



SCHOOL OF GRAUATE STUDIES

PRACTICE AND CHALLENGES OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM OF
CAPITAL PROJECTS IN THREE SELECTED SECTORS: THE CASE OF ENORE WOREDA,
GURAGHE ZONE

MA Thesis

BY: Kelifa Mohammed

April /2024
Wolkite, Ethiopia

WOLKITE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

PRACTICE AND CHALLENGES OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM OF
CAPITAL PROJECTS IN THREE SELECTED SECTORS: THE CASE OF ENOREWOREDA,
GURAGHE ZONE

BY: Kelifa Mohammed

*A THESIS SUBMITTED TO SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF
ARTS(MA) IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES*

Major Advisor: Tamiru Berafe Milky (As. professor)

Co-advisor Name: Tano Geter(M.A.)

April /2024
Wolkite, Ethiopia

APPROVAL SHEET
WOLKITE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

We here by certify that we have read and evaluated this thesis entitled “**Practice and Challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation System of Capital Projects in Three Selected Sectors: The case of Enore woreda, Guraghe Zone**” was prepared under our guidance by Kelifa Mohammed. We recommend that the thesis shall be submitted as fulfilling the requirement for the award of MA Degree in Development Planning & Management.

_____ Name of Major Advisor	_____ Signature	_____ Date
_____ Name of Co-advisor	_____ Signature	_____ Date

As the members of the Board of Examiners of the Master Thesis open defense examination, we have read and evaluated this thesis Prepared by Kelifa Mohammed and examined the candidate. We here by certify that, the thesis is accepted for fulfilling the requirements for the award of the Degree of Master of Arts (MA) in Development Planning & Management

1.	_____ Name of External examiner	_____ Signature	_____ Date
2.	_____ Name of Internal examiner	_____ Signature	_____ Date
3.	_____ Name of Chairman	_____ Signature	_____ Date
4.	_____ Name of Dean, SGS	_____ Signature	_____ Date

Final approval and acceptance of the thesis is contingent up on the submission of its final cop to the council of postgraduate program(CPGS) through the candidates department school graduate committee(DDGC OR SGC).

DECLARATION

I, undersigned here, declare that this work entitled “**Practice and challenges of monitoring and evaluation system of capital projects in Three selected sectors: the case of Enore woreda, Guraghe zone**” is my own original work, has not been submitted to/presented for award of any other degree or diploma to any university or other institute of higher education. And all the materials used as reference in this study have been duly acknowledged.

Students Name :- **Kelifa Mohammed**

Signature -----

Date -----

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as thesis advisor.

Main Advisor

Name :- **Tamiru Berafe Milky (As. professor)**

Signature -----

Date-----

Co-Advisor

Name :- **Tano Geter(M.A.)**

Signature :- -----

Date-----

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

The author of this MA thesis, was born in June 10, 1977E.c in Horbetnazizo kebel, Enorena Ener Woreda of Guraghe zone, Ethiopia. Then, he attended elementary and junior school education at Gomeshea Junior Secondary School and high school level education at Addis Ababa and Gunchire Comprehensive Secondary School. After a successful completion of his secondary school, he has joined Haramaya University in1995 E.C., where studied Agricultural Extension and graduated with Degree in 1998 E.C. Soon after his graduation, he was employed by NGO(WORLD BANK, Water supply sanitation and Hygiene project) in Enorena Ener Woreda to work as project coordinator up to 2000 E.C. Then after, he was employed by Enemorena Ener Woreda Agriculture and natural resource development office & worked as expert and sector vice head of Enorena ener woreda youth and sport office and Agriculture and natural resource development office respectively. And now, I am working in Enore worda Trade and Market development office as an expert.

Acknowledgement

Praise is to ALLAH, the Almighty, for his endless support that enabled me finalize the paper and provided the opportunity to come up with final result of my endeavor.

My Next deepest appreciation and heartfelt gratitude should be extended to Tamiru Berafe Milky (As. professor), my major advisor, and Tano Geter(M.A.), my co-advisor, for their undeniable commitment to provide constructive and on time comments to evaluate the paper from the beginning up to the end; and remarkable motivation.

Furthermore, I would like to greatly acknowledge Wolkite University, school of graduate studies especially department of development planning and management. Without the support of the department, the paper would have not been finalized properly.

My special thanks should go to Enore woreda Administration office for providing me the opportunity to study this MA program. My deepest thanks also go to different individuals like Abidlemewella Bedewi(who have supported me in computer writing process); and employees from three selected sectors who have sacrificed much in provision of genuine data, supportive materials; and special thanks to trade & market office employees who worked hard to facilitate the final data analysis works and finalize the paper.

Lastly but not least, I am indebted to Zehera yakob(my wife), for her substantial support of burden sharing throughout my MA Study. Additionally, Mohammed Shafi(my father), Lemya mohammed(my sister), Abdelhadi Mohammed and Hassen Mohammed are the other family members who should receive my thanks for their undeniable motive and the burden carried to share the financial burden what I have carried during the study period.

Acronyms/ Abbreviations

CERA- Center for Economic Research on Africa

FGD- Focus group discussion

PMI- Project Management Institute (2000)

PEG- Project Evaluation Guidelines

WEF- World Economic Forum

Table of Content

<i>APPROVAL SHEET</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>DECLARATION</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Acknowledgement</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>Acronyms/ Abbreviations</i>	<i>vi</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>x</i>
<i>Abstract</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>CHAPTER ONE</i>	<i>1</i>
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	4
1.3. Objectives of the Study	6
1.4. Research Questions	7
1.5. The Scope of the Study	7
1.6. Significance of the Study	7
1.7. Limitations of the study	8
1.8. Organization of the paper	8
<i>CHAPTER TWO</i>	<i>10</i>
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
2.1. Concept of a Project	10
2.2. The Concept of Project Management	10
2.4. A Ten-Steps Model for Monitoring and Evaluation	13
2.5. Monitoring and Evaluation System	18
2.6. Project Evaluation	21
<i>CHAPTER THREE</i>	<i>26</i>
3. Methodology of the Study.....	26
3.1. Description of the Study Area	26
3.1. Research Design	27
3.2. Research Approach	28
3.3. Data Sources and Type of Data	28
3.4. Target Population, Sampling Technique and Sample Size.....	28
3.5. Data Collection Instruments	29
3.6. Method of Data Analysis	30
<i>CHAPTER FOUR</i>	<i>31</i>
4. Results and Discussion.....	31
4.1. Introduction.....	31
4.2. Questionnaire Return Rate.....	31

4.3. Demographic data	31
4.4. Budget related administrative works in the process of monitoring and Evaluation of capital projects 32	
4.5. Practicing monitoring and evaluation of capital projects	37
4.6. Challenges related with monitoring & Evaluation of capital projects	41
<i>CHAPTER FIVE</i>	<i>44</i>
5. Conclusion and Recommendations	44
5.1. Conclusions	44
5.2. Recommendations	45
<i>References</i>	<i>46</i>
<i>Appendices</i>	<i>49</i>

List of Tables

Tables	Page
Table 1 Demographic background of the respondents	31
Table 2 Budget related administrative works about capital projects.....	33
Table 3 Amount of capital projects related budget	35
Table 4 Efficiency of Capital projects related budget use.....	35
Table 5 Transfer of Capital projects to contractors	36
Table 6 Practices being applied to monitor & evaluate capital projects	37
Table 7 Challenges related with monitoring & Evaluation of capital projects	41

List of Figures

Figure 1 map of the study area.....	27
-------------------------------------	----

Abstract

An extensive and efficient infrastructure is important in ensuring an effective functioning of the economy as a whole. With the quality and extensiveness of infrastructure networks (such as communications and transport) not only significantly impacts the economic growth but also have the power to affect level of income inequalities and poverty among countries in several ways. Properly implemented projects are crucial for success of an economy if these are accomplished with a fully specified and coherent set of goals and means, as well as their placement within a suitable institutional framework. This study was conducted as a case study to identify practice and challenges of monitoring and evaluation system of capital projects in three purposively selected sectors namely Agriculture and natural resource development office, Health office and Water, mining and energy development office in Enore woreda, Guraghe zone. Descriptive research design in addition to mixed research approach was applied to collect data, encode data, analyze and interpret the collected data; and purposive sampling technique was applied to select the sectors. Additionally, fifty six respondents as sample size were randomly selected out of sixty five employees that were identified from these three sectors as total population. Amharic version of pre-tested semi-structured questionnaire was distributed to these randomly selected respondents. Collected primary data was analyzed using descriptive statistics using SPSS software(version-20). As a result, analysis result indicated that assigning internal and external professional officers to practice monitoring & evaluation of capital projects is not satisfactory. Additionally, more than sixty percent of the respondents assured that the sectors are not practicing on time discussion to solve any capital projects related problems. Furthermore, lack of professional experts, officers' and contractors' attitudinal problems, lack of cooperation among stakeholders are core challenges or problems what the sectors face in monitoring and evaluation of capital projects. Therefore, the government should give especial attention to follow strategic approach to ensure radical change in monitoring and evaluation of capital projects.

Key words: *Capital Projects, Enoreworeda, Infrastructure, Monitoring & Evaluation*

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Recent days, whether it is in developed or underdeveloped countries, the role of economic development is highly demanding for overall competency and success of the countries; and it is mostly achieved by fulfillment of different infrastructures that are essential for economic development. Furthermore, the more capital projects are built in effective and efficient way, the more will be their contribution for successful accomplishment of the infrastructures. According to Diugwu, Mohammed, and Baba (2015), availability and accessibility of infrastructures such as electric power, road and rail transportation and telecommunications is crucial to achieve fast industrial growth which in turn lead to economic development. Economic infrastructures in the form of physical asset formation comprises of activities that provide general facilities for carrying of economic activities. The researchers also stated citing others findings that infrastructure is the driving force of industrialization because the availability of infrastructural facilities determines the nature of industrial development(Sharma and Vashist, 2010 cited in Diugwu, Mohammed, and Baba, 2015).As a result, it was concluded depending on their findings that the adequate and functional infrastructures enhance the industrial productivity of any country.

Moreover, an extensive and efficient infrastructure is important in ensuring an effective functioning of the economy as a whole, with the quality and extensiveness of infrastructure networks (such as communications and transport) not only significantly impacting on the economic growth but also have the power to affect level of income inequalities and poverty among countries in several ways(WEF, 2010, cited in Diugwu, Mohammed and Baba, 2015). Additionally, CERA(2011) explained emphasizing the role of capital projects for successful development of infrastructures that properly implemented projects are crucial to success of an economy if these are accomplished with a fully specified and coherent set of goals and means, as well as their placement within a suitable institutional framework.

As far as capital projects in governmental sectors are concerned, these are projects that require relatively huge amount of budget being allocated mostly from the government though these projects sometimes are built getting budget from NGOs and community participation. As it is stated by different previous studies, capital projects are projects that are mostly implemented to built and fulfill these highly crucial economic infrastructures. According to PMI(2000, cited in Diugwu, Mohammed and Baba, 2015), a project mostly is implemented to increase supply of infrastructural development activities which involves competing demands with regards to scope, cost, risk and quality, often involving stakeholders with differing needs and expectations; and the fulfillment of mutually agreed objectives of any project requires the application of specialized knowledge, skills, tools, and techniques to these project activities. Therefore, the capital projects, regardless of their size, should properly be planned, adequately financed, effectively monitored and evaluated and/or measured so that the projects could play the role what they have to do. It is because huge amount of budget per year is being budgeted for these projects though final outcome is something which is different from what it should have been.

