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ABSTRACT

Project monitoring and evaluation is fundamental if the project objectives and success is to be achieved especially in public-private partnership projects. It improves overall efficiency of project planning, management and implementation. The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya. To achieve this purpose, the study was guided by four research objectives including: establishing the influence of institutional strengthening on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya; determining the influence of stakeholder perspectives on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya; assessing the influence of public accountability on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya; and establishing the influence of facilitated negotiations on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya. This study used descriptive survey research design. The population of this study was composed of various stakeholders in the PPPs including government representatives from the concerned ministries, management staff of the contracting authorities, project managers of the private partners and county representatives (MCAs and engineers) adding up to 252. A combination of stratified sampling and simple random sampling was used in this study. Stratified sampling was used to ensure representation from the different stakeholders constituting the strata. Through simple random sampling, 152 respondents were picked from the population. The study collected primary data using a questionnaire which were administered through a drop and pick later method. Pilot study was undertaken aimed at testing the validity and reliability of instruments to be used. Quantitative data was analyzed by descriptive analysis and presented by use of tables while a conceptual content analysis was adopted for the qualitative data and the findings presented in prose. Regression analysis was also used to establish the relationship between the variables. The study established that having partnerships with stakeholders in a PPP arrangement has ensured support for the project, the stakeholders have aided in the selection of appropriate indicators improving the quality of the project, there are open forums/meetings held which involve stakeholders and selecting the appropriate indicators in a PPP project has been difficult due to stakeholders’ different preferences in Nairobi County, Kenya. The study further established that reports concerning the PPP projects are published by the institution. The study concluded that involving all stakeholders with varied views strengthens the institution; PM&E is effective in ensuring that the objectives of the project are met, PM&E provides government officials and development partners with better means for learning from past experience and also it improves conflict management among stakeholders. The study finally concludes that stakeholder perspectives had the greatest effect on the performance of PPPs projects, followed by institutional strengthening, and then facilitated negotiations while public accountability had the least effect to the performance of PPPs projects. From the study findings and conclusions, the study recommended that institutions should involve all the stakeholders in ensuring that the objectives of the projects they undertake are met. This is because PM&E will enable the institution and the development partners a platform to learn more from previous projects and helps avoid conflicts. The PPPs should also incorporate performance based management in their operations as this will help improve communication as well as improve accountability. The study also recommends that organizations should organize forums that will allow different stakeholders to articulate their needs and make collaborative decisions.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

In order to ensure successful project implementation as per the set goals and objectives, governments and private businesses are continuously getting involved in the process of monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring and evaluation provides development partners with answers to questions like; what development interventions make a difference? Is the project having the intended results? What can be done differently to better meet goals and objectives? Monitoring and evaluation are therefore important management tools which are used to track project progress and facilitate decision making for better performance of the project. When planning for monitoring and evaluation, there are key steps that should be taken into account; firstly, identifying who will be involved in design, implementation and reporting which involves engaging stakeholders to ensure their perspectives are understood and feedback incorporated. Secondly, clarifying the scope, purpose, intended use, audience and budget for evaluation. Thirdly, developing the questions to answer what you want to learn as a result of the project. Fourthly, selecting measurable indicators and fifth, determining the data collection methods. Evaluation aims to analyze the past to understand the future of the project (Gaventa and Blauert, 2000). Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) at a community level is a relatively new subject area in most development spheres and it only began to be popular in early 1990s (Kadzikano and Chishawa, 2001). Participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) is a self-assessment, knowledge generation, and collective action process in which stakeholders in a program collaboratively define the evaluation issues, collect and analyze data, and take action as a result of what they learn through this process (Rossman, 2012). Further Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) offers development organizations a host of opportunities for improving the performance of the projects undertaken by both the Government and private businesses.

In recent years, PM&E has gained prominence over more traditional approaches to monitoring and evaluation in the developing countries especially in Africa (Tana, Onyango, Ochola and Omolo, 2012). Whereas monitoring and evaluation in the past has been judgmental where external experts are contracted to evaluate the project against the objectives, PM&E seeks to involve all beneficiaries and stakeholders in the process of developing objectives and indicators by proposing local solutions (Coupl, 2001). According
to CARE (1994) participatory Monitoring and Evaluation therefore is a necessary condition for ensuring the sustainability of development process in African based projects. It involves the assessment of change through processes that involve stakeholders affecting or affected by the impact being assessed. Coupal (2001) argues that the main function of participatory evaluation is to provide stakeholders and programme managers with information to assess whether project objectives have been met and how resources have been used, in order to improve project implementation and make critical decisions.

