

**St. Mary's University**  
**School of Graduate Studies**  
**College of Business Administration**  
**Department of Project Management**



**ASSESSMENT OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION PRACTICE ON RURAL  
WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS: THE CASE OF OROMIA WATER RESOURCE  
DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY BUREAU.**

**By:** Fita Oli Wakejira  
SGS/0107/2010B

**Advisor:** Maru Shete (Ph.D.)

**February, 2023**

**ADDIS ABABA**

**ETHIOPIA**

AN ASSESSMENT OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION PRACTICE ON RURAL  
WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS: THE CASE OF OROMIA WATER RESOURCE  
DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY BUREAU

By  
Fita Oli Wakejira  
ID.NO. SGS/0107/2010B

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF GRADUATE  
STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION IN PROJECT  
MANAGEMENT

February 2023  
ADDIS ABABA  
ETHIOPIA

ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
SCHOOL OF BUSSINESS

AN ASSESSMENT OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION PRACTICE ON RURAL  
WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS: THE CASE OF OROMIA WATER RESOURCE  
DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY BUREAU

BY

FITA OLI WAKEJIRA

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

---

Dean, Graduate studies

---

Signature and Date

---

Advisor

---

Signature and Date

---

Internal Examiner

---

Signature and Date

---

External Examiner

---

Signature and Date

## DECLARATION

I, Fita oli, declare that this thesis entitled “An Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Practice on Rural Water Development Projects: the case of Oromia Water Resource Development and Energy Bureau” is my original work, prepared under the guidance of the research advisor. All sources of materials used for the thesis have been correctly acknowledged. I further confirm that the thesis has not been submitted either in part or in full to any other higher learning institution for the purpose of earning any degree.

---

Fita Oli Wakejira

St. Mary’s University, School of Graduate Studies

Department of Project Management

Addis Ababa – Ethiopia

---

Signature & Date

## **ENDORSEMENT**

This thesis has been submitted to St. Mary's University, School of Graduate Studies for examination with my approval as a University advisor.

---

Advisor

---

Signature and Date

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to thank God for empowering me from start to end preparing this paper.

My special and heartfelt gratitude to my advisor Maru Shite (PHD), for his advice in the course of conducting this research study.

I would like to extend my appreciation for all who were on beside of by giving advice, encouraging me during my felt time and reach to this date.

I would also want to say thanks to Ato Yehualashet Deme and all staff at Oromia Water Resource Development and Energy Bureau

## ACRONYM

<b>DWAF-</b>	Department of Water Affair and Development
<b>ECPE-</b>	Ethiopian Country Program Evaluation
<b>ECSFE-</b>	European Commission Civil Society Fund in Ethiopia
<b>IFRC-</b>	International Federation of Red Cross
<b>IFC-</b>	International Financial Cooperation
<b>LFA-</b>	Logical Frame Approach
<b>M&amp;E-</b>	Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>MDG-</b>	Millennium Development Goal
<b>OECD-</b>	Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development
<b>OWRDEB-</b>	Oromia Water Resource Development and Energy Bureau
<b>PPM-</b>	Project Planning Management
<b>SAMDI-</b>	South African Management Development Institute
<b>SPSS-</b>	Statistical Package for Social Science
<b>UNDP-</b>	United Nation Development Fund

# Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	v
ACRONYM .....	vi
Table of contents.....	xi
Abstract.....	xii
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
1.1. Introduction.....	1
1.2. Background of the study .....	1
1.3. Statement of the problem .....	2
1.4. Research questions.....	3
1.5. Objectives of the study.....	4
1.5.1. General objective.....	4
1.5.2. Specific objectives .....	4
1.6. Significance of the study.....	4
1.7. Limitation/Scope of the study.....	4
1.8. Organization of the research paper .....	5
Chapter two.....	6
Review of related literature.....	6
2.1. The theoretical review of Monitoring and Evaluation .....	6
2.2. Empirical review .....	6
2.3. Monitoring and Evaluation.....	7
2.4. Types of monitoring .....	9
2.4.1. Input Monitoring.....	9
2.4.2. Activity Monitoring.....	10



2.4.3.	Output Monitoring.....	10
2.4.4.	Impact Monitoring.....	10
2.4.5.	Assumption/Risk Monitoring .....	10
2.5.	Types of evaluation .....	10
2.6.	Importance of Monitoring and Evaluation.....	11
2.7.	Practice of Monitoring and Evaluation .....	12
2.7.1.	Planning and implementing a project Monitoring and Evaluation system	12
2.7.2.	Steps in planning a project Monitoring and Evaluation system.....	12
2.7.2.1.	Assess the existing readiness and capacity for M & E system.....	12
2.7.2.2.	Identification of the project's outcomes and development goal(s)	13
2.7.2.3.	Select key indicators and an evaluation framework .....	13
2.7.2.4.	Set baselines and plan data collection and analysis.....	13
2.7.2.5.	Select results targets .....	13
2.7.2.6.	Plan monitoring, data analysis, communication and reporting ....	14
2.7.2.7.	Plan the form and timing of critical reflection and interim evaluations.....	14
2.7.2.8.	Plan for the necessary conditions and capacities.....	14
2.7.2.9.	Components of a project M&E system.....	15
2.7.2.10.	Clear statements of measurable objectives .....	15
2.7.2.11.	A structured set of indicators.....	15
2.7.2.12.	The logical framework approaches.....	17
2.7.2.13.	Data collection mechanisms .....	19
2.8.	Challenges on practice of M & E.....	20

2.8.1.	Time and resource .....	21
2.8.2.	Technical expertise .....	21
2.8.3.	Culture/attitudes.....	21
CHAPTER THREE .....		22
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD .....		22
3.1.	Introduction.....	22
3.2.	Description of study area .....	22
3.3.	Research Design.....	22
3.4.	Target Population.....	23
3.5.	Sampling and sampling techniques.....	23
3.6.	Data source and techniques of data collection.....	23
3.7.	Data analysis and presentation.....	24
3.8.	Validity and reliability .....	24
3.9.	Ethical considerations .....	26
CHAPTER FOUR.....		27
DATA PRESENTATION ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION .....		27
4.1.	Introduction .....	27
4.2.	General information about respondents .....	27
4.3.	Monitoring and Evaluation system .....	29
4.4.	Importance of Monitoring and Evaluation .....	35
4.5.	Challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation System.....	36
CHAPTER FIVE .....		37
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION .....		37
5.1.	Major findings and summary .....	37

5.2. Conclusion.....	39
5.3. Recommendation.....	39
References.....	41
Annex 1 .....	43
Annex 2.....	49

## Table of contents

Table 1 Projects not completed within scheduled time .....	3
Table 2 A logical structure for project monitoring and evaluation indicators .....	18
Table 3 Case processing summary.....	26
Table 4 General Information about the respondents.....	28
Table 5 General Information on M&E of the Bureau.....	30
Table 6 Monitoring and Evaluation of the Bureau .....	33
Table 7 Importance of M&E.....	34
Table 8 Difficulties of M&E.....	35

## **Abstract**

The research carried on Oromia water development and Energy Bureau give attention on Monitoring & Evaluation practice of rural water development projects. Currently the Bureau develops and administered different water projects in all areas of the region. The main reason for making this research study was the delay of water resource projects started at different time but still not hand over to the community. According to the discussion made with Bureau staff and written internal reports starting from 2011 GC until 2022, 134 projects were not completed according to their scheduled time. This research tries to answer the questions on how the monitoring and evaluation practice of the Bureau was taking place, and fill the gaps that shown on project handling of the bureau. Descriptive research design was chosen for the study, in order to describe the monitoring and evaluation practice. Both qualitative and Quantitative data analysis approach was used in the study. By using the Non –Random sampling technique all 100 employee working on water development projects were chosen. The data for the study were obtained from primary sources with the help of structured questionnaires and Interviews. Some of the structured questioners were provided in the form of Likert scale in order to know the feeling and attitude of employees toward the M&E practice. Secondary data were collected from reports bulletins and magazines of the organization. 69 male and 28 females' respondents were participated on answering the research questions. The response from the respondents coded and analyzed by using SPSS 20 and Excel. The finding of this study shows that the presence of weak Monitoring and Evaluation practice, so that it was recommended that the Bureau has to utilize its employs efficiently by giving appropriate training, using the modern project implementation tools like the logical Frame work Approach, giving more attention for external factors that hinder the fulfillment of project success and more over the management has to give attention to monitoring and evaluation system.

Key words: Monitoring and Evaluation, Logical Frame Approach, Performance Indicators

# CHAPTER ONE

This chapter presents the introductory part of the study. It tries to provide the background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions and objectives, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study and it then presents summary of the other chapters that make up the research project report.

## 1.1. Introduction

According to European Commission civil society Fund in Ethiopia “Monitoring and Evaluation offer government officials, development managers, the public, private sectors and civil society with better means of learning from past experience, improving service delivery, planning and allocation of resources and demonstrating results as parts of accountability to key stake holders. (Umhlaba, 2017).

Monitoring and evaluation is a crucial issue for every organization because it alleviates the challenges of increasing effectiveness, if we are effective in achieving our performance so that a greater developmental impact can be made. One important way in which to increase effectiveness is by focusing on M&E. This is because M&E is a key skill that has the positive effect of improving policies, strategies and plans, as well as improving performance and optimizing impact (Toscano, 2013).

## 1.2. Background of the study

The Oromia Water Resource and Energy Bureau is one section of the Oromia Region governmental offices or bureaus that administer and control the development and distribution of pure water development and sanitation projects in the rural and urban areas of the regional state. There are many water projects development and exploration of energy resources carried out under this bureau. According to the written documents of the bureau until 2022 GC there are around 134 pure water development projects that are not completed according to their planned schedule. The Bureau has no well-organized monitoring and evaluation system as it was assumed as government organization. Plan of monitoring and evaluation incorporated with project plan but it was not communicated against the monitoring and evaluation. The bureau used process or physical progress of monitoring. Monitoring and Evaluation tools or technique the bureau used was on

assessment of performance indicators. Most data of the projects were collected and reported by site engineers and sent to the management of the organization.

### **1.3. Statement of the problem**

The major aim of monitoring and evaluation is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of project objectives, to bring developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability based on project. (Osman, 2002).