According to Mekoro Arega(2022), in developing countries like Ethiopia, huge amount of money is spent on different public investment programs and projects to meet developmental needs. In this respect, mega capital projects and small capital projects are under construction at federal, regional, and local government levels. Unfortunately, some public sector projects are not being completed on time and this dalliance results in allocation of budget for additional expenditure (Tilahun, 2013). Asmamaw et al., (2012) stated that the major challenges of public investment projects are top down project approach, lack of mandatory control gateways at the front end project preparation and decision making stage, and weak links between projects stakeholders affected. A recent study conducted by Tilahun (2013), stated following findings of his study that even though there are a monitoring and evaluation system in different governmental and/or public sectors, it does not have clear policy, and procedures to guide, monitoring and evaluation does not have practice of preparing, monitoring and evaluation plan on time; there is no data collection schedule, adequate data collection tools and specific time for a project monitoring and evaluation activity. Moreover, Bezaawit Tesfae(2019) stated citing others finding that there is monitoring and evaluation challenge as project success is the question of completing a project against its main design parameters set at the start of the project and on

time which is attributed to proper implementation of monitoring and evaluation activities of a project, within budget, in accordance with the set specifications and with customer satisfaction respectively (Ottoosson, 2013, cited in Bezawit, 2019).

Monitoring and evaluation as part of development project planning and implementation process, is the first crucial activities or tools to be practiced about the projects that help project managers know when and how plans are going according to plan and when conditions change; and provide the management with information to make decisions in regard to the project(Mekoro, 2022).Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is useful to all projects, big or small, because it helps in identifying project areas that are on target and those that need to be adjusted or replaced(Shapiro, 2011).Moreover, monitoring is a continuous function that uses systematic collection of data using specified indicators so that it could be possible to provide management of any concerned public sector and other concerned stakeholders to know about development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. In other words, monitoring refers to collecting information on a project regularly and analyzing it to find out how it is progressing(WB, 2011). Furthermore, the importance of monitoring and evaluation was emphasized by (Mekoro, 2022) as *“monitoring is needed of outcomes to manage implementation and assess impact. This is especially important for process type projects that do not identify, for example, specific production models in advance, and sector projects for which only indicative models may be appraised. ADB's Project Performance Monitoring System (PPMS) provides the framework for laying out key parameters that require monitoring through appropriate data collection systems as inputs for ongoing analysis and as outcome indicators. Analysis can inform the need for course changes and assessing real-time or ex-post impact.”*

Well organized and professionally guided project monitoring and evaluation approach for Capital Projects is not choice but mandatory as it is recognized from findings of different previous studies to ensure achievement of early set objectives of any project. Thus, it is a study that was conducted to identify practice and challenges of monitoring and Evaluation activities for capital projects (different medium and small scaled projects that are using budget from different sources like the government, different NGOs etc... as the projects need frequent and especial

attention by concerned bodies) taking purposively selected three sectors in case study area of Enore Woreda.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

As it is identified by different previous studies such as Phillip LeBel(2011), Gudda(2011) etc... stated that many of African least developed countries are suffering from lack of unwise use of resources which is attributed to development planning, monitoring and evaluation system of different capital projects. Irfan, M.et.al.(2021), stated that the core reason for the failure of many public sectors capital projects is the poor planning and competency of a project manager and it remains the same though the world has progressed exponentially.

Additionally, it is assured that successful performance in projects enhances the social, economic, and environmental wellbeing of various stakeholders involved(Andersen, E.S.; Birchall, D.; Jessen, S.A, 2006). Moreover, Phillip LeBel(2011) reported that development projects particularly those in Africa during the course of the past thirty years since independence, have had a mixed record of performance. It is because there are a number of challenges that can affect final result of a project. Having powerful monitoring and evaluation system and practices to make informed decisions about projects and document lessons learnt for future programming, design and implementation is mainly essential for project success(Gudda, 2011, cited in Bezawit, 2019). Gudda (2011) also stated that monitoring and evaluation as one of the major management functions called controlling and it is the process of monitoring, evaluating, and comparing what is planned with actual results to identify the progress toward the project objectives. In other words, it is the process of determining the relevance and fulfillment of project objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability based on project monitoring & evaluation guidelines (IFRCS, 2011). Thus, the aim of monitoring and evaluation is to provide information that can help informed decisions and then improve performance and achieve planned results (Ottosson, 2013, cited in Bezawit, 2019).

Informal estimates by the World Bank suggest that as many as half of all development projects do not achieve their objectives, with corresponding losses in terms of un-recovered funds. Furthermore, the role of project planning and monitoring or successful accomplishment of

different projects was indicated by Irfan, M.; et.al.(2021)citing findings of different previous studies as:-

“The issue of delayed, over-budgeted, poor quality and insufficiently beneficial projects is becoming epidemic worldwide [8], poor mechanisms of monitoring and control [8,13] and lack of human resource competencies[13–15]. Furthermore, Ayodele and Alabi [18] reported in their study that Nigeria is considered as the world’s junk-yard of problematic and abandoned projects, due to inadequate planning, incompetent project staff, poor monitoring and control mechanisms, inadequate funds, and delayed payments. In the past few years, studies have indicated that Pakistan is facing serious issues and challenges in the completion of public sector projects due to the inadequate feasibility and planning of the projects, weak monitoring and control mechanisms, and a lack of human resource competency [20,21]. Moreover, public sector projects in Balochistan, which is the largest province of Pakistan, are suffering from delays, cost overruns, abandonment, lack of quality, and benefits shortfalls issues and it is attributed to poor project selection and feasibility, lack of technical designs, proper specifications, project planning and control, lack of competent human resource and technology, weak project supervision, and availability of insufficient funds [22].”

If the reality at the ground about overall activities and performance of capital project is taken in to account, it is possible to realize that there are a number of challenges being faced in Africa in general and in Ethiopia in particular. This could be attributed to a number of factors. Supply-chain challenges, improper selection of project management methodologies and inadequate planning often lie at the core of this. Other obstacles include an ineffective project management structure, a lack of skills and poor competency of the project management team, and ignorance to risk management and governance requirements. Asmamaw et al.,(2012, cited in Mekoro, 2022) stated that the major challenges of public investment projects are top down project approach, lack of mandatory control gateways at the front end project preparation and decision making stage and weak links between projects stakeholders affected. Likewise, there is a study conducted by Tilahun (2013) also stated that even though there are a monitoring and evaluation system in the governmental sectors, there are a number of challenges as it does not have policy, no clear procedures to guide, there is no transparent monitoring and evaluation practice as there

is no monitoring and evaluation plan on time, there is no data collection schedule and adequate data collection tools in specific time for a project a monitoring and evaluation activities.

For the last consecutive decades, Enore woreda in Guraghe zone has been investing huge amount budget budgeted from government, NGOs and community participation on capital projects regardless of the source of money invested and their performance. If the final performance of these different projects is considered, it is possible to recognize different level of project achievements which may be attributed to different challenges related with monitoring and evaluation system of project owners. Furthermore, because of different internal and external factors such kind of project performance is being adopted and the woreda is losing the value of this huge budget.

However, it is not possible to get related studies conducted to identify why we are having such projects showing very low performance in Ethiopia in general and in this case study area in particular. And even it is rare to get such related studies conducted around guraghe zone. Therefore, this study was conducted by the researcher taking in account of this research gap and to identify the practices and challenges related with monitoring and evaluation system of capital projects in Enore Woreda using three purposively selected sectors so that it could be possible to contribute for existing literatures and minimize the research gap.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective

The general objective of this study is to assess the Practice and Challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation System of Capital Projects(projects that have been constructed and implemented using capital budget being provided by Government and different donors)using Enore Woreda as Case study area in Guraghe Zone.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

- To Identify the mechanisms being Practiced in Monitoring and Evaluation of Capital projects in Enore Woreda three Selected Sectors Capital projects

- To Identify the challenges being faced in Monitoring and Evaluation of Capital projects in Enore Woreda Selected three Sectors

1.4. Research Questions

The study addressed the following research questions

- ✚ What are the mechanisms being Practiced in Monitoring and Evaluation of Capital projects in EnoreWoreda?
- ✚ What are the challenges being faced in Monitoring and Evaluation of Capital projects in EnoreWoreda?

1.5. The Scope of the Study

The study was delimited only to purposively selected three sectors that are known to have a great role in poverty alleviation in the Woreda. In other words, there are commonly known sectors like Education office, Agriculture and natural resource development office, Health office, Water, mining and energy development office, Road transport office so on that have great role in economic and social affairs and to receive huge government budget per year so that the sectors could accomplish their planned activities in the woreda. Therefore, the researcher selected three of them such as Agriculture and natural resource development office, Health office and Water, mining and energy development office to assess the practice and challenges of monitoring and Evaluation for Capital projects in Enore Woreda, Guraghe Zone, SNNP Regional State.

1.6. Significance of the Study

The main objective of the study was assessing Practice and Challenges of monitoring and evaluation for Capital projects using purposively selected three Sectors as Case study area in Enore Woreda. As a result, the findings of the study will have great role to provide valuable information about performance of overall conditions of these projects in the woreda. Moreover, the findings will be useful for policy makers and decision makers. Furthermore, findings of the study will provide clear and valuable information about use of capital projects related budget to

budget providing bodies in the woreda. Finally, the findings could be used as benchmark to those who need to make further assessment around the topic.

1.7. Limitations of the study

The study was conducted assessing Practice and Challenges of monitoring and evaluation for Capital projects using purposively selected three Sectors as Case study area in Enore Woreda. Even though capital projects, as infrastructure components, are expected to have nearly similar performance behavior and procedures, we may not be able to set generalized conclusions with full confidence about Practice and Challenges of monitoring and evaluation system of Capital projects in Ethiopia in general or other regions and zones in SNNPRS depending on findings of data analysis results conducted for this case study area.

1.8. Organization of the paper

The paper is organized in to five chapters. Chapter one comprises of background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, research questions, scope of the study, limitations and significance of the study; and organization of the paper. Chapter two presents the review of related literatures. The third chapter is about the research design and methodology like source of data, process of data collection, the instruments used for data collection and the system to analyze data. Chapter four deals with analysis result of the collected data and interpretation of the results. Chapter five presents conclusions and recommendations.

1.9. Operational Definition of Key terms

- ✓ Capital projects : a temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product, service, or result an supported by government or NGo budgeted budget
- ✓ Projects- a temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product, service, or result
- ✓ Infrastructure- is the driving force of industrialization as the availability of infrastructural facilities determines the nature of industrial development

- ✓ Monitoring- collecting the necessary information with a minimum effort in order to make a routing decision at the right time
- ✓ Evaluation- a learning and management tool; assessing what has taken place in order to improve future work, determine how far objectives have been achieved and whether the initial assumptions about what would happen were right; and, to make judgments about effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the work
- ✓ Stake holders – person or organization with a legitimate interest in a given situation action or enterprise
- ✓ Selected sector –certain collection of offices (governmental) to collect related data
- ✓ Woreda- below the zonal administration structure and above the kebeles in political organizational standard (level)
- ✓ Zone – a numbers of woreda as a single administrative circle which are politically situated and administered below region

CHAPTER TWO

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Concept of a Project

Coating and referring different theories and findings from different scholars, Pekka J Buttler(2022)stated in his PhD dissertation that project concept is a term used by several scholars to refer to various ideas that could be used as a benchmark for a project. As he says, these ‘ideas for a project’ may be of limited scope and pertain only to one aspect of a project(Wells, Wardman & Whetton, 1993; Floricel& Miller,2001; Cohen & Palmer, 2004; Miller & Hobbs, 2005; Kenward & Monnickendam, 2006; Skibniewski & Vecino, 2012; Rawlins &Westby, 2013, cited in Buttler, 2022)or they may be the project equivalents of grand theories, aiming to indicating or narrating the entire rationale behind why the project was started and enfold the idea of an entire project. Furthermore, concept of a project is a general notion or idea; conception; and it is an idea of something formed by mentally combining all its characteristics or particulars; a construct. It also is a directly conceived or intuited object of thought (Webster’s, 1996, cited in Buttler, 2022)

2.2. The Concept of Project Management

A project, to which infrastructural development activities belong to, involves competing demands with regards to scope, cost, risk and quality, often involving stakeholders with differing needs and expectations. And the fulfillment of mutually agreed objectives of any project requires the application of specialized knowledge, skills, tools, and techniques to project activities [28] [29]; this, in a nutshell, is what project management is all about. Several attempts have been made to define/describe what project management connotes. For instance, authors such as [30] believe it is all about planning, scheduling and controlling those activities that impact on the achievement of project objectives. There are equally, definitions of project management given by professional bodies and regulators. The British Standard for Project Management defines project management as:

“...the planning, monitoring and control of all aspects of a project and the motivation of all those involved in it to achieve the project objectives on time, and to the specified cost, quality performance”[31]. Additionally, the Association for Project Management notes that project management is the process by which projects are defined, planned, monitored, controlled and delivered such that agreed benefits are realized, by not only defining the inputs and outputs, but also taking into account all relevant constraints and mechanisms[29]. As it is described by all these literatures about project management, there must be a proper identification of needs, a commensurate execution plan of action, and measures to ensure conformance to this or modification of this as may be necessary so that it could possible achieve early set goals of a project. In other words, in order to meet stakeholder expectations and needs, and equally achieve project objectives, projects are usually executed through laid down procedures or processes-the project management processes.

