate and Capable workforce for the project Office	1.000	.	129	.577**	.000	129	.516**	.000	129	.629**	.000	129	-.199*	.024	129
Development of Capacity building program for M&E	.577**	.000	129	1.000	.	129	.222*	.011	129	.469**	.000	129	-.185*	.036	129
Stake holders involvement in M&E	.516**	.000	129	.222*	.011	129	1.000	.	129	.247**	.005	129	-.199*	.024	129
Standardized Data collection Analyzing Method	.629**	.000	129	.469**	.000	129	.247**	.005	129	1.000	.	129	-.125	.157	129

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Monitoring and Evaluation Practice

Monitoring and evaluation plan and design

- Stakeholder involved in the planning of the M&E processes is correlated with coefficient -.111* which is negative and insignificant effect (sig >0.05)on project start and completion as per planned in terms of time and cost but there is a right of way problem from the respondents response which the result of lack of stack holder involvement during planning phase and in the project activities.
- Stakeholder involved in the activities is correlated with coefficient -.029*(approach to zero, weak) which is negative and insignificant effect on project start and completion as per planned in terms of time and cost.
- Presence of logical framework approach (log frame) is correlated with coefficient -.116 , which is negative and insignificant effect on project start and completion as per planned in terms of time and cost.
- We can also observe the inter item correlation between items as indicated by single and double *.Most of them have strongly correlated with high significance level.

Table 4.8 Plan and design

	Spearman's rho													
	Do stakeholder involved in the planning of the M&E processes?			Involvement of stakeholders in the M&E activities?			Presence of separate budget project M&E activities			Is there logical framework approach (log frame) in its project planning stages so as to help M&E activities accordingly?			projects in eight towns start and completed as per planned in terms of time and cost		
	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Do stakeholder involved in the planning of the M&E processes?	1.000	.	129	.745**	.000	129	.398**	.000	129	.545**	.000	129	-.111	.209	129
Involvement of stakeholders in the M&E activities?	.745**	.000	129	1.000	.	129	.562**	.000	129	.498**	.000	129	-.029	.744	129
Presence of separate budget project M&E activities	.398**	.000	129	.562**	.000	129	1.000	.	129	.750**	.000	129	.110	.213	129
Is there logical framework approach (log frame) in its project planning stages so as to help M&E activities	.545**	.000	129	.498**	.000	129	.750**	.000	129	1.000	.	129	-.116	.191	129

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Monitoring, Evaluation Process and Management

- Use of data collection tools and techniques (questionnaires, Interview etc) is correlated with coefficient .003*(approach to zero, weak) which is positive and insignificant effect on project start and completion as per planned in terms of time and cost.
- Experience sharing and adoption of best practices is correlated with coefficient -.027(approach to zero, weak) which is negative and insignificant on project start and completion as per planned in terms of time and cost.
- Conduction of Ex-ante (evaluation beginning of the project) is correlated with coefficient -.147(approach to zero, weak) which is negative and insignificant on project start and completion as per planned in terms of time and cost.
- Share lessons learned on project M&E externally is correlated with coefficient -.156(approach to zero, weak) which is negative and insignificant on project start and completion as per planned in terms of time and cost.
- Here also the inter variable relationship are strong because their sig.<0.01.

Table 4.9 Process management Correlation Matrix

	Spearman's rho														
	projects in eight towns start and completed as per planned in terms of time and cost			Use of data collection tools and techniques (questionnaires, Interview etc)			Experience sharing and adoption of best practices			Conduction of Ex-ante (evaluation beginning of the project)			Share lessons learned on project M&E externally		
	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
projects in eight towns start and completed as per planned in terms of time and cost	1.000	.	129	.003	.973	129	-.127	.151	129	-.147	.097	129	-.056	.529	129
Use of datacollectiontools andtechniques (questionnaires, Interview etc)	.003	.973	129	1.000	.	129	.560**	.000	129	.582**	.000	129	.682**	.000	129
Experiencesharing and adoption of best practices	-.127	.151	129	.560**	.000	129	1.000	.	129	.277**	.002	129	.262**	.003	129
Share lessons learned on project M&E externally	-.056	.529	129	.682**	.000	129	.262**	.003	129	.523**	.000	129	1.000	.	129

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.7 Descriptive statics of independent variables

The Table below indicates that the overall average value of independent variables is 3.18 with average standard deviation of 0.604. It means the overall average mean value ranges from 2.576 to 3.784 i.e. 68.% of the response lies within this range and average mean 3.18 is below 3.39 (Zaidaton & Bagheri,2009) is low. The existence of M & E expectation, plan and design and process management is weak on the project.