Without monitoring and evaluation firms or Organizations can not able to assess the day-to-day performance of their projects. According to the (Clark, 2009) Monitoring can be defined as “the ongoing process by which stakeholders obtain regular feedback on the progress being made towards achieving their goals and objectives”.

The presence of monitoring and evaluation unit/department/ in governmental and aid organization is one of the criteria for their effective performance and their accountability to the public. The absence of properly established M&E unit will affect the day-to-day follow up of projects and becomes one cause for their delay.

The Oromia Water Resource development and Energy Bureau has a written M&E plan but, there was no communicating with the result of monitoring and evaluation. This shows the presence of weakness on outcome and impact assessment. The Bureau used process (physical progress monitoring), Technical monitoring, financial monitoring and quality monitoring but there was weakness on using assumption monitoring. The type of evaluation most practiced by the bureau was Final Evaluation. Monitoring tools (technique) used by the bureau was using performance indicators; there was a weakness on using The Logical Frame Approach (LFA) the M&E practice mostly conducted by site engineers. In answering the importance of M&E information: The bureau do not effectively promote and communicate M&E function to all staff. In addition to that planned project schedules do not compare against actual schedule, there was weakness on providing training for staff involved on M&E. The information of M&E was not used to assist in decision making and planning. Most of the respondents do not agree on current M&E practice of the bureau in helping and improving project performance and moreover, the M&E practice did not help in acquiring sufficient data that need to be a base for project modification. The information of M&E was provided to the management of the bureau.

According to the written documents of the bureau until 2022 GC there are around 134 pure water development projects that are not completed according to their planned schedule. As it is shown below on table 1, starting from 2011 GC the following projects were not completed and hand over to the community.

**Table 1 Projects not completed within scheduled time**

S/N	Name of projects	Year started	Zone	Town	Woreda
1	Arsii Negelle,shash.&siraro	2011	West Arsi	Shashamane	4 Woredas
2	Awalilo II	2013	West wellega		Amuruu
3	Tayife	2015	West Arsi		Burqaa Diimtuu
4	Mararo	2013	Arsii	Mararo fi sirboo	Limmus Bilbiloo
5	Batu	2013	East Shoa	Baatuu	Baatuu
6	Ginchi	2014	West Shoa	Gincii	Dandii
7	Borode	2015	West Harage	Bordoddee	Gubbaa Qorichaa
8	Karee taa	2018	North Shoa	Kuyyu	Kuyyuu
9	Babu	2018	Jimmaa	Babbuu	Limmuu Kossaa
10	Kebe	2018	Kelam Wellega	Qeebbee	Gaawo Qeebbee
11	Arsi Negele	2018	West Arsi	Negellee Arsii	Arsii Nagallee
12	Fincha	2018	West wellega	Finca'a	Abay Chomen
13	Bokojii	2018	Arsii	Boqojjii	Limmuu
14	Bote	2012	East Shoa	Booteed	Booraa
15	Bareedi & Naannoo	2015	Bale	Multi-village	Daawwee Sar

Source: Survey data

#### 1.4. Research questions

- How is the M&E of the rural water development projects practiced under Oromia Water Resource Development and Energy Bureau?



- ✚ What is the importance of Monitoring and Evaluation practice for the Organization?
- ✚ What are the difficulties that hinder the establishment of effective M&E practice in the organization?

## **1.5. Objectives of the study**

### **1.5.1. General objective**

The general objective of the study is to describe the practice of monitoring and evaluation of rural water development projects in Oromia Water Resource development and Energy Bureau.

### **1.5.2. Specific objectives**

Specific Objective of the research is:

- ✚ To describe the M&E practice of Oromia Water Resource Development and Energy Bureau on Rural Water development projects.
- ✚ To show how far the Monitoring and Evaluation practice helps to run the projects.
- ✚ To Describe the Main challenges that hinders the formation of M&E system in OWRDEB.

## **1.6. Significance of the study**

The study will help to enable project participants of OWRDE to decide on the issues related to Monitoring and evaluation of projects. The study become very important in such a way that it can provide ideas on the current practices of monitoring and evaluation of projects so that the project participants can take corrective action to minimize or avoid the challenges and use the opportunities identified in a better way.

Other stake holders such as the community, the government, contractors, and participants other than OWRDEB can also benefit from the result of this study. The study can be used as a reference for other studies related to monitoring and evaluation of projects.

## **1.7. Limitation/Scope of the study**

Due to time constraint, the research only focused on rural water development projects, it didn't include the urban water projects. In addition to this financial constraint made the study to consider only M&E of the rural water resource development projects. Moreover some other constraints such as availability of internet sources,

## **1.8. Organization of the research paper**

The Research was organized on five chapters. Chapter one of the study is introduction that focuses on the background of the study, statement of the problem and objectives of the study. Chapter two focuses on review of related literature. The third chapter is about the design of the methodology by which the study employed. This chapter focuses on the sources of data, sampling techniques and sample size determination and the method of data collection and analysis. Chapter four of the paper discusses findings and presents the results from the sources. The last chapter focuses on conclusion and recommendation of the study.

## **Chapter two**

### **Review of related literature**

This chapter presents the review of related literatures on the study to have an understanding in to the research topic and briefly represent the readers to some of the major areas of the subject matter under consideration. The chapter is presented under the following sections:

#### **2.1. The theoretical review of Monitoring and Evaluation**

According to the manual book of UNDP (Clark, 2009) a decent planning, monitoring and evaluation increase the contribution of an organization by creating clear links between past, present and future creativities and progress results. (Jody Zall Kusek Ray C. Rist, 2004), argued that the beginning of globalization has made growing pressures on governments and organizations around the globe to be more reactive to the demands of the stakeholders. Those stakeholders are demanding good governance, accountability and transparency, more progress, effectiveness, and supply of concurrent results.

Monitoring and evaluation can aid organization to extract relevant information from past and ongoing activities that can be used as the basis for programmatic modification and future planning. Without good planning, monitoring and evaluation, it would be impossible to tell if work is going in the right position, whether development and achievement can be claimed, and how future efforts might be improved (Clark, 2009).

#### **2.2. Empirical review**

In order to have some idea about Monitoring and Evaluation the researcher review some of the previous studies as follow.

(Paul Crawford\*, Paul Bryce, 2002), argued that Government and Aid agencies are required to conform to strict project reporting requirements in order to satisfy the wide range of stakeholders. Project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) information systems (IS), frequently a requirement for funding, are believed to inform the reporting process. In addition to that accountability in the context of aid NGOs has been defined as “the means by which individuals and organizations report to a recognized authority, or authorities, and are held responsible for their actions.

(Faris, 2017), on his thesis emphasized that M&E practices are more critical in health services. According to the research report, even if monitoring and evaluation is important, it is not known how and to what extent public health centers are practicing it in the context of Expanded Program for Immunization. In Ethiopia the knowledge and skill of Monitoring and evaluation is not developed well. International Reports of World Bank (Zoellick, 2008) p130 ) emphasize the challenges in the practice of the field as follow “Reporting the development effectiveness of advisory services has been challenging for IFC(International Financial Cooperation), as the application of the monitoring and evaluation framework is still in its early stages. However, efforts to enhance consistent data capture exist, and we expect the streamlining of results indicators to enhance data quality and coverage”

Based on the report of Ethiopia Country programmer Evaluation ECPE (Directorate, 2010) most of the organizations in the country do not use effective monitoring and evaluation practices. On the report it is stated that “Ethiopia has made rapid and recent progress on key Millennium Development Goals (MDG) indicators in education, literacy and health. However, progress on their indicator remains slow including income, poverty and access to safety water. As such Ethiopia’s ability toward MDG completion is still considered fragile and cannot be taken as granted.

### **2.3. Monitoring and Evaluation**

As it is shown on guideline of Water and Forestry department of Republic of South Africa

*“M&E is the systematic collection and analysis of information to enable managers and key stakeholders to make informed decisions, uphold existing practices, policies and principles and improve the performance of their projects.*

*“M&E can be seen as a practical management tool for reviewing performance. M&E enables learning from experience, which can be used to improve the design and functioning of projects. Accountability and quality assurance are integral components of M&E, which help to ensure that project objectives are met, and key outputs and impacts are achieved.”*

The OECD (2002, p27) defines monitoring and evaluation as “Monitoring is a continuous function that uses the systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the

main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds” (UNDP, 2002).

According to (UNDP, 2009) Monitoring can be defined as the continuing process by which stakeholders gain regular feedback on the progress being made towards attaining their goals and objectives.

UNDP (2009) explains the idea of M&E from two perspectives. In the narrower approach, monitoring may focus on following the day-to-day activities of projects and the use of the organizations resources and in the wider sense, monitoring also involves assessing strategies and actions being taken by partners and non-partners, and showing what new strategies and actions need to be taken to guarantee progress towards the best results.

Monitoring systems provide managers and other stakeholders with regular information on progress relative to targets and outcomes. This enables managers to keep track of progress, identify any problems, and alter operations to take account of experience, and develop any budgetary requests and justify them. This enables the early identification of problems so that solutions can be proposed. It is considered to be a critical part of good management.

“Project monitoring is an integral part of day-to-day management. It provides information by which management can identify and solve implementation problems, and assess progress. The Logical Framework, the implementation schedule, activity schedules, and project budget provide the basis for this monitoring. There are a number of different levels of monitoring, each related to what kind of information is relevant, and the regularity of monitoring (ECSF, 2017).

Evaluation is a systematic process with key indicators or criteria against which to evaluate the work done. Inputs, activities, outputs outcomes and impacts are components of the evaluation process. Ways to evaluate inputs, activities, outputs outcomes and impacts are essential components of M&E.

“Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, program, or policy, including its design, implementation, and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. Evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the in-

corporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors (UNDP, 2009).

According to South African Management Development Institute (SAMDI) Evaluation is a decision-making tool to be included in to the planning cycle and the performance management of government. Evaluation is a systematic assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the design, implementation and the results of completed or ongoing interventions. Its aim is to help to improve these interventions. The main objective of evaluation is to supply information on lessons learnt from work already done to influence future planning.

Periodic evaluation is also considered to be good practice, and can be used to investigate and analyze why targets are or are not being achieved. It looks at the cause and effect of situations and trends which are recorded within monitoring.