2.3. Theoretical frame works

2.3.1. Definition of Projects

The term project has been defined by different scholars in a variety of ways. According to the PMI, 2013 project is defined as “A project is a temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product, service, or result.”A project is a one-time, unique, multitask job with a definite starting point, definite ending point, a clearly defined scope of work, a budget, and usually a temporary team. In addition, projects need capital and commitment of other resources and most of the time involves conflict. A project is completed when its goals and objectives are accomplished to the satisfaction of the stakeholders and when objectives are attained (PMI, 2013).

2.3.2. Project Success

According to PMI (2013), the success of a project should be measured in terms of completing the project within its scope, in time, on budget, to the required quality, with the right amount of resources and also the constraint of risk as aggraded up on, between the project manager and senior managers. Project success should be referred to the last baselines approved by the authorized stakeholders. In order for a project to be successful, the project team should Select

appropriate processes required to meet the project objectives, Use a defined approach that can be adapted to meet requirements, Establish and maintain appropriate communication and engagement with stakeholders, Comply with requirements to meet stakeholder needs and expectations, and Balance the competing constraints of scope, schedule, budget, quality, resources, and risk to produce the specified product, service, or result (PMI, 2013). Project success is the completion of projects within the specified period of time, within the budgeted cost, at the proper performance or specification level, with customer satisfaction and acceptance, with minimum or mutually agreed upon scope changes, without disturbing the main work flow of the organization and without changing the corporate culture, (Kerzner, 2009).

2.3.3. Project Processes

Project management involves five process groups as identified in the PMI (2013), which are the necessary competencies that must be achieved in order to secure the most effective use of project resources, namely initiation, planning, execution, monitoring and evaluation and project closing respectively. From the start to the end, a project goes through a whole lifecycle that includes defining the project objectives, planning the work to achieve those objectives, performing the work, monitoring and controlling the progress, and closing the project after receiving the product acceptance.

Project initiating process group: this stage defines and authorizes the project. The project manager is named, and the project is officially launched through a signed document called the project charter, which contains items such as the purpose of the project, a high-level product description, a summary of the milestone schedule, and a business case for the project. It involves Selection of the best project given resource limits, recognizing the benefits of the project, Preparation of the documents to sanction the project and Assigning of the project manager. It consists of defining effectively the beginning of a project. Setting clear phases for work to be completed, initializing teams, and having the budget in place before work begins are also going to be conducted.

Project planning process group: In this stage, the project objective will be refined, and project management plan will be developed.

The plan is a collection of several plans that constitute a course of actions required to achieve the objectives and meet the requirements of the project. Project scope management plan, a schedule management plan, and a quality management plan are the major outcomes of this process group. It involves defining the work requirements, defining the quality and quantity of work, defining the resources needed and scheduling all activities of the project. The projects' goals and expectations are going to be explained. Project executing process group: the project plan is going to be implemented to achieve the objectives of the project. The main output of this stage is the project's deliverables. Changes, modifications and omissions, if there are any, are going to be implemented at this stage. The project team is hired, and works are going to be started. It involves managing teams effectively while achieving time line expectations and reaching at milestones of the project. It is the process group where most of the projects budget will be utilized.

2.4. A Ten-Steps Model for Monitoring and Evaluation

As it was clearly stated by World Bank (2004), there are ten obviously presented steps containing model to a results-based Monitoring and Evaluation System and these are a keystone to be used for project evaluation though developing countries missing proper use of the model. Experts have devised a number of different models for building M&E systems, but often miss the complexities and nuances of the wider country context. The needs of the recipient country are often only vaguely understood by those experts trying to provide technical assistance. For all the good intentions to advance the design, creation, and use of results-based M&E systems, too little emphasis is placed on existing political, organizational, and cultural factors and contexts. As WB emphasized, most of the existing models start by jumping straight into building a results-based M&E system without even knowing where a given country stands in relation to a number of critical factors as organizational roles, responsibilities and capabilities, incentives and demands for such a system; ability of an organization to sustain systems and so on.

There are a few models that pose key readiness questions as stated by (Mackay 1999 & World Bank, 2003a., cite in WB, 2004) most experts look at the "what" questions like what are the goals? What are the indicators? and not the "why" questions: as Why do we want to measure

something? Why is there a need in a particular country to think about these issues? Why do we want to embark on building sustainable results-based M&E systems? To answer these “why” questions, there is a considerable amount of preparatory work to do before the actual construction of a results based M&E system.

i. Conducting a Readiness Assessment

According to WB(2004), this is a unique step in addition to the many M&E models that currently exist because it provides an analytical framework to assess a given country’s organizational capacity and political willingness to monitor and evaluate its goals, and develop a performance-based framework. Thus, it is a key step unfortunately often missed or omitted in helping developing countries, in particular, build their own results-based M&E systems.

ii. Agreeing on Outcomes to Monitor and Evaluate

As it is stated by WB(2004), setting goals as part of a project is being included mostly by the governmental decision making process at every level. All governments have goals although most of them have not M&E capacity. As a result, assuming that a country or organization is in fact in a position to move forward in building a results based M&E system, the next step is to agree on the outcomes (derived from the goals) to monitor and evaluate. Being able to know where we are going before we get moving is the key activity.

iii. Selecting Key Indicators to Monitor Outcomes

The third step in this model is selection of key indicators is and it comes after identification of achievable and well-defined outcomes which also the issues and process involved in agreeing upon those outcomes. According to World Bank(20004), Outcome indicators are not the same as outcomes rather indicators are the quantitative or qualitative variables that provide a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to an intervention, or to support assess assessment of the performance of an organization against the stated outcome. Indicators should be developed for all levels of the results-based M&E system. In other words, indicators are needed to monitor improvement with respect to inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and goals. Progress of any project whether small or large should be monitored at all

levels of the system to provide feedback on areas of success and areas in which improvement may be required. WB(2004) states also that indicators help to answer two fundamental questions: a)“How will we know success or achievement when we see it? and b) are we moving toward achieving our desired outcomes?”.These are the questions that are increasingly being asked of governments and organizations across the globe.

Developing key indicators to monitor outcomes enables managers to assess the degree to which intended or promised outcomes are being achieved. Indicator development is a core activity in building a results-based M&E system. It drives all subsequent data collection, analysis, and reporting. According to World Bank (2011, cited in Mekoro, 2022), Monitoring is a continuous function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an on-going development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Monitoring refers to collection of information on a project regularly and analyzing it to find out how it is progressing. To do so, we collect quantitative data, hard facts such as how much money and time has been spent on a project; and also qualitative data such as whether the project is progressing smoothly and whether participants are satisfied with the project(Mekoro, 2022).

iv. Baseline Data on Indicators — Where Are We Today?

Soon after we finalize selecting key performance indicators to monitor outcomes of a project, then we are expected to establishment baseline data as fourth step(it is establishing where we are at present relative to the outcome we want to achieve). One cannot identify project performance into the future (set targets) without first establishing a baseline. The baseline is the first measurement of an indicator which sets the current condition against which future change can be tracked. In other words, it helps to inform or provide information to decision makers about current circumstances before embarking on projecting targets for a given program, policy, or project. Thus, the baseline is used to learn about current or recent levels and patterns of performance(WB, 2004).

v. Planning for Improvement - Selecting Results Targets

According to WB(2004), the fifth step is establishing results targets- what can be achieved in a specific time toward reaching the outcome which comes after gathering baseline data on indicators. Identifying the expected and desired level of project, program, or policy results requires the selection of specific performance targets. Target setting is the final step in building the performance framework. It, in turn, is based on outcomes, indicators, and baselines. The reasoning process is a deductive one, flowing back from the desired outcomes. In this part it is possible to address (a) definition of targets, (b) factors to consider when selecting indicator targets, (c) examples of targets related to development issues and (d) the overall performance-based framework.

vi. Monitoring for Results

As the six step of this model, we are expected to use the information to monitor for results. The resulting data will provide evidence on performance and flag any changes that may be needed for a given project, program, or policy. It helps to focus on how a results-based M&E system is, most importantly, a system to enable a government (or any organization) better manage resources. It now becomes relevant to review the need to manage inputs and outputs & outcomes. Managers may use different organizational tools to manage inputs, including budgets, staffing plans, and activity plans. A results-based monitoring and evaluation system needs to align with annual and other work plans of the organization to become a true results-oriented system(WB, 2004).

vii. The Role of Evaluations

According to WB(2004), building a monitoring system to continuously measure performance is absolutely essential for managers of governmental and non[governmental organizations. It is because; the monitoring system gives ongoing information (via selected indicators) on the direction of change, the pace of change, and the magnitude of change; and also identifies whether there are unanticipated changes or not. All these are critically essential to recognize or get informed whether policies, programs, and projects are moving in the expected or intended direction or not. However, WB(2004) stresses that data collected in relation to monitoring do not provide the basis for attribution and causality for change. Moreover, these data do not provide

evidences about how changes are coming except only to provide data changes are occurring. Likewise, monitoring activity related data, only by themselves cannot address the strengths and weaknesses in the design of the project, program, or policy. As a result, evaluation of monitoring related information is necessary to address these and other important questions to come up with appropriate project results.

viii. Reporting Findings

As performance information is critically necessary to use as a management tool, it is derived from both monitoring and evaluation because it can provide critical, continuous, and real-time feedback on the progress of a given project, program, or policy. Thus, analyzing and reporting performance findings is a critical step as it determines what is reported, when it is reported, and to whom it is reported(WB, 2004). This step also has to address the current technical capacity of concerned organization because it focuses on the methodological dimensions of accumulating, assessing, and preparing analyses and reports to managers and other stakeholders(WB, 2004).

ix. Using Findings

After reporting findings to concerned bodies of a project in the previous step, we are expected to precede to the next step where to use findings which emanating from the results-based monitoring and evaluation system. Then, we will consider (a) the uses of performance findings; (b) additional benefits of using the findings-feedback, knowledge, and learning; and (c) strategies for sharing information (WB, 2004).

x. Sustaining the M&E System within the Organization

As the final step of this model, sustaining results-based M&E systems presented here. Monitoring and evaluation system should be regarded as a long-term effort, as opposed to an episodic effort for a short period or for the duration of a specific project, program, or policy(WB, 2004). Sustaining such systems within governments or organizations recognizes the long term process involved in ensuring utility. Specifically, it is important to address (a) six critical components of sustaining results-based monitoring & evaluation systems; (b) the importance of incentives and disincentives in sustaining monitoring & evaluation systems; (c) possible hurdles

in sustaining a results-based monitoring & evaluation system; (d) validating and evaluating monitoring & evaluation systems and information; and (e) monitoring & evaluation stimulating positive cultural change in governments and organizations(WB, 2004).

2.5. Monitoring and Evaluation System

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is a process that helps improve performance and achieve results. Its goal is to improve current and future management of outputs, outcomes and impact. The past, present and the future will be linked through this system. It is one of the most powerful tools that influence the performance of a project (Gudda, 2011).M&E is a key component of project management that gives control over the main parameters that define a project; scope, quality, resources, completion time and cost (Kerzner, 2017). Basically, we start the M&E process by measuring actual performance, which is then compared against planned performance. If there is any deviation (or variance), we analyze the causes. We formulate corrective actions and implement them to correct the variance, then repeat the process by measuring the revised performance and comparing it to planned activities until there is no more(Ritz & Levy, 2013).