Table 4.10 Mean and Standard Deviation of independent variables

Independent variable	Mean	Std. Deviation
Monitoring and Evaluation Expectation	3.14	.731
Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Design	3.2	.585
Monitoring & Evaluation Process and Management	3.2	.496

Correlation between independent variables

Monitoring and evaluation Expectation

- Monitoring and evaluation expectation is significantly correlated with Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Design and also with Monitoring & Evaluation Process and management with a value .695** and .521** respectively.
- Monitoring and evaluation expectation also negatively and significantly correlated with dependent variable start and completed as per planned in terms of time and cost with a value of -.212*.

Table 4.11 Expectation correlation

			Monitoring and Evaluation Expectation
Spearman's rho	Monitoring and Evaluation Expectation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.
	Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Design	Correlation Coefficient	.695**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	Monitoring & Evaluation Process and management	Correlation Coefficient	.521**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	projects in eight towns start and completed as per planned in terms of time and cost	Correlation Coefficient	-.212*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.016

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Monitoring and Evaluation plan and design

- Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Design is significantly correlated with Monitoring & Evaluation Process and management with a value .729**.
- Generally all the independent variables (Three) significantly and positively correlated with each other with a value far from zero and near to 1which indicate existence of strong correlation.

Table 4.12 Plan and Design correlation

			Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Design
Spearman's rho	Monitoring and Evaluation Expectation	Correlation coefficient	.695**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Design	Correlation coefficient	1.000**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.
	Monitoring & Evaluation Process and management	Correlation coefficient	.729**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It was discussed in chapter one the main objective of the paper so that to assess the monitoring and evaluation of the project and how effectively was the monitoring and evaluation of the eight town distribution project in EEU. This chapter focuses on the practical implications of the findings from chapter four with respect to objectives, and investigate project management monitoring and evaluation practices of the specific project from international body of Knowledge perspective. The next sub section presents concluding statements and then makes recommendations.

5.1. Conclusion

As it was mentioned in the previous chapters the project aims to provide the distribution system of eight towns more standardized so that sustainable power supply can be gained. This project takes longer period in the designing phase and was late according to the different literatures interviews of the company's higher management. This was the reason the researcher initiated to conducted an assessment on how the M & E was conducted during the implementation phase. Because M & E is a very essential tool for the implementation phase of a project so as to achieve the intended objective of the project and success in terms of schedule cost and quality. To accomplish the objectives of the study, descriptive research method was employed and secondary data were used. Hence, the sampling techniques were purposive sampling technique after categorizing the target population in to three as project management office, own force consultants and internal stakeholders. The general objective of assessing the project monitoring and evaluation system by taking projects monitoring and evaluation practice of EEU distribution project and comparing from the knowledge point of view of M & E practices international requirement. The specific objectives of this study were to explore the stakeholders‟ expectation of monitoring and evaluation systems; to investigate the current monitoring and evaluation practices of EEU Eight towns projects; to identify the main problems in conducting M & E; to identify challenges encountered in monitoring and evaluation of the project; and to identify the major gaps from the body of knowledge point of view as was discussed in the literature and forward alternative recommendations. The questionnaire is arranged according to the literature point of view as discussed in chapter

three and some input from previously conducted researches. The reliability and validity of the project is confirmed from statistical analysis and usage of the same questionnaires by other researchers with customization. The questionnaires address first the successfulness of the project, the government and concerned parties expectations about the M & E of the project. Then addresses the expectations by examining the structural arrangements of the company so as it tells us there were expectations so as arrangements are made to achieve the expectations. Failing to fulfill the required arrangements means the expectation level was minimum and vice versa. In the second part of the questionnaire the planning and design of project M & E was assessed because without planning and design of M & E nothing can be successful, items to be addressed are included in the planning of M & E practices of the project .Then it tries to investigate the Process of M & E. Open ended type of questions are also included so that other related issues can be explained and some of them agrees with the findings of the questionnaires. According to the finding discussed in chapter four the main problems of the project office in Monitoring and evaluation are identified.