Governments and organizations around the globe are struggling with demands and pressures for improvements and reforms in public management and service delivery (Yescombe, 2007). Governments are therefore turning to the private sector to design, build, finance, and operate infrastructure facilities previously provided for by the public sector. Partnerships between private and public sectors can be traced as far back as the Roman Empire in Europe. In the 19th century, the industrialization in Europe brought rapid expansion and development of public works which were mostly done by private parties. Private-sector financing through public–private partnerships has recently become popular as a way of developing public-sector infrastructure, in various sectors such as transportation, social infrastructure, public utilities, government offices, accommodation, and other specialized services such as communications networks or defense equipment (Yescombe, 2007).

Public private partnership (PPP or P3) is a long-term contractual agreement in which the public sector authority assigns a traditionally public responsibility to the private sector participant, in hopes of achieving mutual benefit (Yescombe, 2007). Governments are increasingly relying on creative financing and asset management to maintain and improve the provision of key services as budgetary challenges constrain potential options (Rossman, 2012). One method of tapping into alternative sources of capital and addressing the infrastructure deficit for governments is the public-private partnership (PPP) modality (Public Private Partnership Unit, 2014). Nisar (2007) notes that using private capital and expertise in the provision of public infrastructure and services is not new. In the United Kingdom (UK) for instance, the government has vigorously encouraged the Private Finance Initiatives (PFI), because it has allowed many projects to go ahead that would not have been possible under traditional public borrowing methods which are restricted and tightly controlled (Campilan, 2000).
Kenya’s Vision 2030 is the country’s development blueprint which aims at transforming the country into an industrializing, middle-income country providing quality life to all its citizens by the year 2030. The vision is founded on three pillars namely; social, economic and political pillars which therefore require heavy investment in infrastructure services resulting to a gap in expenditure given the annual Kenya’s budget and allocation on infrastructure spending. According to the Public Private Partnership Unit (2014), the Government of Kenya (GoK) is currently giving priority to equitable and sustainable development projects to improve the welfare of its citizens. Faced with increasing financing pressure for both development and recurrent expenditure, which has heightened with the implementation of the devolved structure of governance, the government has had to turn to alternative sources of financing to carry out the projects and be able to achieve vision 2030 (Public Private Partnership Unit, 2014). According to the Public Private Partnership Unit (2014), the National Treasury is responsible for overall coordination, promotion, and oversight of the implementation of the entire PPP program in Kenya. For the last three (3) years, the National Treasury and the Government has been committed through undertaking deliberate initiatives to improving and strengthening the environment for private sector participation in the country. In December 2011, the GoK adopted a PPP Policy with the objective of articulating the government's commitment to PPPs and to provide a basis for the enactment of a PPP Law which was gazetted and became operational in February 2013 (Public Private Partnership Unit, 2014). Further the GoK drafted PPP regulations for both the National and County governments as well as developing PPP standard bidding documents, templates and toolkits. The government has approved 58 projects to be funded through partnerships with the private sector in a bid to seal a huge gap between public investments needs and available resources. According to the Treasury, the 58 projects have been subjected to a series of suitability tests and received the Cabinet’s approval to proceed for development as PPPs (Public Private Partnership Unit, 2014). Some of the key projects in the PPP arrangement include; the Mombasa-Nairobi and Nairobi-Nakuru highways, which will be constructed and expanded to dual carriageway in the partnership; operation and maintenance of a 40km section of the Nairobi –Thika highway, as well as the 30km Nairobi Southern bypass, and the construction of Jomo Kenyatta International Airport Terminal 2 is also expected to be under the initiative and is projected to have an annual passenger capacity of 12 million (Public Private Partnership Unit, 2014). In addition there is also a proposed construction of a 3 – 4 star transit hotel with a 150 – 200 hotel room capacity at the JKIA under the private sector engagement
among many other PPP projects within Nairobi County (Public Private Partnership Unit, 2014).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

According to Behn (2003), most of the government projects in the developing countries (66.7%) fail due to poor monitoring and evaluation during the project implementation process. Traditionally, monitoring has been conducted by external experts or consultants who dictate all aspects of the monitoring process and the policy or management decisions that arise from their findings (Danielsen, Burgess and Balmford, 2005). However under the new approach participatory monitoring and evaluation increasingly involve local people in monitoring their own resources and projects. Participatory monitoring and evaluation can be cheaper and more efficient than externally driven monitoring and it as well encourages responsible resource use (Danielsen et al., 2005).