2.5.1. Project Monitoring

According to Gudda (2011) monitoring is collecting the necessary information with a minimum effort in order to make a routing decision at the right time. The information gathered contains an important and necessary data base for analysis, discussion, evaluation and reporting. It is a regular and systematic process integrated in all the cycle of projects. It is a continuous function that aims primarily to provide project managers and stakeholders of ongoing project with early indications progress or lack thereof, in the achievement of project objectives. Monitoring is a broad management strategy aimed to see if programs are doing the right thing and are doing it right, in order to improve their quality. A good motoring is focused on results, records this results in reports, makes recommendations and follows-up with decisions and action. Its scope includes assessing the progress of projects and also providing managers with information that will be used as a basis for making decisions and taking action (Ritz & Levy, 2013).

According to J. Jackson (2010) the three primary elements associated with managing the construction project are quality, cost, and time. These factors must be monitored throughout the duration of the job. Data for monitoring the project must be directly related to the project plans, outputs, schedules, and budgets, materials purchasing invoices, worker time cards, change notices, test results and standards. Project monitoring tools and mechanisms include; field visits, annual project report, outcome groups and annual review (Sinha & Labi, 2011). Monitoring involves repeated assessment of a situation over time. Having an initial basis for comparison helps you to assess what has changed over a period of time and if this is a result of the project's presence. So, you must have information about the initial starting point or situation before any intervention has taken place. This information is what is commonly known as the "baseline" of information. It is the line of the base conditions against which comparisons are made later on (Simon, 2013).

2.5.2. Types of Monitoring

According to Gudda (2011) the types of monitoring include process monitoring, technical monitoring, assumption monitoring, financial monitoring and impact monitoring. Process monitoring/ physical progress monitoring: It involves a routine data collection and analysis in order to establish whether the project tasks and activities are leading towards the intended project results. This kind of monitoring measures the inputs, activities and outputs. It informs managers and owners of the project in keeping a check on whether activities in project are up to schedule. Managing physical progress can be linked to managing time. Project outputs, Project inputs, Progress of project according to objectives and the way the project is managed, and style of work are items to consider during physical progress monitoring. Project milestones are the simplest method for monitoring physical progress monitoring. As stated by J. Jackson (2010) those three methods can be used for measuring physical progress of a project: A. Quantifying output of the activity in absolute terms. It is used to determine what percentage of the work is completed on the project. It can be calculate by measuring the quantity of work executed to date relative to the total quantity of work planned.

2.5.2.1. Technical monitoring:

Assess the strategy that is being used in project implementation to establish whether it is achieving the required results. It involves the technical aspects of the project such as the activities to be conducted. Assumption monitoring: any project has its working assumptions which have to be clearly outlined in the project log frame. These assumptions are those factors which might determine project success or failure, but which the project has no control over. Assumption monitoring involves measuring these factors which are external to the project. it involves the process of writing down the risks, assessing them and making all project team members be aware of their existence. Financial Monitoring: refers to monitoring project expenditure and comparing them with the budgets prepared at the planning stage. Financial monitoring is important for accountability and reporting purposes, as well as for measuring financial efficiency and ensuring there is no excess or wastage of fund. It is used to estimate project cost at completion (PMI, 2013). One of the budget monitoring or cost performance measurement techniques is the earned value technique (EVT).

According to J.Lewis (2004), the earned value technique compares the cumulative value of the budgeted cost of work performed (earned) at the originally allocated budget amount, to both the budgeted cost of work scheduled (planned) and to the actual cost of work performed(actual). Budgeted cost of work scheduled (BCWS) or planned value (PV): Planned value is the budgeted cost for the work scheduled to be completed on an activity or work break-down structure component up to a given point in time. It shows what is planned for execution Budgeted cost of work performed (BCWP) or earned value (EV): Earned value is the budgeted amount for the work actually completed on the schedule activity or work break down structure component during a given time period. Actual cost for the work performed (ACWP) or actual cost (AC): Actual cost is the total cost incurred in accomplishing work on the schedule activity or WBS component during a given time period. It is obtained by summing up the actual cost incurred to date in progressing work package.

2.5.3. Project quality Monitoring:

The first goal of the quality management plan is to get things done right the first time. Getting it right in construction doesn't always mean getting it perfect. Quality monitoring primarily deals with issues relating to conformance to the plans and specs. All of the materials, systems, and workmanship applied to the project must conform to the requirements set forth in the contract documents. Quality control is accomplished using a number of different mechanisms: submittals, mock-ups, shop drawings, inspections, and testing, which are all called for in the project manual. Impact Monitoring: it is a type of monitoring which continually assesses the impact of project activities to the target population.

2.6. Project Evaluation

Garbutt, (2013) defined evaluation as “a learning and management tool; assessing what has taken place in order to improve future work, determine how far objectives have been achieved and whether the initial assumptions about what would happen were right; and, to make judgments about effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the work.” Additionally, (Catherman,2013) also defines “Evaluation is the periodic assessment of changes in desired outcomes that can be attributable to a program’s interventions. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, program, or policy, including its design, implementation, and results. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors (IFRCS, 2011).According to the IFRCS, 2011 the evaluation standards that guide us in evaluating our work are Utility, Feasibility, Ethics and legality, Impartiality and independence, Transparency, Accuracy, Participation and Collaboration.

2.6.1. Types of Evaluation

According to IFRCS, (2011) the different types of evaluation are;Based on evaluation timing:
Formative evaluation: evaluation done during project implementation to assess project

performance, providing continuous feedback to inform on-going changes and improvements. Summative evaluation: is a form of assessment that traces its roots back to measure the attainment of goals and objectives over time. It occurs at the end of project/program implementation to assess effectiveness and impact. Midterm evaluations: is evaluation that occur midway through the project evaluation formative in purpose.

Final evaluations: are summative in purpose and are conducted at the completion of project implementation to assess how well the project achieved its intended objectives. Ex-post evaluations: are conducted sometime after implementation to assess long term impact and sustainability. Based on who conducts the evaluation: Internal or self-evaluations: are evaluations conducted by those responsible for implementing a project. External or independent evaluations: are evaluations conducted by evaluator(s) outside of the implementing team, lending it a degree of objectivity and often technical expertise. Participatory evaluations: are evaluations conducted with the beneficiaries and other key stakeholders, and can be empowering, building their capacity, ownership and support. Joint evaluations: Are conducted collaboratively by more than one implementing partner, and can help build consensus at different levels, credibility and joint support. Based on evaluation technicality or methodology:

Real-time evaluations: are undertaken during project/program implementation to provide immediate feedback for modifications to improve ongoing implementation. Meta-evaluations: are used to assess the evaluation process itself. Thematic evaluations: focus on one theme, such as gender or environment, typically across a number of projects, programs or the whole organization. Cluster/sector evaluations: focus on a set of related activities, projects or programs, typically across sites and implemented by multiple organizations (e.g. National Societies, the United Nations and NGOs). Impact evaluations: focus on the effect of a project/program, rather than on its management and delivery.

2.7. Monitoring Vs. Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluations are interactive and mutually supportive processes. The main difference between monitoring and evaluation is their timing and focus of assessment. Monitoring is ongoing and tends to focus on what is happening. On the other hand, evaluations

are conducted at specific points in time to assess how well it happened and what difference it made. Monitoring data is typically used by managers for ongoing project implementation, tracking outputs, budgets, compliance with procedures, etc. Evaluations may also inform implementation, but they are less frequent and examine outcomes. However, monitoring and evaluation are essentially associated too; monitoring typically provides data for evaluation, and elements of assessment take place when monitoring (IFRCS, 2011).

2.8. Purpose of Monitoring and Evaluation

According to Hobson & Mayne, (2013) M&E helps to determine the extent to which the project is on track and make the necessary corrections accordingly, to make an informed decision regarding the management process, to ensure the most effective and efficient use of resources and also helps to evaluate the extent to which the project is having or has had the desired delivery.

The aim of M&E is to determine the fulfillment of objectives, determine efficiency, effectiveness and impact of a project (OECD, 2011). Monitoring and evaluation systems can be an effective way to provide constant feedback on the extent to which the projects are achieving their goals, Identify potential problems at an early stage and propose possible solutions, Monitor the accessibility of the project to all sectors of the target population, Monitor the efficiency with the extent to which the project is able to achieve its general objectives and Provide guidelines for the planning of future projects (Gudda, 2011).

Monitoring and evaluation can help organization extract relevant information from past and ongoing activities that can be used as the basis for programmatic improvement, reorientation and future planning. Without effective planning, monitoring and evaluation, it would be impossible to judge if work is going in the right direction, whether progress and success can be claimed, and how future efforts might be improved (Hobson & Mayne, 2013). Both big and small organizations should monitor and evaluate their projects to have its benefit which is outlined in project/ program monitoring and evaluation guideline (IFRCS, 2011). According to this guideline performing monitoring and evaluation to any project will be important to the organization because:

- It Support project implementation with accurate, evidence-based reporting that informs management and decision-making to guide and improve project performance.
- It Contribute to organizational learning and knowledge sharing by reflecting upon and sharing experiences and lessons so that can gain the full benefit from what do and how organization do it.
- It Uphold accountability and compliance by demonstrating whether or not the work has been carried out as agreed and in compliance with established objectives.
- It Provide opportunities for stakeholder feedback, especially beneficiaries, to provide input into and perceptions of work, modeling openness to criticism, and willingness to learn from experiences and to adapt to changing needs.
- It Promote and celebrate the work by highlighting, accomplishments and achievements of contributing to resource mobilization.

2.9. Challenges in Monitoring and Evaluation

M&E is an important component of project design and implementation. It is also a management tool that generates a large amount of vital information that allows project administrators to identify the major problems, constraints and successes encountered during implementation, adjust project activities, plans and budgets, and to provide information for accountability and advocacy. M&E therefore plays a crucial role in enhancing a project's success (Hobson & Mayne, 2013). However, there are a number of constraints and challenges that hinder the implementation and use of M&E in an organization. The major challenges include; poor organizational capacity, paucity of competent staff (lack of skilled employees), misunderstanding on the role and utility of M&E, inadequate mandate of those charged with M&E responsibilities and no or little budget allocation for M&E activities, (FAO, 2010). According to OECD, 2011 difficulties in M&E system include the a/Poor system design in terms of collecting more data than are needed or can be processed b/Inadequate staffing of M&E both in terms of quantity and quality c/Missing or delayed baseline studies. Strictly these should be done before the start of project implementation, if they are to facilitate with and without project comparisons and evaluation d/Delays in processing data, often as a result of inadequate processing facilities and staff shortages. Personal computers can process data easily and quickly but to make the most of

these capabilities requires the correct software and capable staff e/Delays in analysis and presentation of results. These are caused by shortages of senior staff, and by faulty survey designs that produce data that cannot be used.

It is disillusioning and yet common for reports to be produced months or years after surveys are carried out when the data have become obsolete and irrelevant. This is even more the case when computer printouts or manual tabulations of results lie in offices, and are never analyzed and written up. Finally, even where monitoring is effective the results often remain unused by project staff.

CHAPTER THREE

3. Methodology of the Study

3.1. Description of the Study Area

Enor Woreda is one of the Woreda in the Southern Nation Nationalities, and Peoples' Region of Ethiopia. It is located 42 kilometers from the zone capital Wolkite, 301 kilometers from the regional capital Hawassa, and 197 kilometers from capital city of Ethiopia- Addis Ababa. This Woreda is bordered on the north by the Cheha Woreda, on the south Enor Ener Megere Woreda, on the east Geta Woreda, on the west Oromia region, and on the south west Yem special Woreda.

According to Woreda Agriculture Office statement, based on the information obtained by GIS, the total surface area of Enor Woreda is estimated to be 113,467 hectares. Of this, 1576 hectares are for annual crops, 57364 hectares are occupied by permanent crops, 10882 hectares can be cultivated in the future, 7500 hectares are for grazing land, 1307 hectares are natural forest, 7388 hectares artificial forested land, 1636 hectares are damaged land, 2120 were water-covered land, 5000 residential compound land, 2139 hectares government institutions' land, and 2364 hectares are under miscellaneous holdings. The administrative structure of the Woreda is composed of 40 rural and 3 urban kebeles.