To generalize the output of the finding:-

In the first place as most of the respondents believe the project was not met the goal in schedule and cost as planned is determined. Some of the problems identified in the structure of the office adequate and capable work force, and the absence of capacity building program is identified which has a possibility of creating weak management of M & E so as project failure in achieving the objective in schedule and cost. Absence of stake holder involvement in the M & E program and it can contribute to the project delay because one of the reason for project delay as was mentioned in the open ended question was right of way, compensation related, problem which is an effect of stakeholder involvement in the execution and even in the planning and activity of the project. Other observations that are taken from the second part are absence of logical frame work that means according to literatures that is discussed the monitoring group does not identified what to measure in its M & E activity so that couldn't contribute to project success to achieve its objectives. Finally Absence of use of data collection tools and techniques are identified which results lack of direction towards achieving objectives.

5.2. Recommendations

As we can see from the descriptive statistics of the independent variables further studies on the effect of the variables in relation to project success should be conducted to have general prediction capability of the model using inferential statistics methods. From the research conducted and analysis of descriptive statistics the researcher has the following recommendations. To have a tangible out come from the project office and its M & E program the project office should be structured in accordance with the expectations of Government bodies, company, stake holders and loaners.

- Adequate and capable work force of Monitoring and evaluation should be maintained.
- The workforce should also be capable of performing the specific task apart from the traditional way of doing it. So that capacity building program should be accompanied while creating the group.
- Stake holder involvement during planning and activity is very important to have a solution before hand for rescues that may be encountered during implementation such as compensation related issues.
- Using Logical frame work approach in the planning phase helps to have a clear objective in the monitoring and evaluation time. That is it provides information what to monitor and evaluate.
- Information sharing internally and externally also can bring the monitoring evaluation performance better. It can also improve future projects monitoring and evaluation activity simple by sharing lessons learned.

References

Admin, Robert Goatham2017, What is project success? International Project leadership Academy, Posted on February 21,2017.

Appleton, Simon 96, "Problems & Measuring Changes in Poverty over Time," IDS Bulletin Vol. 27No 1, Brighton, UK: Institute for Development Studies.

Bamberger, M., Rugh, J., and Mabry, L., 2006, 'Reconciling Different Priorities and perspectives: Addressing Political Influences', Chapter 6 in Real world Evaluation: Working Under Budget, Time, Data and Political Constraints, Sage Publications, California.

Bamberger, Michael and Hewitt, Eleanor,1986 Monitoring and Evaluating Urban Development Programs, A Handbook for Program Managers and Researchers. World Bank Technical Paper no 53. (Washington, D.C.: 1986)

Birhanu Fikade , ,Reporter NEWS paper(internet) ,Ethiopia 1 October 2016

Bpayne and Adrienne watt, The Project Life Cycle (Phases) derivative copy of Project management by Merrie Barron and Andrew Barron licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Un ported and Project Management From Simple to Complex by Russel Darnall, John Preston, Eastern Michigan University.

Casley, Dennis J. and Kfishna Kumar, Project Monitoring and Evaluation in Agriculture. Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1987.

C.R. Kothari, 2004 research methodology methods and techniques, New Age international

Damien Sweeney and Martin Pritchard 2010, Developing a Monitoring & Evaluation Plan, evaluation Toolbox /www.bayside.vic.gov.au

David Goulden, 2017, Project Management Execution Phase: Best Practices posted on July 24, 2017, ©Clarize,2018

Derck Poate,96 Lessons & Practices is produced by the Operations Evaluation Department to help disseminate the World Bank's develop- L ment experience.

Dr.I.Selvaraj, Research Proposal PGCH&FW ,NIHFW, NewDelhi

Erik Wibbels ,2018 research on end line impact evaluation ,GSAM (Duke University and Social Impact), Heather Huntington (University of Michigan and Cloudburst Group), Brett Gall (Duke University and Social Impact), and Elaine K. Denny (Duke University and UC Merced),

Geremew Dida Wirtu,2016 An Assessment of Public Project Monitoring and Evaluation Practices of Oromia: the Case of Oromia Bureau of Finance and Economic Development,AAU

GMagali Simarda*, Danielle Labergea,2014, research on Governance representations in temporary organization: a case of governance sense making, Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

Görgens,Marelize,2009,Making monitoring and evaluation systems work : a capacity development tool kit The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank

G. RAJASEKHAR, 2014-15 business research methods, Lecture notes on business research methodology YijawahalalNehru technological University Anantapure MBA Semester – II