Ondieki and Matonda (2013) observed that there had been failure to engage local communities to air their views, needs, challenges and priorities as well as lacking capacity to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate projects in a participatory manner. Further, Mureithi, Asiabaka, Wamuongo, Moses and Mweri (2002) observed that there had been lack of emphasis put on community-based monitoring and evaluation during the implementation of development projects in Kenya. This is echoed by Oduwo (2014) who indicated that due to the low level of education, the community members as stakeholders are not aware of their role in the projects. Oduwo further opined that the stakeholders have little knowledge on policies guiding monitoring and evaluation which influence adoption of participatory monitoring and evaluation in management of projects.

Other studies conducted on participatory monitoring and evaluation include: Oyuga (2011) on determinants of adoption of participatory monitoring and evaluation in management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District, Kenya; Tana, Onyango, Ochola and Omolo (2012) on socio-cultural participatory monitoring and evaluation indicators used in adopting improved cassavas by Western Kenya communities and Soransora (2013) on the influence of community participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of development projects with reference case of Ewaso Ng’iro North Development Authority, Isiolo County. On the other hand Diba (2012) who did a study on critical success factors for public private partnership projects in the Kenyan road sub-sector observes that there is a
deficit of literature done on PPP projects and that there is need to do a study on the same. It is evident therefore that none of these studies looked at the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya and despite the fact that these projects play a big role in the development of the County and the Country at large, it is not clear how effectively the monitoring and evaluation is done on these projects. This study therefore sought to establish the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya.

1.4 Objectives of the Study
The study was guided by the following objectives

i. To establish the influence of institutional strengthening on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya.

ii. To determine the influence of stakeholders perspectives on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya.

iii. To assess the influence of public accountability on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya.

iv. To establish the influence of facilitated negotiations on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya.

1.5 Research Questions
This research study sought to answer the following questions;

i. How does institutional strengthening influence performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya?

ii. How do stakeholder perspectives influence performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya?

iii. What is the influence of public accountability on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya?

iv. How do facilitated negotiations influence performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya?
1.6 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study will be significant in various ways: First on the theoretical value, it is hoped that the findings of this study will provide greater insight to the policy makers in Government on development and resource allocation. The treasury will find the findings of this study important in evaluating the progress and performance of projects undertaken through public-private partnership. Secondly, it is hoped that the research findings will be used by the government and particularly policy makers, planners and programme implementers to formulate policies and strategies on effective implementation of participatory monitoring and evaluation in public private partnership projects and other projects in general.

It is also hoped that the findings of this study will be important to the key stakeholders in the development projects within the county, since information on how participatory monitoring and evaluation affects performance of public private partnership projects will be paramount. It is further hoped that the findings of this study will be important to future scholars and researchers as it will act as a source of reference besides suggesting areas for further research.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

A key limitation of this study was respondents’ truthfulness. The researcher was likely to encounter cases where the respondents may not be fully truthful, and may provide what they think the researcher wants to hear as opposed to what is the exact situation. Secondly, the study faced difficulties in accessing top level officers in Government owing to their busy schedule. To counter the limitation of respondents’ truthfulness, the researcher sought to assure the respondents’ anonymity and confidentiality, and re-assure them that the feedback may only be used for the purpose of the study. On the difficulties imposed by accessing top level Government officials, the researcher attempted to reach them via electronic means, for instance the use of emails.

The researcher foresaw a challenge where some of the respondents may be unwilling to give the much needed information for fear that the information may be misused. This occurred when the respondents felt that the information is very delicate and confidential. In order to counter the problem of confidentiality, the researcher carried with himself a letter from the university stating that the research was solely for academic purposes and that any information given was to be treated with utmost confidentiality.
1.8 Delimitations of the Study

This study focused on the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects. The study was specifically focusing on public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya. The County of Nairobi was chosen as the study area since it hosts key projects which have been proposed to be undertaken through PPP. In addition, it was the headquarters of the PPP stakeholders ranging from Treasury who disburse funds, other key stakeholders in financing and the overall project supervisors from the Government. The data was collected from public private partnership contracting authorities, representatives of the ministries concerned and private stakeholders in public private partnerships. This therefore provided a clear overview of how participatory monitoring and evaluation influence performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya.

1.9 Assumptions of the Study

Basic assumptions of the study were that the public-private partnerships undertaken by the government and public institutions in Nairobi County involve participatory monitoring and evaluation. This study also assumed that respondents selected provided honest responses revealing the true picture of the situation on the ground. The researcher also assumed that external factors like strikes did not arise as this could have affected the process of data collection and hence the completion of the project.