The topography of the Woreda is mostly plains and the remaining part is mountainous and rugged terrain covered with natural and man-made forests. The climate of the district is estimated to be: highland 57.22%, altitude above sea level (15006-2300 meters), lowland 26.25% altitude above sea level (801-1500 meters) and temperate 16.23% altitude above sea level (2300-3400 meters). The maximum annual rainfall is 1400 mm and the minimum annual rainfall is 801 mm. Nu' Harav, EnsHarav, Gogare, Winke, Nakam are among the rivers that are naturally endowed to the Woreda.

Based on the data of the 2007 Ethiopian population and housing census and by identifying the kebeles and villages that included as part of the Woreda, the population of Enor Woreda in 2022 is estimated to be 166,025, of which 80,902 (48.73%) are males and 85,123 (51.27%) are females. Accordingly, the data shows that 93.91% of the total population lives in the rural areas

and the rest of 6.09% population are the share of the urban population. This data shows that from the total population of the Woreda, the people lives within 40 rural as well as 3 urban kebeles. According to the statistics of the 2007 population and housing census, using the regional standard, the population of the Woreda is growing at an average rate of 2.8 percent (growth rate of the rural population) and to reach 166,025 in 2022. On the other hand, social and economic development is slow in terms of population number, and it is widely believed that it is contributing negatively to rapid population growth of the Woreda



Figure 1map of the study area

3.1. Research Design

To finalize the paper properly, the researcher used descriptive research design so that the researcher could identify Practice and Challenges of **Monitoring and Evaluation** for Capital projects in Enor Woreda in the purposively selected sectors. In other words, the researcher used descriptive research design to describe in detail what is at the ground about practices and

challenges of capital projects collecting real data from selected respondents in the sectors. Thus, descriptive research was used to assess practices and challenges of capital projects and to provide possible solutions for those challenges.

3.2. Research Approach

To conduct the study, the researcher used both qualitative and quantitative research approach to collect, encode, analyze and interpret the collected data. According to Kumar(2011), qualitative research approach helps to perceive and describe attitude, feelings, values, experiences and practices of group of people. Thus, qualitative research approach is more preferable to conduct such type studies to assess opinions of the respondents in depth.

3.3. Data Sources and Type of Data

To collect reliable data and to finalize the paper properly, primary data was collected and used for analysis purpose. To collect this primary data, three core sectors namely: Agriculture and natural resource development office, Health office and Water, mining and energy development office out of potentially known poverty alleviating six sectors were purposively selected and used for the study. In these three sectors, sixty five employees working in main work processes were purposively selected as total population. Out of these purposively selected sixty five employees, fifty six were randomly selected as sample size of the study. Therefore, the sampling techniques that were applied to take both target population and sample size were purposive sampling and simple random sampling respectively.

3.4. Target Population, Sampling Technique and Sample Size

Out of potentially known poverty alleviating six sectors, three core sectors namely Agriculture and natural resource development office, Health office and Water, mining and energy development office were selected and used as case study area. From these purposively selected three sectors, performance of all projects that are being implemented as capital projects obtaining budget from both government and NGOs were taken in to account to collect data and make assessment. In these three sectors, only sixty five employees working in main work processes

were purposively selected as total population so that the researcher collect reliable data. Out of these purposively selected sixty five employees, fifty six were randomly selected as sample size of the study.

Therefore, the sampling techniques that were applied to take both target population and sample size were purposive sampling and simple random sampling respectively. Sample size of the respondents was calculated using the formula recommended by Yamane (1967):

$$n = \frac{N}{(1 + N (e)^2)} \Rightarrow 56 = \frac{65}{(1 + 65 (0.05)^2)}$$

Where: n –Sample size of the study.

N –Total population

e – Level of precision (0.05)

3.5. Data Collection Instruments

To collect reliable data and to finalize the paper properly, primary data was collected and used for analysis purpose. As a result, primary data was collected using different data collection tools as follows

3.5.1. Questionnaires

As commonly used tool for data collection, the researcher used Amharic version of questionnaire to collect primary data from respondents. It is because advantage of covering more respondents with minimized cost of data collection. Thus, the researcher used self prepared questionnaire with close ended questions to collect primary data. Additionally, the questions were developed in likert scale type form.

3.5.2. Focus Group Discussion

The focus group discussion was conducted with three planning officers (development plan preparation monitoring and evaluation officers) of sampled sectors as these officers relatively have close relationship with capital projects. According to Kothari (2004), focus group

discussion has advantages to save time and money; and to conduct deep rooted discussion so that the participants remember different related ideas each other which result in more data.

3.6. Interview

As additional data collection instrument, interview was conducted by the researcher with the respondents whenever necessary.

3.7. Method of Data Analysis

Following collection of primary data, the researcher edited, encoded and entered the data in to computer system using SPSS/Version 20 to analyze and generate output of the analyzed data. Therefore, the data was analyzed using descriptive statistics like percentages and frequencies. The analyzed output is properly narrated and clearly presented so that it could be possible to understand the output easily.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter, the researcher tried to present analysis result and interpretation of output which was obtained conducting descriptive analysis of collected primary data. Therefore, analysis result about demographic background of the respondents, practice of the selected sectors about monitoring and evaluation of capital projects and related challenges are presented as follows.

4.2. Questionnaire Return Rate

Out of purposively selected sixty five employees(as total population), fifty six of them were randomly selected as sample size and Amharic version of the questionnaire was distributed to them. Then, forty eight respondents returned back filling the questionnaire properly. Therefore, the return rate is about 85.71% and it is possible to say satisfactory level of return rate.

4.3. Demographic data

Analysis result about demographic data is presented here which was analyzed using respondents from selected sectors.

Table 1Demographic background of the respondents

R.N.	Items		N	Frequency	Percent age	Mean	Mini mum	Maxim um	Std. Deviation
1	Sex of respondents	Male	48	37	77.1	1.23	1	2	.425
		Female		11	22.9				
2	Age of respondents	20-29	48	13	27.1	2.10	1	4	.928
		30-39		22	45.8				
		40-49		8	16.7				
		50-59		5	10.4				
3	Education level	10/12 complete	48	3	6.3	3.63	1	5	.937
		Certificate		3	6.3				
		Diploma		6	12.5				
		Degree		33	68.8				
		MA/MSc		3	6.3				
4	Marital status	Married	48	41	85.4	1.15	1	2	.357
		Unmarried		7	14.6				

Source: own computation, Survey data & SPSS V-20/2023

Detailed analysis result about age, sex, educational level and marital status of the respondents is presented in the above table 1. As a result, the analysis showed that 37(77.1%) of the respondents were male and 11(22.9%) of them were female respondents.

Out of the total forty eight respondents, 13(27.1%), 22(45.8%), 8(16.7%) and 5(10.4%) of them were identified to be from age group between 20-29, between 30-39, 40-49 and between 50-59 respectively. If analysis result about respondents academic qualification is taken in account, 3(6.3%) of them are 10/12 complete, 3(6.3%) of them are certificate holders, 6(12.5%) of them are diploma holders, 33(68.8%) of them are degree holders and the remaining 3(6.3%) of these respondents were identified to be masters degree holders. As the analysis result revealed, majority 33(68.8%) of the employees in these selected sectors were identified to be degree holders and 35(72.9%) of the respondents are at highly reproductive age level among the employees of the sectors.

4.4. Budget related administrative works in the process of monitoring and Evaluation of capital projects

In this section, the researcher tried to discuss analysis result of data collected about activities of planning officers in the sectors availability of capital projects related budget and use of the budget being obtained from different sources. As a result, descriptive analysis was conducted by the researcher to measure central tendency of detailed items through examination of mean score of the data. The lower the mean score indicates that most of the respondents responded are not comfortable with the specific idea raised and vice-versa. While, standard deviation is used to measure the variability or dispersion. The higher the standard deviation indicates that more scores spread out. Thus, descriptive analysis results for budget related parts are presented below in table 2.

Table 2 Budget related administrative works about capital projects

R. N.	Items		N	Frequ ency	Percent	Mean	Mini mum	Maxi mum	Std. Deviation
1	planning officer	Yes	48	48	100.0	1.00	1	1	0.000
2	experience of planning officer	Sufficient	48	30	62.5	1.40	1	3	.536
		not sufficient		17	35.4				
3	professional capacity of planning officer	Sufficient	48	31	64.6	1.40	1	3	.574
		not sufficient		15	31.3				
4	administering Capital projects	Yes	48	43	89.6	1.10	1	2	.309
		No		5	10.4				
5	running allocated budget	Yes	48	35	72.9	1.27	1	2	.449
		No		13	27.1				
6	source of budget	Government	48	22	45.8	3.38	1	6	2.294
		International NGOS		2	4.2				
		Both 1 & 2		24	50				
7	Time of allocated Budget	Yes	48	26	54.2	1.65	1	5	1.000
		No		19	39.6				
8	presentation of proposal	Yes	48	45	93.8	1.06	1	2	.245
		No		3	6.3				
9	preparation of proposal	planning officer	48	21	43.8	1.96	0	3	.988
		management team		5	10.4				
		other coordinated team		21	43.8				
10	community participation	Yes	48	18	37.5	1.63	1	2	.489
		No		30	62.5				

Source: own computation, Survey data/2023 & SPSS V-20

As the beginning question in table 2 above, about availability of planning officer was presented to the respondents in the selected sectors. As it is revealed by analysis result, all 48(100%) of the respondents responded that the sectors have planning officers. Out of total respondents, 30(62.5%) and 17(35.4%) of them responded to assure that the planning officers in the sectors have sufficient and insufficient work experience respectively. Here, it is possible to conclude depending on analysis result that the officers have more or less sufficient experience though percentage share of the response from those who provided negative response has considerable ratio.

When we come to the third item, it is about professional capacity of the planning officers working the sectors. The analysis result authenticated from response of 31(64.6%) that the officers have sufficient professional capacity. However, the response provided by 15(31.3%) of

the respondents revealed that the officers have no sufficient professional capacity. The fourth and the fifth consecutive questions were used by the researcher to assess whether the sectors are administering capital project and running the projects related budget per year or not. As the analysis result showed majority of the respondents responded that these selected sectors are administering Capital Projects and related budget. In other words, 43(89.6%) and 35(72.9%) of the respondents assured that the sectors are administering capital project and running the projects related budget respectively.

Next to this, assessment was conducted to know the source of budget being used for capital projects. Therefore, 22(45.8%), 2(4.2%), 10(20.8%) and 14(29.2%) of the respondents responded that the government, international NGOs and both the government and international NGOs respectively are being used by the sectors as source of capital projects related budget. However, the time on which the sectors are getting the budget is not satisfactory. It is because almost half of the respondents (19/39.6%) of the respondents responded that the budget is not allocated on time though 26(54.2%) of them assured that the sectors are getting the budget on time. The response obtained from focus group discussion participants also indicated that the sectors are not getting budget on time.

In the same way, it was assessed to identify whether the sectors are presenting budget proposal to concerned bodies so that it could be possible for them to get the budget properly and the response from 45(93.8%) of the respondents authenticated that the sectors are presenting budget proposal to budget providers and this was also assured by focus group discussion participants. Likewise, the respondents from all sectors were contacted to get information about proposal preparation. As a result, 21(43.8%), 5(10.4%) and 21(43.8%) of the respondents responded that the budget proposal is being prepared by planning officer, management team and other coordinated team respectively. And the question here was presented to identify the participation of stakeholders in the preparation of the proposal. Thus, analysis result indicated that the participation is not enough. It is because 18(37.5%) and 30(62.5%) of the respondents responded yes and no respectively to show level of stakeholders participation and the analysis output revealed clearly that the participation is not enough.