Iannacci et al,2009, Evaluating Monitoring Systems in the European Social Fund Context, www.sagepublications.com

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies *(IFRC PPP, 2010)* Project/programme monitoring and evaluation guide M&E concepts and considerations

Institute of Development Studies, Brighton

ITU,2013 result based management and project, Project management guidelines, International Telecommunication Union, November 2013

Jennifer Spirko, 2017 Updated April 17,

Johns Hopkins University, How to Develop a Logic Model, Project, supported by USAID's office of Population and Reproductive Health, Bureau for Global Health, under cooperative Agreement with the Johns Hopkins(JHU.CPP)

John Henderson Social Sciences Librarian, (607) 274-1961) (607) jhenderson@ithaca.edu

Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health's Center for Communication Programs

Jones, N., et al., 2009, 'Improving Impact Evaluation Production and Use', Working Paper 300, overseas Development Institute, London

Kusek, J., and Rist, R., 2004, 'Ten Steps to a Results-based Monitoring and Evaluation System', World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Lucas, H. and Longhurst, H., 2010, 'Evaluation: Why, for Whom and How?', IDS Bulletin, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 28-35

Morton, J., 2009, 'Why We Will Never Learn: A Political Economy of Aid Effectiveness', James Morton & C

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance committee(2002)

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2010 'Better Aid: Evaluation in development Agencies', OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation, OECD Publishing, Paris

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) 2002, Glossary of Key terms in evaluation and Results Based Management.

Public service commission 2008, Basic concepts in monitoring and evaluation, Published in the Republic of South Africa by:the republic service commisssion (PSC), www.psc.gov.za

Roni Feldsher,2016 Project management initiation phase: Best practices © World Bank evaluation Capacity development Working Paper, no. 13, World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Shelley Hen, 2017 What is the Project Management Life Cycle?, © 2018 Clarize

United Nations Evaluation Group, 2005, 'Standards for Evaluation in the UN System', UNEG,

United Nations Development Program Evaluation Office,2002. The Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results New York, USA

United Nations Development Programme Evaluation Office, 2009, 'Handbook on Planning, monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results', UNDP, New York

White, H., 2005, 'Challenges in Evaluating Development Effectiveness', IDS Working Paper, no. 242, Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.

World Bank, Operations Evaluation Department, 1994 'Building Evaluation Capacity'', Lessons 6 Practices No. 4, November 1994.

World Bank Operations Evaluation Department, 2002, Monitoring and Evaluation: Some tools, methods and Approaches, The World Bank, Washington, D.C

World Bank Operations Evaluation Department, 2004, 'Influential Evaluations: Evaluations that Improved Performance and Impacts of Development Programs', World Bank.

World bank, 2004, The Logical framework approach ,Monitoring and evaluation Some Tools methods & Approaches, Washington, D.C.www.worldbank.org/oed/ecd/

World Bank, 2005 monitoring & Evaluation for Sustainable Communities www.geog.ox.ac.uk/research/technologies/projects/

Zaidatol, A.L., & Bagheri, A. 2009, Entrepreneurship as a center choice: An analysis entrepreneurial self efficiency and intention of university student.

APPENDICES

Questionnaire

Addis Ababa University College of Business and Economics
School of Commerce Department of Project Management
Master of Project Management Program

The questionnaire is designed to collect information on—An Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation practices of Eight town distribution rehabilitation project in Ethiopia Electric utility. The information is going to be used as a primary data in this research which the researcher is conducting as a partial fulfillment of his study at Addis Ababa University for completing Master of Project Management.

Believing that your frank and genuine responses will contribute vastly to the quality of the findings of this study, the researcher would like to ask you kindly to complete this questionnaire, as truthfully as possible. He would also like to inform you that the responses you provide will be kept confidential and will not be disclosed to the third party without your consent.

The researcher would like to express his heartfelt thanks in advance for taking part in this endeavor.

Samuel Demas: Mobile 0912150415, email Samuel.demas9@gmail.com

Direction

No need of writing your name;

Put "X" mark in the appropriate space or circle the choice you select whenever necessary; If you cannot get any satisfying choice among the given alternatives, you can write your answer, in the space provided for the option —if other, please specify area;

For the open ended items, give brief answer in the space provided.