Periodic and formal evaluation are vital for internal reporting and auditing, and are also requested by funding agencies – often as mid-term and final evaluations. External stakeholders and funding agencies that are accountable to donors are part of the public sector need to see results and demonstrable impacts.

However, it should be recognized that ongoing or ‘informal’ evaluation should always be available as a tool to managers, not only to meet the requirements of governments and donors, but also as a means of understanding when and why things are going right or wrong during project implementation.

## **2.4. Types of monitoring**

According to Danish Deming Group DDG (Nedergaard, spring 2014) monitoring is classified according to the following levels:

### **2.4.1. Input Monitoring**

It is the monitoring of the resources that are used for the implementation of the Activity. For example, money, labor, equipment, etc. the monitoring information can be collected from management reports, progress reports and Finance. Ways of measuring this can be number of

days consultants are employed, or the amount of money spent on training and equipment (IFRCS, 2002).

#### **2.4.2. Activity Monitoring**

Activity monitoring informs what is happening during the implementation of the project. Also it shows whether those activities which were planned were carried out accordingly. This information is often taken from the progress report (IFRCS, 2002).

#### **2.4.3. Output Monitoring**

Output monitoring is the step between activity and impact monitoring. Its main purpose is to assess the result or output from project inputs and activities. The measurements used for output monitoring will be those which show the immediate physical outputs and services from the project.

#### **2.4.4. Impact Monitoring**

Impact monitoring relates to the objectives of the project. The aim of impact monitoring is to analyze whether the broader development objectives of the project have been met (Such monitoring should demonstrate changes that are fundamental and sustainable without continued project support (Nedergaard, spring 2014).

#### **2.4.5. Assumption/Risk Monitoring**

This is associated with monitoring of external factors (those factors outside the control of the project), defined by project assumptions and the risks related to these assumptions not being achieved. During assumption monitoring it can, be found that there are changes in policies and legislation, which result in outputs not being achieved.

### **2.5. Types of evaluation**

According to the guide of M&E of European Commission civil Society Fund in Ethiopia (ECSF, 2017) Evaluation can be divided as Mid-term (mid-term evaluation or review), it is practiced When the project is still under way, and such interim evaluations are usually under-taken at to review progress and propose changes to project design during the remaining life of the project. Final or end-of-project evaluation, accomplish to document the re-sources used, results and progress towards objectives. The objective is to take lessons learned about the project, which can be used

to improve future designs. Ex post evaluation, is types of evaluation that will be take place after a number of year's completion of the project. Often focuses on assessing the impact of development projects, which take place some period after its completion.

## **2.6. Importance of Monitoring and Evaluation**

M&E is important for incorporating the views of stakeholders, particularly the target population and can be a further mechanism to encourage participation and increased ownership of a project. Thus, the key reasons for M&E can be summarized under four headings. The first one is for accountability that means demonstrating to donors, taxpayers, beneficiaries and implementing partners that expenditure, actions and results are as agreed or can reasonably be expected in the situation, second for provision of the information needed to co-ordinate the human, financial and physical resources committed to the project or programme, and to improve performance ,third for provision of information to inform setting and adjustment of objectives and strategies and the fourth one for capacity building the capacity, self-reliance and confidence of beneficiaries and implementing staff and partners to effectively initiate and implement development initiatives.

Monitoring and evaluation should be evident throughout the lifecycle of a project, as well as after completion. It provides a flow of information for internal use by managers, and for external use by stakeholders who expect to see results, want to see demonstrable impacts, and require accountability and trustworthiness on the part of the public sector.

Governments and organizations are accountable to stakeholders and this requires them to both achieve expected outcomes and be able to provide evidence that demonstrates this success (Paul Crawford, Paul Bryce 2003). As a consequence, increasing attention is now being given to funding harsh impact evaluations that are capable of providing solid empirical evidence about whether or not a particular type of development intervention works. Producing this evidence is technically challenging and expensive and won't be feasible for all or even the majority of projects. Nevertheless, as a vehicle of policy research it can, when applied to particular kinds of project, help inform decisions about how to allocate resources between different types of intervention, and between different project designs. The demand for difficult impact evaluation clearly has implications for the design of M&E systems, and is most likely to be met if the project and associated M&E system are designed with this difficulty in mind from the outset.



M&E can help an organization to get relevant information from past and ongoing activities that can be used as the basis for future planning. Without M&E it would be impossible to judge if a project was going in the right direction, whether progress and success was being achieved, and how future efforts might be improved (DWAF, 2005)

A well-organized M&E approach makes information available to support the implementation of rural water development projects and activities and will enhance the sustainability. Effectively used M&E can help to strengthen project implementation and encourage useful partnerships with key stakeholders. (DWAF, 2005)

## **2.7. Practice of Monitoring and Evaluation**

### **2.7.1. Planning and implementing a project Monitoring and Evaluation system**

Planning is a guide as to what we should evaluate, what information needed and who we are evaluating for. It outlines the key evaluation questions and the detailed monitoring questions that help to answer the evaluation questions. This allows us to identify the information needed to collect, and how it can be collected. Depending on the detail of the M&E plan, we can identify the people responsible for different tasks, as well as timelines. The plan should be able to be picked up by anyone involved in the project at any time and be clear as to what is happening in terms of monitoring and evaluation. Setting up a project M&E system involves nine steps. These need to be considered in the planning stage and then fulfilled at project start-up and throughout project implementation (Clark, 2009).

### **2.7.2. Steps in planning a project Monitoring and Evaluation system**

#### **2.7.2.1. Assess the existing readiness and capacity for M & E system**

Review current capacity within the organization and its partners which will be responsible for project implementation, covering: technical skills, managerial skills, existence and quality of data systems, available technology and existing budgetary provision. Identify any barriers to M&E of the project such as a lack of political will, expertise or experience. (Laurence Smith, Jhon Ma. & Susi T., 2016)

### **2.7.2.2. Identification of the project's outcomes and development goal(s)**

Setting a development goal and the project purpose or expected outcomes is essential in building an M&E system. In project design the specification of outputs, activities and inputs follows from this, and the expectation that achievement of outcomes will contribute to the higher-level development goal(s) provides the justification for the project

### **2.7.2.3. Select key indicators and an evaluation framework**

Indicators are the qualitative or quantitative variables that measure project performance and achievements. Indicators should be developed for all levels of project, logic indicators are needed to monitor progress with respect to inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact, to feedback on areas of success and where improvement is required.

Each indicator initially selected for inclusion in the M&E program needs to be carefully analyzed and tested before acceptance. Criteria must be set against which each indicator can be tested to ensure that they are suitable for inclusion.

### **2.7.2.4. Set baselines and plan data collection and analysis**

The baseline is the first measurement of an indicator, which sets the pre-project condition against which change can be tracked and evaluated. A single point in time or current value may not be representative and it may be better to use an average, for example, for the three previous years if such data are available. Baseline data must be gathered for the key indicators and this may require implementation of a baseline survey unless existing data sources are adequate.

### **2.7.2.5. Select results targets**

Following definition of outcomes, indicators and baselines, target setting is a key step in building a results-based approach. A target is a specification of the quantity, quality, timing and location to be realized for a key indicator by a given date. Starting from the baseline level for an indicator the desired improvement is defined taking account of planned resource provision and activities, to arrive at a performance target for that indicator. Most targets are set annually, but some could be set quarterly or for longer periods. Targets do not have to be single numerical values and sometimes a range of achievement may be more appropriate. Targets should also be kept under review and revised flexibly as necessary to take account of changing resource availability or other

factors beyond the control of project management, but not to disguise poor project performance. (Laurence Smith, Jhon Ma. & Susi T., 2016)

#### **2.7.2.6. Plan monitoring, data analysis, communication and reporting**

Implementation monitoring' tracking the inputs, activities and outputs in annual or multiyear work plans, and 'results monitoring' tracking achievement of outcomes and impact, are both needed. The demands for information at each level of management need to be established, responsibilities allocated, and plans made for: what data to be collected and when, how data are collected and analyzed, who collects and analyses data and who reports information, and in what form, to whom and when?

An assessment of the flow of information and degree of detail needed by each level of management will help to clarify the indicators to be measured. The agency managing the project will require different types of information for its own internal management, compared to the reporting requirements of higher levels of government and development agencies.

#### **2.7.2.7. Plan the form and timing of critical reflection and interim evaluations**

For managers evaluation should be a continuously available mode of analysis utilized whenever evaluation results can be useful. Scheduling of events such as management team meetings can, however, be useful to ensure that analysis of progress and critical reflection takes place. Similarly, periodic project review workshops to facilitate analysis and discussion with project partners and other stakeholders may be necessary. Supervision requirements of governments and funding agencies may require periodic and formalized evaluations to take place. The data needs and analysis requirements for mid-term, terminal and ex post evaluations should be considered, and planning for these linked to the planning of monitoring and choice of evaluation framework. A timetable of formal evaluation reports should be set out.

#### **2.7.2.8. Plan for the necessary conditions and capacities**

It is necessary to plan the organizational structure for M&E including whether an M&E unit specific to the project is needed. Appropriate organizational structures for M&E should be discussed with partners and other stakeholders. Each partner's responsibilities and information requirements should be considered. Planning should cover: staffing levels and types, responsibilities and internal linkages, incentives and training needs, relationships with partners and

stakeholders, horizontal and vertical lines of communication and authority, physical resource needs and budget.

Monitoring and ongoing evaluation should normally be the responsibility of the project managers. Impact evaluation may often require the expertise and capacity of external specialists

#### **2.7.2.9. Components of a project M&E system**

A sound project M&E system requires six main components which together help to ensure that M&E is relevant to the project, within the capacity of the project management organization, and is used to good effect. Each is considered briefly below.

##### **2.7.2.10. Clear statements of measurable objectives**

Projects are designed to contribute to long-term sectoral development goals, but at the level of project purpose their outcomes should be quite specific and complete. Thus, for example, an irrigation project may be designed to further the sectoral goals of increased agricultural productivity, farm incomes and rural employment, but have a project purpose of providing an increased and more reliable irrigation supply through rehabilitation or modernization of an irrigation system. Objectives at the level of project purpose should be specific to the project interventions, realistic in the timeframe for their implementation

##### **2.7.2.11. A structured set of indicators**

According to (Bubb,p.Jenkins&kapos, 2005) Indicators provide the qualitative and quantitative detail necessary to monitor and evaluate progress and achievements at all levels of the project hierarchy. The ability to define an indicator, and agree with partners and stakeholders a target and the timing for its achievement, is a demonstration that project objectives are clearly stated, and are understood and supported.