Table 3 Amount of capital projects related budget

R. N.	Items	Scale	N	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation
1	The Budget is sufficient	strongly disagree	48	11	22.9	2.44	1	4	1.183
		Disagree		21	43.8				
		Agree		16	33.3				
2	The Budget is insufficient	strongly disagree	48	5	10.4	3.44	1	5	1.335
		Disagree		11	22.9				
		Agree		22	45.8				
		strongly agree		10	20.8				

Source: own computation, Survey data & SPSS V-20/2023

As far as the items included in the third table(table-3) are considered, the questions were included to assess sufficiency of budget being provided by concerned bodies. When we see the response from the respondents, 11(22.9%), 21(43.8%) and 16(33.3%) of the responded strongly disagree, disagree and agree respectively that the budget being budgeted is sufficient. However, 5(10.4%), 11(22.9%), 22(45.8%) and 10(20.8%) of them responded strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree respectively that the budget is insufficient and focus group discussion participants also supported that the budget what the sectors obtaining for capital projects is not sufficient.

Table 4Efficiency of Capital projects related budget use

R.N.	Items	Scale	N	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation
1	The budget is used efficiently	strongly disagree	48	8	16.7	2.60	1	5	1.267
		Disagree		23	47.9				
		Neutral		1	2.1				
		Agree		12	25.0				
		strongly agree		4	8.3				
2	The budget is used in inefficient way	strongly disagree	48	3	6.3	3.19	1	5	1.249
		Disagree		18	37.5				
		Agree		21	43.8				
		strongly agree		6	12.5				

Source: own computation, Survey data & SPSS V-20/2023

Analysis result about efficiency of budget use is included in table-4 above. As the analysis result revealed, 8(16.7%), 23(47.9%),1(2.1%), 12(25%), and the remaining 4(8.3%) of the respondents answered strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree respectively

that the budget is being used in efficient way. However, 3(6.3%), 18(37.5%), 21(43.8%) and 6(12.5%) of them responded strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree respectively that the budget is being used in inefficient way. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the capital projects relate budget what the sectors get from different donors and the government is not being used in efficient way. It is because 31(64.58%) of the respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed while filling the questionnaire about efficiency of budget use(item no.1 table-4 above).

Table 5 Transfer of Capital projects to contractors

R. N.		Scale	N	Frequenc y	Percent	Mean	Mini mum	Maximu m	Std. Deviation
1	transfer of capital projects to contractors	Negotiation	48	6	12.5	2.17	1	5	.883
		Bid		35	72.9				
		Other		2	4.2				
2	participation of stakeholders to transfer projects	Yes	48	20	41.7	1.58	1	2	.498
		No		28	58.3				

Source: own computation, Survey data & SPSS V-20/2023

Analysis result about transfer of capital projects to contractors is indicated in table-5 above. Thus, 6(12.5%), 35(72.9%) and the remaining 2(4.2%) of the respondents answered negotiation, bid and other respectively. Depending on the response obtained from focus group participants and 35(72.9%) of the respondents, it is possible to conclude that projects are being transferred to contractors using bid though 6(12.5%) of the respondents responded that it is being done through negotiation. In relation to this, the respondents were contacted to assess whether stakeholders have the opportunity to take part in the projects transferring process. As a result, 20(41.7%) and 28(58.3%) of them responded *yes* & *no* respectively to reveal stakeholders participation is not satisfactory. It is because, only 20(41.7%) of the respondents responded that they are have the opportunity to participate. However, 28(58.3%) of them responded that the stakeholders have no the chance to take part in.

4.5. Practicing monitoring and evaluation of capital projects

Referring different documents and taking in account of personal observation throughout his stay in governmental sectors as an employee, the researcher had developed about nine different questionnaire items(table-6) to assess whether these selected sectors use the methods and practices to monitor and evaluate capital projects. As a result, the analysis result is presented as follows.

Table 6 Practices being applied to monitor & evaluate capital projects

R.n.	Items	Scale	Frequency	Percent	N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation
1	Conducting regular field supervision	strongly disagree	6	12.5	48	2.90	1	5	1.309
		Disagree	20	41.7					
		Neutral	0	0					
		Agree	17	35.4					
		strongly agree	5	10.4					
2	Conducting Sudden field supervision	strongly disagree	6	12.5	48	2.83	1	5	1.277
		Disagree	21	43.8					
		Neutral	0	0.0					
		Agree	17	35.4					
		strongly agree	4	8.3					
3	Assigning internal professional officers	strongly disagree	6	12.5	48	2.94	1	5	1.420
		Disagree	21	43.8					
		Neutral	1	2.1					
		Agree	10	20.8					
		strongly agree	10	20.8					
4	Assigning external professional officers	strongly disagree	8	16.7	48	2.52	1	5	1.185
		Disagree	24	50.0					
		Neutral	1	2.1					
		Agree	13	27.1					
		strongly agree	2	4.2					
5	Conducting on time discussion with concerned bodies if needed	strongly disagree	9	18.8	48	2.67	1	5	1.310
		Disagree	20	41.7					
		Neutral	1	2.1					
		Agree	14	29.2					
		strongly agree	4	8.3					
6	Preparing periodic payment certificate	strongly disagree	10	20.8	48	2.77	1	5	1.448
		Disagree	18	37.5					
		Neutral	1	2.1					
		Agree	11	22.9					
		strongly agree	8	16.7					
7	Testing quality of construction materials	strongly disagree	11	22.9	48	2.73	1	5	1.410
		Disagree	16	33.3					
		Neutral	2	4.2					
		Agree	13	27.1					
		strongly agree	6	12.5					
8	Controlling not to pay beyond performed/constructed of a project	strongly disagree	8	16.7	48	3.02	1	5	1.509
		Disagree	17	35.4					
		Neutral	1	2.1					
		Agree	10	20.8					
		strongly agree	12	25.0					

9	Solving problems automatically whenever related problems are perceived	strongly disagree	8	16.7	48	2.94	1	5	1.465
		Disagree	18	37.5					
		Neutral	1	2.1					
		Agree	11	22.9					
		strongly agree	10	20.8					

Source: own computation, Survey data & SPSS V-20/2023

As the first question in table-6 above, *conducting regular field supervision* was presented to the respondents in the selected sectors to identify whether the sectors are applying in the process of monitoring and evaluation of capital projects. Therefore, 6(12.5%), 20(41.7%), 17(35.4%) and 5(10.4%) of the respondents responded strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree respectively that the sectors are conducting regular field supervision to monitor and evaluate capital projects. As the analysis result indicated 26(54.2%) of the respondents responded either disagree or strongly disagree indicating that there is no regular supervision program in monitoring and evaluation of the projects though the response from 22(45.8%) of the respondents and participants of FGD revealed that there is regular supervision program in the sectors.

The second item was about *conducting sudden field supervision*. Thus, 6(12.5%), 21(43.8%), 17(35.4%) and 4(8.3%) of the respondents responded strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree respectively to assure that the sectors are not conducting sudden field supervision to monitor and evaluate capital projects. It is because the response from 27(56.25%) of the respondents authenticated either strongly disagreeing or disagreeing about idea that there is no such sudden supervision program to control performance of capital projects. However, 21(43.75%) of the respondents and participants of FGD supported the idea that there is such type of sudden supervision program in the sectors

Assigning internal professional officers was used as the third item in table-6 above. As the analysis result authenticated 6(12.5%), 21(43.8%), 1(2.1%), 10(20.8%) and 10(20.8%) of the respondents responded strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree respectively assuring that internal officers (especially planning officers) are not strictly controlling performance of capital projects. However, the response provided by 20(41.6%) of the

respondents revealed that the officers are still struggling for successful accomplishment of such projects though their struggle is not as it should have been.

If the fourth item in table-6 is considered, it was assignment of external professionals to monitor and evaluate capital projects. As the analysis result assured, 8(16.7%), 24(50%), 1(2.1%) and 13(27.1%) of the respondents responded strongly disagree, disagree, neutral and agree respectively that assigning external professional officers is not being applied as a tactic to monitor and evaluate performance of capital projects. It is because more than sixty five percent of the respondents replied either strongly disagree or disagree to indicate the sectors are not receiving technical support from external professionals in monitoring and evaluation of the projects. However, 13(27.1%) of them responded that the sectors are receiving technical support from external professionals for intended purpose.

If we come to fifth questions, it was about practicing on time discussion with concerned bodies as a means to control capital projects performance. 9(18.8%), 20(41.7%), 1(2.1%) and 14(29.2%) and 4(8.3%) of them responded strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree respectively that the sectors are conducting on time discussion about capital projects. In other words, the analysis result and the response from participants of FGD indicated that the sectors are not practicing on time discussion because only 18(37.5%) of the respondents replied agreeing or strongly agreeing to show the sectors are practicing the discussion. Therefore, the response from more than sixty percent of the respondents assured that the sectors are not practicing on time discussion to solve an capital projects performance related problems.

Unless there is a problem related with personal attitude, it is commonly known fact that there should be preparation of on time payment certificate for financial control purpose. Taking in account of this idea, the researcher included this certificate relate question as the six item in the above table-6. Thus, 10(20.8%), 18(37.5%), 1(2.1%), 11(22.9%) and 8(16.7%) of the respondents responded strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree respectively. From this analysis result, it is possible to see that 28(58.33%) of the respondents either strongly disagreed or disagreed to reveal that the sectors are not working hard to prepare periodic payment

certificate which one of the critical tools to control performance of capital projects. In other words, the analysis result indicated that payments for capital projects might be made using rule of guess approach.

Likewise, testing materials what contractor use for construction of capital projects could be use as one of the tactics in controlling ongoing process of the projects. Therefore thinking this in mind, the researcher included the phrase " *testing quality of construction materials*" as the seventh item in table-6 above so that it could be possible to identify whether the sectors are controlling quality of construction materials using different approaches. As a result, 11(22.9%), 16(33.3%), 2(4.2%),13(27.1%) and 6(12.5%)of the respondents responded strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree respectively to show their response about the idea. As the analysis result revealed here, more than fifty percent of the respondents responded in negative way that the sectors are not practicing it properly. In other words, 27(56.25%) of the respondents responded either strongly disagree or disagree supporting the idea that the sectors are not practicing though 19(39.58%) of them either agreed or strongly agreed that the sectors are practicing quality of material control method as a means to monitor and evaluate ongoing performance of capital projects.

In the same way, 8(16.7%), 17(35.4%), 1(2.1%),10(20.8%) and 12(25%)of the respondents responded strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree respectively about the eighth item(*Controlling not to pay beyond performed/constructed of a project*) which was included in the table-6 above. However when we see the analysis result, it indicated that the sectors are not following the effective way not to make excessive payment through ongoing stages when different capital projects are being constructed starting from the beginning of the projects. It is because more than fifty percent of the respondents responded either strongly disagree or disagree to show care not taken when contractors present request for payment though 22(45.8%) of the respondents responded that the sectors are not making over payment at the time of payment request.

Finally on this part of the questionnaire, the respondents were contacted to identify whether the sectors follow automatic problems solving approach whenever related problems are perceived.

As a result, 8(16.7%), 19(39.58%), 11(22.9%) and 10(20.8%) of the respondents provided the response strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree respectively. As the result showed, the response from 27(56.25%) of them indicated that the sectors are not following automatic problem solving approach. However, 22(43.7%) of the respondents and participants of FGD responded that the sectors are applying automatic problem solving approach even if it is not as strong as it should have been.