Consider the following abbreviation and use where appropriate:

AG= Agree

DA= Disagree

NN= Neither agree nor disagree

SA= Strongly agree

SD=Strongly disagree and Consider M&E = Monitoring and Evaluation

Part I: Demographic characteristics of the respondents and general background

1. Sex:

a. Male b. Female

2. Age:

a. 21-30 b. 31-40 c. 41-50 d. above 50

3. Current academic qualification:

a. Ph.D. b. MA/MSc c. BA/BSc d. Diploma e. High School completed

If other, please specify----------

4. Position in the organization:

a. Top management

b. Middle management

c. Project manager

d. M&E expert/officer

e. Other expert

5. Service year in the organization ----------

Part II. General Issues

1. Source of your major project fund *(You can circle more than one)*

a. Government treasury

b. International donor agencies

c. Bi-lateral Organizations

d. Nongovernmental Organizations

e. Income generating activities

f. Individual donations

Other, (please specify) ----------

2. Do the projects in eight towns start and completed as per planned in terms of time and cost?

a. Yes

b. No

c. Partially

3. If the answer to the above question is No, why? ----------

---

Part III: Monitoring and Evaluation Expectation

1. Please read each items carefully and rate according to the knowledge you have about the M&E System of your organization using "X" mark.

No.	Questions	Response Categories				
		SA	AG	NN	DA	SD
1	Presence of Project management office M&E Program					
2	Adequate and Capable work force for the project Office					
3	Allocates resources(Human resource, Budget) for M&E					
4	Development of Capacity building program for M&E					
5	Installed data acquisition plan					
6	Stakeholders involvement in M&E					
7	Standardized Data collection/Analyzing Method					
8	Documentation and information sharing					
9	Culture of disseminating M&E findings					
10	There is a policy/legal framework of M&E					

2. M&E reporting expectations from Management, Government and loaners
   a. Very strict
   b. Strict
   c. Lenient
   d. Very lenient
3. The practice of report from the government, societies and local administration side is:
   a. Very strict
   b. Strict
   c. Lenient
   d. Very Lenient

Part IV. Monitoring and Evaluation Practices

A. **Monitoring and Evaluation plan and design**

1. Please read each items carefully and rate according to the knowledge you have about the M&E System of your organization using "X" mark.

No.	Questions	Response Categories				
		SA	AG	NN	DA	SD
1	Do stakeholder involved in the planning of the M&E processes?					
2	Involvement of stakeholders in the M&E activities?					
3	Are there indicators linked to the objectives of the program/project?					
4	Frequency of data collection defined					
5	Individual(s) in charge of M&E					
6	Schedule of M&E activities					
7	Plan/schedule for dissemination/ reporting of findings					
8	Resources needed for M&E					
9	Roles and responsibility of staff in M&E clearly stated					
10	Presence of separate budget project M&E activities					
11	Is there logical framework approach (log frame) in its project planning stages so as to help M&E activities accordingly?					
12	Are M&E indicators linked to inputs, outputs, outcomes and impact					

B. Monitoring, Evaluation Process and Management

1. Please read each items carefully and rate according to the knowledge you have about the M&E System of your organization using "X" mark.

No.	Questions	Response Categories				
		SA	AG	NN	DA	SD
1	Use of data collection tools and techniques (questionnaires, Interview etc)					
2	Experience sharing and adoption of best practices					
3	Documenting Monitoring and evaluation documents permanently					
4	Disseminate M&E findings to decision making					
5	Measurement of schedule performance					
6	Measurement of financial performance of the projects					
7	Monitoring over all progress of the projects					
8	Monitoring quality of the projects					
9	Conduction of Ex-ante evaluation (beginning of the project)					

10	Conducting of Midterm (interim) evaluation					
11	Presence of Summative evaluation (end of project) plan					
12	Presence of Impact evaluation(after sometime of project completion) plan					
13	Analyze data in order to assess achievements and challenges					
14	Document findings and information on project execution					
15	Share lessons learned on project M&E internally					
16	Share lessons learned on project M&E externally					

2. To carry out evaluations of projects, how do you involve an external facilitator?

(a) If you involve an external facilitator, briefly explain why? _____

_____

(b) If you conduct evaluation on your own force briefly explain why? _____

_____

3. Please mention any other monitoring and evaluation issues that might not have been covered above. Additional issue:

a. _____

b. _____

4. Any success in the project implementation process

---

5. Any challenges in the monitoring and evaluation of a project----------

---

---

6. What do you recommend to cope up any challenges and improve M&E system effectiveness?

THANK YOU