Input indicators are quantified and time-bound statements of the resources financed by the project, and are usually monitored by routine accounting and management records. They are mainly used by managers closest to implementation, and are consulted frequently (daily or weekly). They are often left out of discussions of project monitoring, though they are part of essential management

information. An accounting system is needed to track expenditures and provide data on costs for analysis of the cost effectiveness and efficiency of project processes and the production of outputs.

Process indicators monitor the activities completed during implementation, and are often specified as milestones or completion of sub-contracted tasks, as set out in time-scaled work schedules. One of the best process indicators is often to closely monitor the project's procurement processes. Every output depends on the procurement of goods, works or services and the process has well defined steps that can be used to monitor progress by each Output indicators monitor the production of goods and delivery of services by the project. They are often evaluated and reported with the use of performance measures based on cost or operational ratios. For example: kilometers of all-weather highway completed by a given date; percentage of farmers attending a crop demonstration site before fertilizer top-dressing; number of teachers trained in textbook use; cost per kilometer of road construction; crop yield per hectare; ratio of textbooks to pupils; time taken to process a credit application; number of demonstrations managed per extension worker; steps in the process of establishing water-users' associations.

The output indicators, activities and outputs, and the systems used for data collection, recording and reporting are sometimes collectively referred to as the project physical and financial monitoring system, or management information system (MIS). The core of an M&E system and an essential part of good management practice, it can also be referred to as 'implementation monitoring.

Outcome indicators are specific to a project's purpose and the logical chain of cause and effect that underlies its design. Often achievement of outcomes will depend at least in part on the actions of beneficiaries in responding to project outputs, and indicators will depend on data collected from beneficiaries, eg change in crop yields or cropping pattern, and investment by farmers in land management improvements. It will usually be important for project management to try to gain early indications of project performance in achieving outcomes through the use of leading indicators of outcomes. These may often be obtained by surveying beneficiaries' perceptions of project outputs and services, eg perceptions of improved reliability of irrigation supply, proportion of farmers who have tried a new variety of seed and intend to use it again; percentage of women satisfied with the maternity health care they receive. Such leading indicators have the twin

advantages of consultation with primary stakeholders and advance warning of poor project performance.

Impact indicators usually refer to medium or long-term developmental change to which the project is expected to contribute. Dealing with the effects of project outcomes on beneficiaries, measures of change often involve statistics concerning economic or social welfare, collected either from existing regional or sectoral statistics or through relatively demanding surveys of beneficiaries. For example: (health) incidence of low birth weight, percentage of women who are moderately or severely anemic; (education) continuation rates from primary to secondary education by sex, proportion of girls completing secondary education; (forestry) percentage increase in household income through sales of wood and non-wood products.

Exogenous indicators are those that cover factors outside the control of the project but which might affect its outcome, including risks (parameters identified during project design that might compromise project benefits) and the performance of the sector in which the project operates. Use of logical framework analysis for project design will guide the identification of exogenous indicators to match the key assumptions made about necessary external conditions at each level of the logical hierarchy. This need to monitor both the project and its wider environment calls for additional data collection capacity and places an additional burden on a project's M&E programme. This may be best met through use of existing data sources or assignment of the responsibility to another agency. Pragmatic judgment is required in the careful selection of indicators

#### **2.7.2.12. The logical framework approaches**

According to (Coleman, 2012) the module of Common Wealth Youth Program Log frame analysis is a shortened term for the 'logical framework approach' or LFA, which is a long-established activity design methodology, used by a range of major multilateral and bilateral donors. It is based on a systematic analysis of the development situation, particularly key development problems, and of the options for addressing those problems.

The logical framework approach provides an effective structure for planning M&E by defining a hierarchy of objectives for which indicators are required. Classifying project objectives according to their level highlights that management will need to develop systems to provide information (data

collection systems) at all levels, from basic accounting through to statistics of project impact. Ultimately constructing good indicators will be an iterative process.

**Table 2 A logical structure for project monitoring and evaluation indicators**

Logic	Indicators	Nature of the Indicator	
<b>Goal</b>	Impact	Long-term statistical evidence	
<b>Purpose</b>	Out comes	Social and economic surveys of project effects and outcomes.  Plus leading indicators giving management advance warnings from beneficiary perceptions, responses to the project and other measures of performance.	
<b>Out puts</b>	Out puts	Management observation, records, and internal reporting	<b>Exogenous indicators</b>
<b>Activities</b>	Process	Task management of processes. Financial accounts. Management records of progress. Procurement processes.	
<b>Inputs</b>	In puts	Financial accounts. Management records of inventories and usage.	

*Source adapted from Laurence smith, John Ma. & Susie T. (2016) Project planning and management*

According to Coleman (2012) the first column of the PPM is called the intervention logic. This refers to the objectives and activities for the Project. The objectives of the PPM are represented at different levels. These can be described as:

The Goal general development objective that refers to the long-term benefits to an entire population, but is outside of the Project control, and is what the Project will contribute to. Normally the overall objective relates and links to a national objective.

Project Purpose That refers to what the specific objective of the project is, and describes the changed situation the Project should result in if it achieves its results. The Project Purpose should

define the sustainable benefits for the target group/s. It may reflect a change in the target group's behavior, or the benefits that will accrue to them. There is normally only one project purpose.

Output is the results that are a statement of the outcome, or the effects of the activities undertaken. If all of results were achieved, we would expect that the Project Purpose be achieved as a consequence. Although they are numbered, Results are defined according to logical areas and not sequential (they do not have to happen in order), Results are within the control of the Project - they are what the Project guarantees it can deliver. They describe the effect of the completion of the activities.

The objectives in LFA are stated as outcomes - that is as if they have already happened. We therefore state at the beginning of the project what our expected situation is at the end of the Project!

Activities are the sequential steps necessary to achieve a result. They are the tasks to be carried out according to each result. Each activity needs to be specific and detailed to allow for complete clarity as to what is to be done, and to allow for budgeting. The activities must be numbered in sequence according to the relevant result!

#### **2.7.2.13. Data collection mechanisms**

Within project M&E systems there will be a need to collect information of the baseline situation and for measurement of change over time for the indicators selected. It is vital to think about the sources of data, the reliability of that information and the costs and responsibilities.

Data sources for indicators can be primary or secondary. Primary data are collected directly by the project team or agency concerned, whilst secondary data have been collected by other organizations for purposes not specific to the project concerned.

Use of secondary rather than primary data has both advantages and disadvantages. On the positive side its use can be more cost-effective, and for many project situations it may simply be too costly to collect detailed primary data when this would require a large and costly household survey, or alternative data collection method of comparable cost. On the negative side, secondary data may have limitations if the purpose for which it was collected does not match well with the purpose intended for project M&E. The validity and reliability of the data must be considered, trying to identify any sources of bias and inaccuracy that may have arisen during its collection.



Overall, a data collection system used for project M&E should be assessed in terms of reliability, validity, and timeliness. Reliability is the extent to which the data collection system is stable and consistent across time and space. In other words, measurement of the indicators is conducted in the same way on each occasion. Validity is achieved when indicators measure as directly and accurately as possible the changes of interest and relevance to project management. Timeliness consists of three elements: regularity in the frequency of data collection; currency (how recently data have been collected and how this matches important seasonal events or implementation ‘milestones’); and availability (provision of information at the right time to support management decisions).

Data collection will incur costs of staff time and other resources, whilst excessive collection of unnecessary data will slow down processes of analysis and reporting, and may lead to a failure to communicate clear messages. Thus, it is important to collect only the data that will be used effectively to improve management and decision-making.

Project monitoring and evaluation will often make use of a wide range of methods for gathering, analyzing, storing and presenting data. There is no single answer as to which method is best, as this will depend on an organization’s resource availability, access to the sources of data, purpose for the data, and time constraints. Often methods for primary data collection will need to be combined. Structured and formal methods for data collection will tend to be more accurate and reliable, but also more costly and time consuming. For data that are needed frequently and on a routine basis to inform management decision-making, it may be preferable to adopt less structured and less costly collection strategies. Rigorous approaches to impact evaluation that address the problem of attribution will generally require a more formal and structured approach, and hence may need to be applied selectively right approach, M&E can be an important part of creating an environment, which creates a positive environment within an organization – accepting mistakes as part of the learning process, and giving individuals to learn and grow without the fear of retribution.

## **2.8. Challenges on practice of M & E**

According to the study of state of Evaluation (2016) some of the major challenges in M&E at work place are listed as follow.

### **2.8.1. Time and resource**

Not surprisingly, one of the major challenges in effective monitoring and evaluation processes is in finding the time and resource to do it well. In a recent study of state of evaluation 2016, the majority of non-profit organizations said that limited staff time (79%) and insufficient financial resources (52%) were barriers to evaluation activities, with most organizations facing financial constraints.

### **2.8.2. Technical expertise**

In addition, technical expertise within an organization can be a significant challenge to developing effective monitoring and evaluation processes and activities. According to the study made by Johanna Morariu (2016) 48% of non-profits said that limited staff knowledge, skills, and/or tools were a barrier to evaluation activities and 69% of organizations said that having sufficient access to knowledge and skills was a key supporting factor in being able to carry out their evaluations. This lack of technical expertise is in part due to the fact that only 8% of organizations have staff that exclusively performs evaluations. This means there is a significant lack of access to evaluation specialists, and many of those within an organization tasked with M&E activities, will have their attentions diverted elsewhere.

### **2.8.3. Culture/attitudes**

Another challenge to M&E is making sure that you have a culture within your organization which supports the process. Monitoring and Evaluation is more than one any individual activity or process – it is about having a team which focuses on learning and adopting a growth mindset. If the right culture isn't in place, then monitoring and evaluation can often feel like its purpose is to criticize and identify failures.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD**

#### **3.1. Introduction**

This section incorporates the major pillars by which the entire process of addressing the research problem at hand is undertaken. Accordingly, it starts with description of the study area designing the research, identifying the target group to be involved in the research and deploying an appropriate sampling technique. Furthermore, data sources, methods of data collection and analysis are incorporated in this section including ethical considerations.