4.6. Challenges related with monitoring & Evaluation of capital projects

Table 7Challenges related with monitoring & Evaluation of capital projects

R. n.	Items	Scale	Fre que	Perce nt	N	Mea n	Mini m	Max	Std. Dev
1	Lack of professional experts	strongly disagree	4	8.3	48	3.40	1	5	1.198
		Disagree	7	14.6					
		Neutral	2	4.2					
		Agree	31	64.6					
		strongly agree	3	6.3					
2	Existence of attitudinal problems by officers side(not to control construction of projects as per performance agreement)	strongly disagree	5	10.4	48	3.52	1	5	1.288
		Disagree	8	16.7					
		Neutral	2	4.2					
		Agree	23	47.9					
		strongly agree	10	20.8					
3	Existence of attitudinal problems by contractors side(not to construct projects as per performance agreement)	strongly disagree	2	4.2	48	3.90	1	5	1.057
		Disagree	7	14.58					
		Agree	26	54.2					
		strongly agree	13	27.1					
4	Lack of cooperation among stakeholders	strongly disagree	0	0	48	4.11	1	5	0.787
		Disagree	4	8.3					
		Neutral	0	0					
		Agree	30	62.5					
		strongly agree	13	27.1					
5	lack of sufficient budget	strongly disagree	1	2.1	48	3.96	1	5	1.051
		Disagree	7	14.6					
		Neutral	0	0					
		Agree	25	52.1					
		strongly agree	15	31.3					
6	Not getting budget on time	strongly disagree	1	2.1	48	4.23	1	5	0.066
		Disagree	0	0					
		Neutral	0	0					
		Agree	33	68.8					
		strongly agree	14	29.2					
7	Fluctuation of construction materials price	strongly disagree	0	0	48	4.62	1	5	0.644
		Disagree	1	2.1					
		Neutral	1	2.1					
		Agree	13	27.1					
		strongly agree	32	66.7					

Source: own computation, Survey data & SPSS V-20/2023

As the last part of the questionnaire, different seven questions (table-7 above) were included in the questionnaire of the study to assess the challenges what these selected sectors face due to monitoring and evaluation of capital projects. As a result, lack of professional experts was presented to selected respondents in the studied sectors to identify whether the sectors are facing the challenge. Therefore, 4(8.3%), 7(14.6%), 2(4.2%), 31(64.6%) and 3(6.3%) of the respondents responded strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree respectively that the sectors are facing the challenge of lack of professional experts to monitor and evaluate capital projects. As the analysis result indicated 34(70.83%) of the respondents responded either agree or strongly agree authenticating that lack of professional experts is one of the core problems what the sectors face in monitoring and evaluation of capital projects.

The second item was about *Existence of attitudinal problems by officers' side (not to control construction of projects as per performance agreement)*. Thus, 5(10.4%), 8(16.7%), 2(4.2%), 23(47.9%) and 10(20.8%) of the respondents responded strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree respectively to assure that the sectors are facing the challenge of *Existence of officers attitudinal problems in monitoring and evaluation of capital projects*. It is because the response from 33(68.75%) of the respondents authenticated either strongly agreeing or agreeing about idea that there is *officers attitudinal problems* to control performance of capital projects. However, 13(27.1%) of the respondents opposed the idea about existence of officers attitudinal problem in the sectors.

Likewise, *existence of contractors' attitudinal problems not to construct projects as per performance agreement* was used as the third item in table-7 above. As a result, 2(4.2%), 7(14.58%), 26(54.2%) and 13(27.1%) of the respondents responded strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree respectively to assure that *contractors' attitudinal problems* being the most challenging problem not to construct projects as per performance agreement of capital projects. It is because this contractors attitudinal problem related idea was supported by 39(81.25%) of the respondents and participants of FGD though there are 9(18.75%) of the respondents opposing the idea.

If the fourth item in table-6 is considered, it was *lack of cooperation among stakeholders* to monitor and evaluate capital projects. Therefore, 4(8.3%), 30(62.5%) and 13(27.1%) of the respondents responded disagree, agree and strongly agree respectively assuring that *lack of cooperation* is one of the core difficult problems challenging the sectors due to monitoring and evaluation of performance of capital projects. It is because more than eighty nine percent of the respondents replied either strongly agree or agree to indicate the sectors are facing the challenge of lack of cooperation among stakeholders.

If we come to fifth questions, it was about *lack of sufficient capital projects related budget*. 1(2.1%), 7(14.58%), 25(52.1%) and 15(31.3%) of them responded strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree respectively that the sectors are suffering from lack of sufficient capital projects budget as 40(83.4%) of the respondents supported the idea positively. In the same way, the sixth item has been included to identify whether the sectors are getting the budget on time or not. Thus, 1(2.1%), 33(68.8%) and 14(29.2%) of them responded strongly disagree, agree and strongly agree respectively authenticating that budget is not being obtained on time and it is being the most difficult challenge for the sectors. In other words, 47(97.92%) of the respondents assured that it is the most challenging problem in the sectors. Moreover, participants of FGD also supported the idea strongly that lack of sufficient capital projects related budget is being the most challenging problem of the sectors.

Finally, *fluctuation of construction materials price* was used by the researcher as the last item in the above table-7. As a result, 1(2.1%), 1(2.1%), 13(27.1%) and 32(66.7%) of the respondents responded disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree respectively to show their response about the idea. As the analysis result revealed here, more than ninety percent of the respondents and participants of FGD responded supporting the idea that fluctuation of construction materials price is being one of the core challenges affecting monitoring and evaluation of capital projects. In other words, 45(93.75%) of them supported responding either agree or strongly agree that fluctuation of construction materials price is challenging the sectors as one of the core negatively influencing factors.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1. Conclusions

Depending on findings of the study, the researcher tried to present conclusions as follows:

Even though the response from majority of the respondents indicated that there is no regular supervision program in monitoring and evaluation of capital projects, it is possible to conclude that there is a supervision program but it is not regular and satisfactory.

The response provided by 20(41.6%) of the respondents revealed that the planning officers are struggling for successful accomplishment of such projects though their struggle is not as it should have been.

As majority of the respondents assured, the studied sectors are not practicing on time discussion to solve any capital projects related problems.

It is possible to conclude depending on the response provided by majority of the respondents that the sectors are not requesting payment certificate as mandatory document to make payment for capital projects.

Contractors attitudinal problem was supported by 39(81.25%) of the respondents that it is one of the core challenges of the sectors.

The response from 47(97.92%) of the respondents assured that lack of sufficient capital projects related budget is the most challenging problem in the sectors.

Finally, more than ninety percent of the respondents responded supporting the idea that fluctuation of construction materials price is being the second most challenging problem affecting monitoring and evaluation of capital projects.

5.2. Recommendations

Taking in account of findings and conclusions of the study, the researcher tried to list down some ideas to be taken as recommendations.

- ✓ Capital projects are critical components of infrastructures crucially required to ensure economic development of a country. Therefore, all concerned bodies should give especial attention so that it could be possible to improve use of capital projects related budget and overall performance of the projects.
- ✓ To improve professional capacity of planning officers and increase overall control on capital Projects, continues and reliable trainings should be provided to these planning officers.
- ✓ To increase amount of capital projects related budget and to minimize level of capital projects budget deficit, concerned bodies should give attention so that sound capital projects budget proposal could be prepared.
- ✓ Finally, monitoring & evaluation of capital projects should get critical attention to ensure radical change in performance of the projects.

References

- Andersen, E.S.; Birchall, D.; Jessen, S.A.; Money, A.H. (2006). Exploring project success. *Balt. J. Manag.*, 1, pp.127–147.
- Ahmed, R.; M., N.A.(2011). Performance of Projects in Public Sector of Pakistan: Developing a Framework for Future challenges Effort. *Serbian Proj.Manag. J. 1*, pp.3–15.
- Asmamaw Tadege, Klakegg, O.J., & Haavaldsen, T. 2012. Governance of Public Investment Project in Ethiopia. *Project management Journal*, 43 (4)
- Al-Hazim, N.; Salem, Z.A.; Ahmad, H.(2017). Delay and Cost Overrun in Infrastructure Projects in Jordan. *Procedia Eng.*, 182, pp.18–24.
- Amade, B. et.al.(2015). Factors for Containing Failure & Abandonment of Public Sector Construction Projects in Nigeria. *J. Build. Perform.* 6, pp.63–76.
- Ayodele, E.O.; Alabi, O.M. Abandonment of Construction Projects in Nigeria: Causes and Effects. *J. Emerg. Trends Econ. Manag.Sci.* 2, pp.142–145.
- Bezawit Tesfaye(2019). Assessment of Project Monitoring and Evaluation Practice At Bamacon Engineering Plc. MBA Thesis. ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY, Ethiopia
- Budhani, A.; Mallah, H.B.(2007). Mega Projects in Balochistan Collective for Social Science Research. *Collect. Soc. Sci. Res.* Karachi.
- Damoah, I.S.; Kumi, D.K.(2018). Causes of government construction projects failure in an emerging economy: Evidence from Ghana. *Int. J. Manag. Proj. Bus.* 11, pp.558–582.
- Dang, C.N.; Le-Hoai, L(2016). Critical success factors for implementation process of design build projects in Vietnam. *J. Eng. Des. Technol.* 14, pp.17–32.
- Doloi, H.; Sawhney, A.; Iyer, K.C(2012). Structural equation model for investigating factors affecting delay in Indian construction projects. *Constr. Manag. Econ.* 30, 869–884.
- Ejaz, N.; Ali, I.; Tahir, M(2020). Assessment of Delays and Cost Overruns during Construction Projects in Pakistan. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Structural Engineering Construction and Management*, Kandy, Sri Lanka, 16–18 December 2011; Available online: <http://dl.lib.mrt.ac.lk/handle/123/9431>
- Flyvbjerg, B. Policy and planning for large-infrastructure projects: Problems, causes, cures. *Environ. Plan. B Plan. Des.* 34, pp.578–597

- Ikechukwu A., Musa M., Dorothy L. (2015). Towards Effective Infrastructure Development in Nigeria: Theoretical Considerations from a Project Management Perspective. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 2015, 5, pp. 172-180.
- Ikechukwu A. Diugwu, Musa Mohammed, Dorothy L. Baba(2015). Towards Effective Infrastructure Development in Nigeria: Theoretical Considerations from a Project Management Perspective, Department of Project Management Technology, Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria.
- Irfan, M.; et.al.(2021). Role of Project Planning and Project Manager Competencies on Public Sector Project Success.*Sustainability***2021**, 13, 1421.
- Jørgensen, P.E.F.; Isaksson, M(2008). Building credibility in international banking and financial markets: A study of how corporate reputations are managed through image advertising.*Corp. Commun.Int. J.* 13, pp.365–379.
- Laufer, A.; Tucker, R.L(1987). Is construction project planning really doing its job? A critical examination of focus, role and process.*Constr.Manag.Econ.*5, pp.243–266.
- Munns, A.A.; Bjeirmi, B.F(1996). The role of project management in achieving project success.*Int. J. Proj. Manag.*14, pp.81–87.
- MekoroAregaGashe(2022). Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation of Capital Projects in Hadiya Zone, South Ethiopia. *International Journal of Economics, Social Science, Entrepreneurship and Technology (IJESET)*, (1)1, pp, 1-1
- Nixon, P.; Harrington, M.; Parker, D(2012). Leadership performance is significant to project success or failure: A critical analysis. *Int. J. Product. Perform. Manag.*61, 204 216.
- Nzekwe, J.U.; Oladejo, E.I.; Emoh, F.I(2015). Project failure as a reoccurring issue in developing countries: Focus on Anambra State, South East, Nigeria. *Int. J. Energy Environ. Res.* 29, pp.4471–4480.
- Trevor Paul Davis(1983). *A Comprehensive Approach to the Formulation of Capital Projects in Developing Countries: Finance and Implementation. Case Study: Edendale, Kwazulu (Housing).*
- Phillip LeBel,(2011). *Economic Analysis of Development Projects (translated and updated from the French original version, ©1999).* Center for Economic Research on Africa, School of Business, Montclair State University.

Tilahun, G.(2013). Exploring the Practice of Monitoring and Evaluation System of Capital Projects, thesis Degree of Master of Art in Public Financial Management, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

VOLPE(2009). Development of Evaluation Measures for Major Capital Projects

World Economic Forum (2010). The Global Competitiveness Report 2010-2011. World Economic Forum, Geneva.

Appendices

Appendix-I Questionnaire

Wolkite University

College of Social Science and Humanities

Department of Governance and Development Studies (MA program)

This questionnaire is designed to collect data for the study on the title “Practice and Challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation System of Capital Projects in Selected Sectors: The Case of Enoreworeda, GuragheZone” that will be conducted as a partial fulfillment for Master of Arts degree in development studies at Wolkite University. Findings of the study will strictly be utilized for the intended academic purpose only. In other words, your genuine information is essential and highly valuable for the successful completion of this study. Therefore, the researcher would like to assure you that your response will be kept secret with full confidence. Thus, you are kindly requested to respond to all of the given questions properly. Finally, I would like to express my heartfelt appreciate and gratitude in advance for your cooperation

Please give answers in the spaces provided and tick (√) in the box that matches your response to the questions where applicable.