#### **3.2. Description of study area**

The Research study was conducted in Oromia Water Resource Development and Energy Bureau. The main objectives of the Bureau are providing pure water for rural and urban communities in the Oromia region. The Bureau also responsible for the development of the energy sources in the region.

#### **3.3. Research Design**

This research study uses descriptive Research Design because the study intended to find out how the Bureau practice its M&E activities for its water development projects. (C.R.Kothari, 2004) defines descriptive research as the study that concerned with describing the characteristics of a particular individual, or of a group and also used to show statistics of data average and frequencies.

The two known ways of data collection techniques and analysis procedures commonly used in business and management research according to (Saunders, Lewis & Thom hill, 2007) are quantitative and qualitative methods. One way of differentiating between the two is the attention on numeric (numbers) or non-numeric (words) data. Quantitative is widely used for any data collection technique (such as a questionnaire) or data analysis procedure (such as graphs or statistics) that generates or uses numerical data. In contrast, qualitative is used predominantly as a synonym for any data collection technique (such as an interview) or data analysis procedure (such as categorizing data) that generates or uses non-numerical data.

The study was used a quantitative method by including a qualitative item in to the questionnaire. Thus, data was gathered from all Bureau staff and professional engineers by using closed ended

and open questionnaire with structured interview, (Saunders, Lewis & Thom hill, 2007) also divide research design in to longitudinal and cross-sectional, based on time horizon. Cross-sectional studies are the study of a particular phenomenon at a particular time. It includes research projects undertaken for academic courses. Cross-sectional studies often employ the survey strategy. Longitudinal research has capacity to study change and development over time the researcher is able to exercise a measure of control over variables being studied. In this study, the researcher had used a cross-sectional study because data were collected from a cross-section of management staff and professional engineers of the enterprise once.

### **3.4. Target Population**

The focus of this study is on those employees, working at Head Office as managers, project team leaders, M&E experts and other experts. All of employees having more than 3 year experiences within the bureau those have direct relation with M&E were taken. These people are expected to have more knowledge about M&E system either through training or job career or due to the responsibility and accountability they will assumed.

### **3.5. Sampling and sampling techniques**

The research was conducted by using all employees engaged on water development at head office so that census of population was taken. According to the Human Resource Department of the bureau 100 employees were assumed to give their response. The sampling technique used for the selection of questioner of structured close ended, open ended and Likert scale. respondents were chosen based on quota sampling technique, because it enables us to use our judgement to select cases that will best enable us to answer our research question(s) and to meet our objectives (Saunders, Lewis & Thom hill, 2007). The sampling technique employed for the interview was purposive sampling. (Elaine Barnett-Page\* and James Thomas, 2009), as it is quoted in (Saunders, Lewis & Thom hill, 2007) purposive sampling is entirely non-random and is normally used for interview surveys. Those who are expected to have M&E Knowhow as a whole selected, and interviewed because their number is not large as well as to get reliable result.

### **3.6. Data source and techniques of data collection**

The study had used both primary and secondary data sources. The secondary data were collected by detailed review of related literature i.e. books, articles, journals and many other relevant written

publications. The researcher used primary data that was collected via questionnaire and interview. The decision to select the two instruments was arrived at after carefully considering their advantages and disadvantages and the population size for each category. As the research was intended to investigate the practice of M&E of water projects in Oromia region, a set of questionnaire was distributed to management staff and professional engineers of the Bureau.. In addition, four purposively selected management staff and two professional engineers were interviewed.

The questionnaire statements developed to answer the research question and objective were evaluated on a 1-5 Likert scale, where 1 indicates strongly disagree with the statement, 2 disagree, 3 neutral, 4 agree and 5 refers to strongly agree with the statement.

### **3.7. Data analysis and presentation**

The methods of analysis used in this research were selected due to the type of data available for the analysis and the objectives of the research. The questions in the questionnaire were qualitative; hence the descriptive method of analysis is best suited for the analysis. Such method was applied for the presentation, interpretation and discussion parts on various dimensions of the appropriate to analyze, interpret, tabulate and present the result of the study. The data gathered through questionnaires was coded, entered into computer and analyzed and presented in the form of tables by using SPSS Statics version 20 software. The results of the interview questions were integrated to the responses of management and employees through questionnaires and were analyzed accordingly. Finally, conclusions were made based on the results/findings of the study and recommendations were forwarded on the basis of the data analyzed.

### **3.8. Validity and reliability**

Validity refers to the ability of the instrument to measure what it is designed to measure. (Saunders, Lewis & Thom hill, 2007) states that validity is the strength of our conclusions, implications or propositions. It is concerned with whether an instrument is on target in measuring what is expected to measure. Since the questioners were adapted from previous thesis (Lakew, 2019)the researcher did not carry out pilot study to test the validity of the instrument.

According to Saunders et al., (2009) reliability indicates the extent to which the items in a questionnaire are related to each other and also it verifies whether or not it would produce steady findings at different times and under different conditions. One of the most commonly accepted

measures of reliability is Cronbach's alpha. It measures the internal consistency of the items in a scale that is, how closely related a set of items are as a group. It is considered to be a measure of scale reliability. The normal range of Cronbach's coefficient alpha value ranges between 0-1 and the higher values reflects a higher degree of internal consistency and values less than 0.5 are unacceptable. Internal consistency involves correlating the responses to each question in the questionnaire with those to other questions in the questionnaire.

Cronbach's alpha can be written as a function of the number of test items and the average inter correlation among the items. The formula for the standardized Cronbach's alpha is as shown below:

$$\alpha = \frac{N * \bar{C}}{\bar{v} + (N - 1) * \bar{C}}$$

Where:

N - Equal to the number of items,

$\bar{C}$  - the average inter-item covariance among the items and

$\bar{v}$  - the average variance.

A - commonly accepted rule of thumb according to (Saleh, 2009) for describing internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha is as follows.

$0.9 \leq \alpha \leq 1.0$  Excellent

$0.8 \leq \alpha < 0.9$  Good

$0.7 \leq \alpha < 0.8$  Acceptable

$0.6 \leq \alpha < 0.7$  Questionable

$0.5 \leq \alpha < 0.6$  Poor

$0.0 \leq \alpha < 0.5$  Unacceptable

Table 3 Case processing summary

<b>Case Processing Summary</b>			
		N	%
<b>Cases</b>	Valid	97	97.0
	Excluded	3	3.0
	Total	100	100.0

#### **Reliability Statistics**

<b>Cronbach's Alpha</b>	<b>N of Items</b>
<b>.800</b>	34

The reliability scale result is 0.800 which indicates that there is a very high consistency. Therefore, it can be said that the questionnaire is reliable and ready for distribution for the population.

### **3.9. Ethical considerations**

According to (Saunders, Lewis & Thom hill, 2007) Research ethics therefore relates to questions about how we articulate and clarify our research topic, design our research and gain access, collect data, process and store our data, analyze data and write up our research findings in a moral and responsible way. An attempt was made to ensure all respondents to keep their identity and responses as confidential; so that all the information was given in full confidence. The questionnaire was distributed based on willingness of each respondent. In addition, the purpose of the questionnaire was clearly indicated in a cover letter along with the questionnaire

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **DATA PRESENTATION ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

#### **4.1. Introduction**

This chapter describes and discusses the results of findings based on the analysis done on the data collected. The result of the study was discussed by triangulating the different source results: questionnaire results, interview and document review results .the discussion attempts to address the objectives of the study and answer the research questions.

The research questioners were adapted with minimum modification from previous thesis paper prepared by (Lakew, 2019) because the researcher believes that the research questions can answer his own research questions.

A total of 100 questionnaires which focused on the monitoring and evaluation practice of the bureau were distributed to employees who directly participate in the M&E process. However, 97 questionnaires were filled appropriately and returned, which is a 97 % response rate.

The questionnaire contains close ended questions and some open-ended questions which will focus on issues such as the presence of well-organized and written M&E system in the Bureau, the degree of involvement of the respondents on M&E practice of the bureau, the types of monitoring &Evaluation the bureau used respectively, types of tools or techniques the bureau used, by whom M&E is conducted, to whom the M&E result provided, techniques and data collection, the importance of M&E on projects, difficulties on the process and the M&E system as a whole. Most items in the questionnaire are arranged in a form of Likert items to capture the feelings and attitude of respondents in scale ranging from 1 to 5. The data has been analyzed in SPSS so that the accuracy of the information is maintained. In addition to this a semi-structured open-ended interview questionnaire is also used to support the researcher in discussing the issues raised more clearly. All the interview questions were structured so that it matches the contents of the items enlisted in the questionnaire.

#### **4.2. General information about respondents**

The general information about the respondents tries to address the information about the respondents with diverse demographic characteristics. It starts from sex and followed by age, level of education, Current work position status, work experience and their involvement on M&E



practice. Consequently, the demographic variables about the respondents were summarized and described in the tables 4 below.

**Table 4 General Information about the respondents**

Variable	Frequency	Percent
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	69	71.1%
Female	28	28.9%
Total	97	100%
<b>Age</b>		
<=30 Years	18	18.6%
31-40	44	45.4%
41-50	24	24.7%
>50	11	11.3%
Total	97	100%
<b>Level of Education</b>		
Diploma	-	-
BSc Degree	75	77.3%
Masters	20	20.6%
Above Masters	2	2.1%
<b>Current position in the Bureau</b>		
Project Manager	6	6.2%
Project Coordinator	27	27.8%
Office engineer	64	66.0%
<b>Work Experience</b>		
<=1 year	-	-
2-5 Years	21	21.6%
6-10 years	55	56.7%
>10 years	21	21.6%
Total	97	100%
<b>Involvement on M&amp;E practice</b>		
Yes	46	47.4%
No	51	52.6%

**Source: Survey Data**

As it is shown on the table 4 above, 71.1% of the respondents are male and the rest of 28.9% are Female. This implies that the ratio of female employees in the Bureau is very less .Based on our questioner when we look at the age of our respondents 18 (18.6%) of them with the age of <=30, 44 (44.45%) with the age of 31-40, 24 (24.5%) with the age of 41-50 and the rest 11 are above 50 years. The bureau is consisted of major work force that can achieve the objective easily if it used effectively.

According to their level of education 75 (77.3%) of our respondents have BSc Degree, 20(20.6%) of them have second Degree (Masters) and 2 (2.1%) have above Master’s Degree. We can

understand from this most our respondents have level of education of First degree and above. The Bureau can easily harvest what it wants to achieve by giving a minimum training programs.

According to the data shown on Table1, 6 (6.1%) of our respondents are project Managers, 27 (27.6%) are project coordinators and 64 (66%) of them are office engineers. From this we can easily understood that the work force available are fit for what the Bureau needs to achieve its objective if it was used appropriately.

Based on our data collected from respondents 21(21.6%) of them are working in the Bureau for 2-5 years, 55 (56.7%) of the respondents serve for 6-10 years and the rest 21(21.6%) are with work experience above 10 years in the Bureau. We can understand from this the withdrawal rate of employee is very less and the organization is in stable condition.

Based on the information gathered from our respondents 46(47.4%) of them were involved on M&E practice and 51(52.6%) of them were not involved on practice of Monitoring and Evaluation. As we can see before on educational background of employees most the employee of the Organization is more of professionals so that it is better if most of them are engaged in monitoring activity of the organization.

#### **4.3. Monitoring and Evaluation system**

In the Tables shown below listed that the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the Bureau. In this part the question presented for the respondents were to answer what they feel from the given choices. the question given are how well organized the M&E system of the Bureau, the presence of written M&E plan, weather the M&E activities are parts of project schedule or not, the type of project monitoring the Bureau used, the type of evaluation the Bureau used, kinds of M&E tool /Techniques used, the person involved in conducting M&E at particular project, to whom M&E information provided, the types of tools or techniques the Bureau used to collect data were asked and the following responses given back.

**Table 5 General Information on M&E of the Bureau**

Does the Bureau have a well-organized M&E system in its projects?	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Yes</b>	91	93.8%
<b>No</b>	4	4.1%
<b>No opinion</b>	2	2.1%
<b>Total</b>	97	100%
Is there written M&E plan /frame work in your Organization?	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Yes</b>	72	74.2%
<b>No</b>	18	18.6%
<b>No opinion</b>	7	7.2%
<b>Total</b>	97	100%
Are M&E activities are parts of project schedule?	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Yes</b>	92	94.8%
<b>No</b>	1	1.1%
<b>No opinion</b>	4	4.1
<b>Total</b>	97	100%
What type of project M&E does the bureau uses	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Process/Physical /progress monitoring</b>	74	76.3%
<b>Assumption Monitoring</b>	14	14.4%
<b>Financial Monitoring</b>	3	3.1%
<b>Quality Monitoring</b>	6	6.2%
<b>Total</b>	97	100%
What type of M&E tools/Techniques does the Bureau used	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Performance indicators</b>	75	77.4%
<b>Log Frame Approach</b>	1	1%
<b>Formal survey</b>	20	20.6%
<b>Rapid Appraisal method</b>	1	1%
<b>Total</b>	97	100%
Who conduct M&E at particular project site	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Project Manager</b>	6	6.2%
<b>Project Coordinator</b>	28	28.9%
<b>Site engineer</b>	61	62.9%
<b>Office engineer</b>	2	2%
<b>Total</b>	97	100%
To whom M&E information provided?	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>

<b>To all staffs</b>	1	1%
<b>To the management</b>	75	77.3%
<b>To Stakeholders and owners of the project</b>	17	17.5%
<b>Others/ donors/</b>	4	4.1%
<b>Total</b>	97	100%
What tools and techniques does the bureau use to collect the data	Frequency	Percent
<b>Questioner</b>	12	12.4%
<b>Site visit report</b>	4	4.1%
<b>Interview</b>	21	21.7%
<b>Focus Group Discussion (FGD)</b>	2	2.1%
<b>Observation</b>	56	57.7%
<b>Case Study</b>	1	1%
<b>No Standard tools or techniques used</b>	1	1%
<b>Total</b>	97	100%

**Source: survey data**

As it is shown on literature review, a well-organized M&E approach makes information available to support the implementation of projects activities and enhance the sustainability and Effectiveness of the organization that strengthen project implementation and encourage useful partnerships with key stakeholders (Mackay, 2007)

Based on the response of the respondents 91(93.8%) believe that the Bureau has a well-organized M&E practice 4(4.1%) and said yes. 4(4.1%) believe that the Bureau has no well-organized M&E practice and the rest 2(2.1%) said no opinion. As it was observed during an interview with respondents it was not as it thought.

Planning is a guide as to what we should evaluate, what information needed and who we are evaluating for. It outlines the key evaluation questions and the detailed monitoring questions that help to answer the evaluation questions. In order to be effective, it is must to have a written M&E plan /frame work based on this as shown on Table 5. Our respondents replied as 72(74.2%) argue that the Bureau has a written M&E plan, 18(18.6%) argue that the bureau do not have a written M&E plan and the rest 7(7.2%) argue they have no opinion on this idea. but planned monitoring were not easily communicated with its result due to this it was impossible to assess the outcome and impacts of the projects.

As it is shown on Table 5 above 92(94.8%) argued that the bureau prepares action plan/schedule of M&E and included in project plan.1(1.1%) individual feels that the bureau did not prepare M&E schedule incorporated in project plan.4(4.1%) of the respondents, they have no opinion on this idea.

According to project type and policy of the organization firms use different types of M&E activities Based on this fact as it is shown on Table 5 the respondents give their arguments on the type of M&E the bureau practiced, 74(76.3%) of the respondents' answers that the bureau used Process /physical progress monitoring, 14(14.4%), assumption monitoring, 3(3.1%) financial monitoring and the rest 6(6.2%), quality monitoring.

According to the information on Table5, 75(77.4%) of the respondents agree that the bureau used Performance Indicators that show the presence of change between base line measure and project activity 1(1%) feels that the bureau used a log frame approach, 20(20.6%) responded that the firm used Formal survey and the last not the list 1(1%) replied that the bureau used Rapid Appraisal Method. The absence of using Logical Frame Approach makes the bureau to not made project modification due to some exogenous factors.

Based on the information on Table 5, above the respondents give their esteem response accordingly 6(6.2%) feels project Managers conduct M&E practice at particular project, 28(28.9%) argued project coordinators conduct M&E practice, 61(62.9%) the majority of the respondents replied that the site engineer conduct M&E practice and 2(2%) respondents agree with the idea of that Office engineers conduct M&E practice at particular project. More of the work of Monitoring and Evaluation were not made by appropriate Monitoring and Evaluation specialists.

Regarding the response for question of to whom M&E information provided, 1(1%) respondent replied that M&E information provided to all staffs, 75(75%) of the respondents agreed that M&E information provided to the management, 17(17.5) argued that M&E information provided to stakeholders or owners of the project and 4(4.1%) of the respondents replied that M&E information is provided to other parties like the donors. Since the managements of the Bureau didn't give attention to monitoring and evaluation activities other staffs wouldn't motivate on their job.

According to the responses given on Table 5, different alternative on the tools and techniques the bureau used to collect or gather information's 12(12.4%) replied Questioner is a tool used for

collection of data,4(4.1%) said site visit report is the data collection tools,21(21.7%) feels interview is the data collection method, 2(2%) of the respondents said focus group discussion is the data collection tool,56(57.7%) of them agreed Observation is a way of data collection tool, 1(1%) said case study and 1(1%) agree that the bureau used no standard tools or techniques used.

**Table 6 Monitoring and Evaluation of the Bureau**

	Statement	Mean	Mode	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagreed	Strongly disagree
10	The Bureau effectively promotes and communicates M&E functions and roles to all staffs	3.9278	4	-	5.2%	9.3%	73.1%	12.4%
.11	The Bureau compares planned schedules against actual schedule in order to determine project schedule performance	3.8660	4	-	13.4%	8.4%	56.7%	21.5%
12	Data is routinely collected and analyzed to measure project performance	3.7113	4	-	15.2%	13.4%	55.7%	15.7%
13	The staff conducting M&E are adequate	3.9278	4	-	5.2%	9.3%	73.2%	12.3%
14	M&E training is used to assist in decision making and planning	3.8763	4	-	7.2%	8.2%	74.3%	10.3%
15	The Bureau provides M&E trainings to its staff involved in M&E	3.7732	4	-	11.3%	7.2%	74.2%	7.3%
16	M&E information is used to assist in decision making and planning	3.6082	4	-	15.5%	21.6%	49.5%	13.4

**Source: Survey data**

As it is shown on table 6 above for the question provided for respondents to know their feeling and their attitude by raising Likert scale questions on how the bureau practice the M&E activities. On effectively promoting and communicating M&E functions and roles to all staffs the following information was replied.85.5% of them had a feeling of opposing the effectively promoting and communicating M&E functions and roles to all staffs, 9.3% are neutral and 5.2% are in favor of

it. Most of the respondents 78.2% did not argue that the Bureau compares planned schedules against actual schedule in order to determine project schedule performance, 8.4% in middle of agree and dis agrees and 13.4% are agreeing on the fact. Regarding the information on data is routinely collected and analyzed to measure project performance 71.4% dis agree ,13.4 neutral and 15.2% are in favor of it. For the question raised on the adequacy of M&E staff 85% of them do not agree on the idea because there many projects implemented in the region and that needs strict follow up for good practice of the project, 9.3% neutral and 5.2% agreed on the idea.

In connection with the question on M&E training is used to assist in decision making and planning most of them (84.6%) disagree because there were no adequate training given for staff members 8.2% were in neutral position and 7.2% agreed on the idea. Regarding the facts that M&E information used to assist in decision making and planning 62.9% on opposing the idea, 21.6% neutral and 15.5% on favoring of the fact.