Section I: General Background of respondents

1. **Sex:** A/1. Male B/2. Female
2. What is your highest level of educational status?
- 1/Post graduate level (Master) 2/University degree
- 3/College diploma 4/Secondary school 5/Other
3. Marital status
- A. Married B. Single C. Divorced D. Widow

Part two – Questions Pertaining the Practice and Challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation of Capital Projects in Selected Sectors

1. Does your sector have planning officer?
- A/ yes B/no

2. If the answer for question no.1 is **yes**, how is his/her experience?
A/Sufficient B/ not sufficient C/I do no know
3. If the answer for question no.1 is **yes**, how is his/her professional capacity?
A/sufficient B/not sufficient
4. Does your sector administering budgeted capital projects?
A/ yes B/no
5. If the answer for no. 4 is yes, is the sector running the projects as per the allocated budget ?
A/Yes B/no
6. if the answer for question no.4 is yes, from where does your sector getting the budget?
A/ government B/ local NGOs C/ international NGOs D/community participation
E/both a & b F/All
7. Does your sector get the budget on time?
A/ yes B/no
8. Does your sector present project proposal to budget providers?
A/yes B/no
9. If the answer for no. 6 is yes, who prepare the proposal?
A/ planning officer B/ management team C/other coordinated team D/ if other,
please specify-----
10. If the answer for no.6 is yes, do you think that stakeholders participation is enough?
A/yes B/no
11. how is amount of the budget your sector getting from different bodies?

No	Statement	SDA	DA	Neu	AG	SAG
		1	2	3	4	5
11.1	The budget is sufficient					
11.2	The budget is not sufficient					

12. how does your sector using the budget?

No	Statement	SDA	DAG	Neu	AG	SAG
		1	2	3	4	5
12.1	The sector is using the budget					

	efficiently					
12.2	The sector is using the budget in inefficient way					

13. How does your sector transfer capital projects to contractors?

A/ in negotiation B/ using Bid c/if other justify it-----

14. In the process of transferring the projects, do stakeholders have the opportunity to take part in?

A/yes B/No

15. If the answer for question no.14 is yes, what are the stakeholders? Please mention them-----

16. After transferring the projects to contractors, what are the alternatives being applied by your sector to monitor & evaluate performance of the projects?

No	Statement	SDA	DA	NeU	AG	SA
		1	2	3	4	5
16.1	Conducting regular field supervision					
16.2	Conducting Sudden field supervision					
16.3	Assigning internal professional officers					
16.4	Assigning external professional officers					
16.5	Conducting on time discussion with concerned bodies if needed					
16.6	Preparing periodic payment certificate					
16.7	Testing quality of construction materials					
16.8	Controlling not to pay beyond performed/constructed of a project					
16.9	Solving problems automatically whenever related problems are perceived					

17. What are the challenges being faced by your sector in monitoring & evaluation of projects?

No	Statement	SDA	DA	NeU	AG	SAG
		1	2	3	4	5
17.1	Lack of professional experts					
17.2	Existence of attitudinal problems by officers					

	side(not to control construction of projects as per performance agreement)					
17.3	Existence of attitudinal problems by contractors side(not to construct projects as per performance agreement)					
17.4	Lack of cooperation among stakeholders					
17.5	lack of sufficient budget					
17.6	Not getting budget on time					
17.7	Fluctuation of construction materials price					

Appenices-2 SPSS OUTPUTS

		planning officer	experience of planning officer	professional capacity of planning officer	administering Capital projects	running allocated budget	source of budget	Time of allocated budget	presentation of proposal	preparation of proposal	community participation
N	Valid	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.00	1.40	1.40	1.10	1.27	3.38	1.65	1.06	1.96	1.63
Std. Deviation		0.000	.536	.574	.309	.449	2.294	1.000	.245	.988	.489
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
Maximum		1	3	3	2	2	6	5	2	3	2

Frequency Table

planning officer					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	48	100.0	100.0	100.0
experience of planning officer					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Sufficient	30	62.5	62.5	62.5
	not sufficient	17	35.4	35.4	97.9
	3	1	2.1	2.1	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	
professional capacity of planning officer					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Sufficient	31	64.6	64.6	64.6
	not sufficient	15	31.3	31.3	95.8
	3	2	4.2	4.2	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	
administering Capital projects					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	43	89.6	89.6	89.6
	No	5	10.4	10.4	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	
running allocated budget					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	35	72.9	72.9	72.9
	No	13	27.1	27.1	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

source of budget					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Government	22	45.8	45.8	45.8
	International NGOS	2	4.2	4.2	50.0
	1 & 2	10	20.8	20.8	70.8
	All	14	29.2	29.2	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	
Time of allocated budget					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	26	54.2	54.2	54.2
	No	19	39.6	39.6	93.8
	5	3	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	
presentation of proposal					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	45	93.8	93.8	93.8
	No	3	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	
preparation of proposal					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	2.1	2.1	2.1
	planning officer	21	43.8	43.8	45.8
	management team	5	10.4	10.4	56.3
	other coordinated team	21	43.8	43.8	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	
communit participation					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	18	37.5	37.5	37.5
	No	30	62.5	62.5	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Statistics			
		budgetis sufficient	Budget is insufficient
N	Valid	48	48
	Missing	0	0
Mean		2.44	3.44
Std. Deviation		1.183	1.335
Minimum		1	1
Maximum		4	5

Frequency Table

budgetis sufficient					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	11	22.9	22.9	22.9
	Disagree	21	43.8	43.8	66.7
	Agree	16	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Budget is insufficient					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	5	10.4	10.4	10.4
	Disagree	11	22.9	22.9	33.3
	Agree	22	45.8	45.8	79.2
	strongly agree	10	20.8	20.8	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	
		budget is used in inefficient way	budget is used efficiently		
N	Valid	48	48		
	Missing	0	0		
Mean		3.19	2.60		
Std. Deviation		1.249	1.267		
Minimum		1	1		
Maximum		5	5		

Frequency Table

budget is used in inefficient way					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	3	6.3	6.3	6.3
	Disagree	18	37.5	37.5	43.8
	Agree	21	43.8	43.8	87.5
	strongly agree	6	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	
budget is used efficiently					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	8	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Disagree	23	47.9	47.9	64.6
	Neutral	1	2.1	2.1	66.7
	Agree	12	25.0	25.0	91.7
	strongly agree	4	8.3	8.3	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Statistics

		participation of stakeholders in transfer of capital projects	transfer of capital projects to contractors
N	Valid	48	48
	Missing	0	0
Mean		1.58	2.17
Std. Deviation		.498	.883
Minimum		1	1
Maximum		2	5

Frequency Table

participation of stakeholders in transfer of capital projects

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	20	41.7	41.7	41.7
	no	28	58.3	58.3	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

transfer of capital projects to contractors

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	negotiation	6	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Bid	35	72.9	72.9	85.4
	other	2	4.2	4.2	89.6
	4	3	6.3	6.3	95.8
	5	2	4.2	4.2	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Statistics

	Conducting regular field supervision	Conducting Sudden field supervision	Assigning internal professional officers	Assigning external professional officers	Conducting on time discussion	Preparing periodic payment certificate	Testing quality of construction materials	Controlling not to pay beyond performed/	Solving problems automatically
N	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	2.90	2.83	2.94	2.52	2.67	2.77	2.73	3.02	2.94
Std. Deviation	1.309	1.277	1.420	1.185	1.310	1.448	1.410	1.509	1.465
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Frequency Table

Conducting regular field supervision

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SDA	6	12.5	12.5	12.5
	DA	20	41.7	41.7	54.2
	AG	17	35.4	35.4	89.6
	SAG	5	10.4	10.4	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Conducting Sudden field supervision

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SDA	6	12.5	12.5	12.5
	DA	21	43.8	43.8	56.3
	AG	17	35.4	35.4	91.7
	SAG	4	8.3	8.3	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Assigning internal professional officers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SDA	6	12.5	12.5	12.5
	DAG	21	43.8	43.8	56.3
	NEU	1	2.1	2.1	58.3
	AG	10	20.8	20.8	79.2
	SAG	10	20.8	20.8	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Assigning external professional officers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SDA	8	16.7	16.7	16.7
	DA	24	50.0	50.0	66.7
	NEU	1	2.1	2.1	68.8
	AG	13	27.1	27.1	95.8
	SAG	2	4.2	4.2	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Conducting on time discussion with concerned bodies if needed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SDA	9	18.8	18.8	18.8
	DA	20	41.7	41.7	60.4
	NEU	1	2.1	2.1	62.5
	AG	14	29.2	29.2	91.7
	SAG	4	8.3	8.3	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Preparing periodic payment certificate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SDA	10	20.8	20.8	20.8
	DA	18	37.5	37.5	58.3
	NEU	1	2.1	2.1	60.4
	AG	11	22.9	22.9	83.3
	SAG	8	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Testing quality of construction materials

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SDA	11	22.9	22.9	22.9
	DA	16	33.3	33.3	56.3
	NEU	2	4.2	4.2	60.4
	AG	13	27.1	27.1	87.5
	SAG	6	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Controlling not to pay beyond performed/constructed of a project

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SDA	8	16.7	16.7	16.7
	DA	17	35.4	35.4	52.1
	NEU	1	2.1	2.1	54.2
	AG	10	20.8	20.8	75.0
	SAG	12	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Solving problems automatically whenever related problems are perceived

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SDA	8	16.7	16.7	16.7
	DA	18	37.5	37.5	54.2
	NEU	1	2.1	2.1	56.3
	AGR	11	22.9	22.9	79.2
	SAG	10	20.8	20.8	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Statistics

		Lack of professional experts	Existence of attitudinal problems by officers	Existence of attitudinal problems by contractors	Lack of cooperation among stakeholders	lack of sufficient budget	Not getting budget on time	Fluctuation of construction materials price
N	Valid	48	48	48	47	48	48	47
	Missing	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Mean		3.40	3.52	3.90	4.11	3.96	4.23	4.62
Std. Deviation		1.198	1.288	1.057	.787	1.051	.660	.644
Minimum		0	1	1	2	1	1	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Frequency Table

Lack of professional experts

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	2.1	2.1	2.1
	strongly disagree	4	8.3	8.3	10.4
	disagree	7	14.6	14.6	25.0
	neutral	2	4.2	4.2	29.2
	agree	31	64.6	64.6	93.8
	strongly agree	3	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Existence of attitudinal problems by officers side(not to control construction of projects as per performance agreement)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	5	10.4	10.4	10.4
	disagree	8	16.7	16.7	27.1
	neutral	2	4.2	4.2	31.3
	agree	23	47.9	47.9	79.2
	strongly agree	10	20.8	20.8	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Existence of attitudinal problems by contractors side(not to construct projects as per performance agreement)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly disagree	2	4.2	4.2	4.2

	disagree	5	10.4	10.4	14.6
	neutral	2	4.2	4.2	18.8
	agree	26	54.2	54.2	72.9
	strongl agree	13	27.1	27.1	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Lack of cooperation among stakeholders

		Frequen cy	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	disagree	4	8.3	8.5	8.5
	agree	30	62.5	63.8	72.3
	strongl agree	13	27.1	27.7	100.0
	Total	47	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.1		
Total		48	100.0		

lack of sufficient budget

		Frequen cy	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	stronglis agree	1	2.1	2.1	2.1
	disagree	7	14.6	14.6	16.7
	agree	25	52.1	52.1	68.8
	strongl agree	15	31.3	31.3	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Not getting budget on time

		Frequen cy	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongl disagree	1	2.1	2.1	2.1
	agree	33	68.8	68.8	70.8
	strongl agree	14	29.2	29.2	100.0
	Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Fluctuation of construction materials price

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	disagree	1	2.1	2.1	2.1
	neutral	1	2.1	2.1	4.3
	agree	13	27.1	27.7	31.9
	strongl agree	32	66.7	68.1	100.0
	Total	47	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.1		
Total		48	100.0		