**Table 7 Importance of M&E**

	<b>Statement</b>	<b>mean</b>	<b>Mode</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
<b>1</b>	The current M&E practice of the Bureau helps in improving project performance.	4.0928	4	6 (6.2%)	-	8 (8.2%)	54 (55.7%)	29 (29.9%)
<b>2</b>	The M&E practice helps in acquiring sufficient data to be a basis for project modification.	4.0722	4	4 (4.1%)	5 (5.1%)	4 (4.1%)	51 (52.6%)	33 (34.1%)
<b>3</b>	M&E can be used to monitor the progress of a project.	3.9278	4	6 (6.2%)	6 (6.2%)	8 (8.2%)	46 (47.4%)	31 32%
<b>4</b>	M&E helps to identify problems and provide solution.	3.9588	4	6 (6.2%)	6 (6.2%)	6 (6.2%)	47 (48.4%)	32 (33%)
<b>5</b>	M&E can be used to evaluate the achievement of project objectives.	3.8763	4	4 (4.2%)	4 (4.2%)	8 (8.2%)	65 (67%)	16 (16.5%)
<b>6</b>	Information regarding the project can be communicated to the staffs and to the stakeholders of the projects through M&E.	3.8454	4	5 (5.2%)	5 (5.2%)	9 (9.3%)	59 (60.8%)	19 (19.6%)
<b>7</b>	M&E help in learning from experience and in adapting necessary changes.	3.9485	4	-	7 (7.2%)	8 (8.2%)	65 (67.1%)	17 (17.5%)

**Source: Survey data**

#### 4.4. Importance of Monitoring and Evaluation

According to the Information collected from key informants the information obtained from the questionnaires were summarize and discussed the Importance of M&E practices at the bureau as follows. A total of 85.6% of the respondents disagreed that the current M&E practice at the bureau helps in improving project performance. 8.2% neutral and 6.2% respondents agreed, 86.6% disagreed, 4.1% neutral and 9.3% respondents agreed on the fact that sufficient data can be acquired from the system, which can be used as a basis during project modification works. Most of the respondents 79.4% did not agreed on the fact that M&E helps to identify problems, to provide solution to them and cannot be used to monitor the progress of a project respectively. They also disagreed on the fact that it cannot be used to evaluate the achievement of project objectives too. 80.4% of respondents disagreed on the fact that the M&E system can be used to communicate information regarding the project to the staffs, but 9.3% respondents have a neutral opinion and the rest 11% agreed on the above issue. 85.6% disagreed, 8.2% neutral and 7.2% agreed on the help of M&E system in learning from experience and in adapting necessary changes.

**Table 8 Difficulties of M&E**

Statement	Mean	Mode	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1 There is an inadequate understanding of M&E at Organizational level.	2.0928	2	28 (28.9%)	46 (47.4%)	14 (14.4%)	4 (4.1%)	5 (5.2%)
2 There is lack of component staff to carry out M&E practice.	1.8866	2	11 (11.3%)	30 (30.9%)	5 (5.2%)	51 (52.8%)	-
3 There is lack of time and resources to conduct M&E.	1.7526	2	27 (27.8%)	68 (70.1%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1%)	-
4 There is inappropriate M&E implementation strategies are applied	1.8763	2	9 (9.3%)	24 (24.7%)	4 (4.1%)	59 (60.8%)	(1%)
5 There is unavailability of data gathering and analyzing tools.	1.8969	2	6 (6.2%)	29 (29.9%)	5 (5.2%)	57 (58.8%)	-
6 M&E practice are not given priority by the management of the firm.	1.9175	2	25 (25.8%)	59 (60.8%)	9 (9.3%)	4 (4.1%)	-
7 There is difficulty in communicating the result of M&E	1.8557	2	19 (19.6%)	62 (63.9%)	3 (3.1%)	13 (13.4%)	-

Source: Survey data



#### **4.5. Challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation System**

As it is shown on table 5 above 28.9% respondents strongly agreed on the fact that there is an inadequate understanding of M&E system at organizational level and 46% agreed, 14.4% have a neutral opinion and 5.2%strongly disagreed on the situation. 52.8% of the respondents disagreed on lack of competent staff to carry out M&E practices, 5.2% had neutral opinion and 42.2% agreed to the idea. (97.9%) of them agreed on lack of time and resources to conduct M&E activities and (60.8%) disagreed the fact that said the bureau used the implementation of inappropriate M&E strategy and the unavailability of data gathering and analyzing tools too. Difficulty in communicating the results of M&E. 83.5% of respondents agreed 9.3% neutral and 4.3% disagree. On the question raised on M&E not being given priority by the management of the firm 25.8% strongly agree, 60.8% agree 9.3% disagree and 4.1% strongly disagree. On difficulty in communicating the result of M&E, 19.6%strongly agree, 63.9% agree, 3.1% neutral and 13.4% disagree.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In this section based on the data presented in the previous section summaries of information provided, concluded and based on that recommendation given. On the first part summaries of major findings presented next to that conclusion of major summaries presented and the third section Recommendation was given.

#### 5.1. Major findings and summary

The research was conducted on the assessment of M&E practice of Oromia Rural water development and energy bureau. To get more accurate information all employees at head office those are directly involved on projects were selected. For 100 employees engaged on water projects the questioner paper was distributed and 97 questioner papers returned and 3 of them were not returned. On the general information of the respondents based on their gender 69 male and 28 female were participated. The age of the respondents 18 (18.6%) are under age 30 years, 44(45.4) between the age of 31-40, 24(24.7%) between the age of 41-50 and the rest 11(11.3%) were above the age of 50 years.

Most of the respondents are BSc. Degree holders 75(77.3%) and the rest 22(31.7%) are with master and above level of education. Based on their position in the bureau 64(66%) are engaged as office engineers and the rest 27(27.8%) and 6(6.2%) are project coordinators and project managers respectively. More than half of the respondents 55(56.7%) were working 6-10 years in the bureau; from this the researcher has believed that the respondents have more information and experience to share.

According to the information obtained from respondents 46(47.4%) of them were involved on M&E practice and more than half were not involved on monitoring and evaluation practice directly.

Almost 93.8% of the respondents feels that the bureau has a well-organized M&E system and for every projects action plan of M&E prepared and incorporated in to the planning of the project. During the interview with key informants the researcher observed that the bureau do not have a separate monitoring and evaluation department team and the work of monitoring and evaluation done through planning and program department.

During the interview with key informants they agreed that the bureau has a written monitoring and evaluation plan but there were problem on communicating the result of monitoring and evaluation this shows the presence of weakness on out come and impact assessment.

As 74(76.3%) of the respondents agree the bureau practice on process (physical progress) of monitoring and the bureau has given less attention on Assumption Monitoring. Based on the information stated in literature review Assumption Monitoring is associated with monitoring of external factors (those factors outside the control of the project), defined by project assumptions and the risks related to these assumptions not being achieved. During assumption monitoring it can, be found that there are changes in policies and legislation, price escalation, shortage of foreign currency, political unstably which result in outputs not being achieved.

Based on the response of the respondents 75(77.4) believe that, the types monitoring and evaluation tools or techniques the bureau used was on assessments of performance indicators and do not use the modern approach of Logical Frame Approach (LFA). According to the module of Common Wealth Youth Program (2007, p82) Log frame analysis is a long-established activity design methodology, used by a range of major multilateral and bilateral donors. It is based on a systematic analysis of the development situation, particularly key development problems, and of the options for addressing those problems. 62.9% of the respondents responded that the monitoring and evaluation practice at particular project conducted by site engineer not with an appropriate and well trained monitoring and evaluation experts. The data transfer and communication mechanism is through paper report and were not aided by digital technologies due to this the bureau were not used the monitoring and evaluation information for improving project performance, to acquire sufficient data that is used for project modification, to monitor the progress of a project, to identify problem and provide solution, to evaluate the achievement of project objectives and to learn from experience in adapting necessary changes.

More than half of the respondents agreed on the facts that monitoring and evaluation data were not regularly collected and analyzed to measure project performance this can be resulted in making gap between what is practiced On the ground (project site ) and the head office (bureau). Even if most of the respondents working in the bureau have a qualified educational back ground due to luck of appropriate training in the organization there is inadequate understanding of monitoring and evaluation .70% of respondents agree that, there is luck of time and resources to conduct M&E.

Most of the respondents do not agree on the fact that the bureau used inappropriate M&E implementation strategies.

Most of the respondents argued that Monitoring and evaluation practice were not given priority by the management of the firm. This issue may be the main obstacle for developments of monitoring and evaluation practice in the Bureau.

## **5.2. Conclusion**

As it was shown on findings the bureau did not use its qualified staffs on Monitoring and Evaluation practice fully as needed. In addition to this it seems that the bureau has a well-organized M&E system but it was not entirely a well expected one, it has some weaknesses and drawbacks as some participants in the bureau mentioned and observed during the interview with some key informants the Monitoring and Evaluation has no separate department and expertise staff. The written monitoring and evaluation plan were not communicating with the result of Monitoring and Evaluation. The bureau practice Physical process (physical progress) of monitoring and has given less attention on Assumption Monitoring. The types of monitoring and evaluation tools or techniques the bureau used was on assessments of performance indicators and do not use the modern approach of Logical Frame Approach (LFA). The data transfer and communication mechanism is through paper report and were not aided by digital technologies due to this the bureau were not used the monitoring and evaluation information for improving project performance timely and couldn't acquire sufficient data that was used for project modification. Monitoring and Evaluation data were not routinely collected and analyzed to measure project performance Even though most of the respondents working in the bureau have a qualified educational back ground due to lack of appropriate training in the organization there is inadequate understanding of monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring and evaluation practice were not given priority by the management of the organization. This issue may be the main obstacle for developments of monitoring and evaluation practice in the Bureau.

## **5.3. Recommendation**

Based on the summaries of findings and conclusion given above and facts stated in literature review the following recommendations were given.

To be more efficient and effective the bureau must use its qualified staff on practice of monitoring and evaluation in different areas of project activities to achieve the intended objectives. In order to have a more responsible and accountable body the bureau has to organize the monitoring and evaluation team at the head office level that communicate with personnel at grass root (project site) to disseminate the needed information and take feedback to solve project inefficiencies with higher level management. Since the bureau is a governmental Organization and works with some other donors it has to use the modern type of monitoring and evaluation system that best fit the requirement of donors international Aid Organizations. In order to get more Reliable and up to date information it was better if the bureau use routine data collection, analyzing and transferring methods aided with digital Technologies Based on the research findings to have a competent work force the bureau must prepare a continued training program based on the need assessment. Lastly it highly recommended that the higher management of the bureau must give priority for best practice of the monitoring and evaluation system.

## References

- Benjamine, S. (2010). *Ethiopia Country Program Evaluation*. Gatineau, Quebec: Canadian International Development Agency.
- Bubb,p.Jenkins&kapos. (2005). Bio diversity for national Use. *UNEP-WCMC*, 1-62.
- C.R.Kothari. (2004). *Research Methodology*. Japur (India): ew Age International publisher.
- Ceswell. (2009). *Research Design Qualitative ,Quantitative and Mixed Approach*. Oaks, CA: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Clark. (2009). *Handbook on planning,monitoring and evaluating for development results*. New york, ny 10017, usa: undp.
- Clark, H. (2009). *Handbook on planning,monitoring and evaluating for development results*. New york, ny 10017, usa: one united nations plaza.
- Coleman, G. (2012). Logical framework approach to the monitoring and evaluation of agricultural and rural development projects. *ISSN: 0268-8867 (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tiap18>*, 1-10.
- Elaine Barnett-Page\* and James Thomas. (2009). Methods for the synthesis of qualitative research. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*.
- Faris, A. M. (2017, june). Practices and challenges of monitoring and evaluation practice in expanded program for immunization project: the case of public health centers. 1-66.
- Jody Zall Kusek Ray C. Rist. (2004). *Ten steps to Result based Monitoring and Evaluation System*. Washington DC: The World Bank 1818 H Street, NW.
- Lakew, B. (2019, june). Assessment of project monitoring and evaluation practice at bamacon engineering plc. *Assessment of project monitoring and evaluation practice at bamacon engineering plc*.
- Laurence Smith,Jhon Ma.&Susi T. (2016). Project planning and Monitoring. In J. M. Laurence Smith, *Project planning and Monitoring* (pp. 21-34). london: SOAS.
- Mackay. (2007). *Moniittorriing and Evalluattiion*. Retrieved october 22, 2022, from [www.samera.org.za](http://www.samera.org.za):

[https://www.samea.org.za/documents/SAMDI/7\\_Orientation%20course%20M&E\\_Manual.pdf](https://www.samea.org.za/documents/SAMDI/7_Orientation%20course%20M&E_Manual.pdf)

Mikkel, N. (2014). Outcome Monitoring in Humanitarian Mine Action. *ERW and mine action*, 1-4.

Osman, I. (2002). *Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluation*. CH-1211 Geneva 19: International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

Paul Crawford\*, Paul Bryce. (2002). Project monitoring and evaluation: a method for enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of aid project implementation. *Project Management*, 1-11.

Robson. (2002). *Mixed Methods of Research*. London: Blackwell publishing ltd.

Saunders. (2007). *Research Method for Business Studies (Fourth Edition)*. London: Pearson Publishing Agency.

Saunders, Lewis & Thom hill. (2007). *Research Methods for Business Students. 4th edition*. Edinburgh Gate, Harlow.: Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Saunders, Lewis & Thom hill. (2007). *Research Methods for Business Students. 4th edition*. Edinburgh Gate, Harlow.: Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Sullivan, J. (2002). *Hand Book for Monitoring and Evaluation*. CH-1211 Geneva 19: International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

Toscano, S. (2013). Exploring the History and Challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation in International Nongovernmental Organizations: Complemented by Intern Experience at Save the Children USA. *social science*, 1-69.

Umhalab. (2017). *Introduction to Monitoring and Evaluation using logical Frame work approach*. Johansburg South Africa: Umhalab Development Service.

Umhlaba. (2017). *Introduction to Monitoring and Evaluation Using the Logical Framework Approach*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Umhlaba.

Umhlaba. (2017). *Introduction to Monitoring and Evaluation Using the Logical Framework Approach*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Umhlaba publishing service.

## Annex 1

**St. Mary's University**  
**School of Postgraduate Studies**  
**College Of Business Administration**  
**Department Of Project Management**

The objective of this Questionnaire is to gather first-hand information that will help in Assessing the Project Monitoring and Evaluation Practice at Oromia Water Development and Energy Bureau. All data and information that will be gathered through this Questionnaire will be used for the sole purpose of the research and remains confidential. Therefore, you are kindly requested to respond to the questions with utmost good faith, freely and to the best of your knowledge.

Thank you in advance for your time and kind cooperation.

### **Section I: General Information**

#### 1. Sex:

- 1. Female
- 2. Male

#### 2. Age:

- 1. <= 30 Years
- 2. 31 – 40 Years
- 3. 41 – 50 Year
- 4. >50 Years

#### 3. Level of Education:

- 1. Diploma
- 2. BSc. Degree
- 3. Masters
- 4. above Master

#### 4. Current position at the firm:

- 1. Project manager
- 2. Project coordinator
- 3. Office engineer



5. Number of years worked in current position:

- 1.  $\leq 1$  year
- 2. 2-5 years
- 3. 6-10 years
- 4.  $>10$  years

6. Have you ever been involved in M&E practice of the firm?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

**Section II: M&E System**

1. Does the firm have a well-organized M&E system on its projects?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. No opinion

2. Is there a written M&E plan/guideline/framework in your firm?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. No opinion

3. Are Monitoring and Evaluation activities part of the project schedule?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. No opinion

4. What type of Project Monitoring does the firm uses?

- 1. Process / physical progress monitoring
  - 2. Technical monitoring
  - 3. Assumption monitoring
  - 4. Financial monitoring
  - 5. Quality monitoring
  - 6. Other (please specify below)
- 
-

5. What type of Evaluation does the firm uses?

1. Formative evaluation
  2. Participatory evaluation
  3. Final evaluation
  4. Real-time evaluation
  5. Internal evaluation
  6. External evaluation
  7. Other (please specify below)
- 
- 

6. What kind of M&E tool/techniques or method does the firm uses?

1. Performance indicators
  2. Log Frame approach
  3. Formal survey
  4. Rapid appraisal method
  5. Other (please specify below)
- 
- 

7. Who conducts M&E at a particular project/site?

1. Project manager
2. Project coordinator
3. Site engineer
4. Office engineer
5. Other (please specify below)

8. To whom M&E information provided?

1. To all staffs
2. To the management
3. To stakeholders and owners of the project
4. Other (please specify below)

9. What tools and techniques does your organization use to collect data? (You can select more than one if it uses more than one technique)

- 1. Questionnaire
- 2. Site Visit Report
- 3. Interview
- 4. Focus group discussion
- 5. Observation
- 6. weekly reports
- 7. Case study
- 8. No standard tools/techniques used

**Please indicate your level of agreement with the statement given below**

No	Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
10	The Beuro effectively promotes and communicates M&E functions and roles to all staffs					
11	The Beuro compares planned project schedules against actual schedule in order to determine project schedule performance.					
12	Data is routinely collected and analyzed to measure project performance					
13	The staff conducting M&E are adequate					
14	M&E training is used to assist in decision making and planning					
15	The Beuro provides M&E training to its staff involved in M&E					
16	M&E information is used to assist in decision making and planning					

### SECTION III

#### IMPORTANCE OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION PRACTICE

No	Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Dis Agree
1	The current M&E practice of the Bureau helps in improving project performance					
2	The M&E practice helps in acquiring sufficient data to be a basis for project modification					
3	M&E can be used to monitor the progress of a project					
4	M&E helps to identify problems and provide solution					
5	M&E can be used to evaluate the achievements of project objectives					
6	Information regarding the project can be communicated to the staffs and to the stakeholders of the project through M&E					
7	M&E helps in learning from experience and in adapting necessary changes					

### SECTION IV

#### DIFFICULTIES IN M&E PRACTICES

No	Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Dis Agree	Strongly Dis Agree
1	There is an inadequate understanding of M&E at organization level					
2	There is lack of competent staff to carry out M&E practices					
3	There is Lack of time and resources to conduct M&E					
4	There is Inappropriate M&E implementation strategies are applied					
5	There is Unavailability of data gathering and analyzing tools					

6	There is M&E practices are not given priority by the management of the firm					
7	There is Difficulty in communicating the result of M&E					
8						

What do you suggest in order to overcome those difficulties in practice of M&E in your organization?

---



---

### **INTERVIEW QUESTIONS**

This interview question will be answered by purposively selected respondents

1. How is project performance observed/practiced / in you organization?

---

2. Are project monitoring and evaluation practiced in your organization?

---

3. Who is responsible for project monitoring and evaluation?

---

4. Are the monitoring and evaluation practices of the organization effective? Why? Why not?

5. Does the M&E system provide a valuable project status report or not?

---

6. Do you think the M&E practice of the company is significant in the project management practice of the organization?

---

**Annex 2**

**TEMPORARY PROJECT HANDOVER SHEET**

**OROMIA REGIONAL STATE WATER DEVELOPMENT AND ENERGY BUREAU**

**PROVISIONAL (TEMPORARY ACCEPTANCE) FORM**

**Location**

Zone.....

Woreda.....

Town.....

Contract	contract ID	Date	Amount in Birr
.....	.....	.....	.....
Supplementary Agreement.....		.....	.....
Variation order 1.....		.....	.....

List Major Activities performed

1.....

2.....

3.....

4.....

5.....

6.....

This temporary acceptance form is done on .....by verbal /written order or request No.....dated.....from OWRDEB in the presence of the following under handing over committee.

Client	position	signature
1.....	.....	.....
2.....	.....	.....
3.....	.....	.....
Woreda /Town utility office	position	signature

1 Mr.....

Contractor

1. Mr.....

2 Mr.....

Community /if any/ position signature

1. Mr.....

2 Mr.....

3. Mr.....

We have examined

A) Contract and specifications

B) On site Observation of constructed civil works and installed Electromechanical equipment and

C) Consulting the woreda office and the construction contracts.

D) Based on this we certify the execution & temporary acceptance of the project with the following facts

- List of work item ordered to be rectified

---



---



---

- List of work incomplete work items ordered to be rectified

---



---



---

**Date when the contractor took possession of the site**

1. Commencing date.....

2. Agreed length of completion date.....

3. Completion date according to the contract.....

4. Amended contract date.....

5. Actual completion date.....

6. Total number of delay.....

7. Number of justified days of delay.....

8. Number of unjustified days of delay.....

**ACCOUNTS**

A) Total value of work executed & material supplied Birr.....with VAT

B) Deductions

1. Previous payment Birr .....

2. Penalty Birr .....

3. Rebates Birr .....

4. Retention (---%)

5. Birr .....

C) Total Deduction Birr.....

D) Net sum due to the contractor Birr.....

E) Performance bond **Birr.....**

**CONCLUSIONS**

The date of Final Acceptance will be ..... after thorough investigation of the works in all its parts expecting after invisible latent defects. We declare that it was executed in accordance with the drawing and the specification in all acceptance manner except few comments and chlorination system. We writes thereof ,we have written and signed that temporary acceptance of which one copy is to be issued to the contractor for all practical purpose after due approval.