1.10 Definition of Significant Terms

**Evaluation:** It is judging the extent to which project activities have achieved their intended objectives by the assessing the impact of the project.

**Facilitated Negotiations:** This is a process in which the parties to a dispute, who have identified the issues to be negotiated, utilise the assistance of a dispute resolution practitioner to negotiate the outcome. As a PM&E process involves different stakeholders, this invariably requires engaging with varying interests that are played out through existing power relationships, thus making the process deeply political.

**Institutional strengthening:** This is about increasing the capacity or ability of institutions to perform their functions more effectively.
Monitoring: This is a continuous process of collecting information about the performance and progress of a project to ensure it is on course and on schedule in meeting the objectives.

Participation: a process in which different actors negotiate and share control over development initiatives and the related decisions and resources, with particular attention being given to involving groups that had been previously excluded or marginalized.

Participatory monitoring and evaluation: a process in which the primary stakeholders of any development intervention are actively involved in examining whether the programme or project has achieved its objectives, or whether it is progressing in the right direction.

Public accountability: This refers to the obligation of public institutions and agencies that they are to be answerable for fiscal and social responsibilities to those who have assigned such responsibilities to them.

Public private partnership (PPP or P3): It is an arrangement between a private sector and a public entity where a private partner brings its skills, capital and commercial innovation into the provision of the services the government is responsible for.

Stakeholder: An individual, institution or any group that can have a claim or an interest in a project. These consist of the primary stakeholders also referred to as the public stakeholder groups.

Stakeholder perspectives: This refers to the various positions, objectives or opinions that stakeholders have on a project. The key stakeholders are primarily seen as coalitions which must serve the opinions of all parties involved.

1.11 Organization of the study
The research project was organized in five chapters. Chapter one focused on the background of study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives, and research questions, significance of the study, basic assumptions, limitations and delimitations of the study and finally, the definition of significant terms and organization of the study. Chapter two focused on literature review of the study and gives a detailed account of the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects. It also focused on the theories guiding the study, the conceptual framework, knowledge gap and summary of literature reviewed.
Chapter three focused on the research design, target population, sampling procedure and sample size, data collection instruments, their validity and reliability. Data collection procedure, analysis and presentation are also reviewed. Ethical considerations have been captured and operationalization of variables has been focused on. Chapter four focused on presenting data collected from the field, its analysis, and finally the interpretation of the findings on the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects. The data was presented in form of tables and prose for quantitative and qualitative data respectively.

Finally chapter five provided the summary of the findings from chapter four, and also the conclusions and recommendations of the study based on the objectives of the study. The purpose of this study was to determine the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This section focused on the contribution of past scholars. It analyzed and reviewed the studies that have been done on the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects whose objectives are related to the topic of study.

2.2 Theoretical Orientation
This section presents the theoretical foundation of this study. It specifically presents two theories including: Stakeholder theory and the public participation theory. These are discussed in details below:

2.2.1 Stakeholder Theory by Edward Freeman (1984)
It is until recently that scholars and many researchers have concurred that project success concerns not only cost, time and quality, but also the satisfaction and effective management of all the stakeholders involved (Bourne and Walker, 2005). Freeman (1984) defines stakeholders as those individuals or group of individuals who have a claim or interest in a project and its activities. The theory underscores the fact that the creation and the ongoing operations of each project are as a result of several actors' activities, who are the stakeholders. The central idea therefore is that a project's success is dependent on how well the organization manages the relationships with key groups such as customers, employees, suppliers, communities, financiers, and others that can affect the realization of the project objectives (Freeman, 1984). According to Siering and Svensson (2012), in a PPP arrangement the private entities manage stakeholders otherwise handled by the public institution. The social responsibility of the privately owned Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) therefore significantly increases, and external relationships become crucial for the performance of the project. In PPP projects, stakeholder management is a decisive factor as well for a project’s success or failure and therefore identification of stakeholders and their involvement should be part of the project’s planning process (Bourne and Walker, 2005). Most projects consist of individuals and groups with different interests and motivational incentives, hence this makes PPP projects complex in particular because of the need to incorporate perspectives of a large number of parties involved (Yescombe, 2007).
2.2.2 Public Participation Theory by Sherry R. Arnstein (1969)

Arnstein (1969) provides an overview of the different ways the public can be involved in decision making and the various levels of public participation. Further Arnstein defines public participation as a process in which people, and especially disadvantaged people, influence resource allocation, policy and programme formulation and implementation. In this model people are expected to be responsible and should, therefore, be active participants in public service decision making. On the other hand Brett (2003) notes that public participation has gained support in response to demands for greater individual and community control over the activities of governments towards its citizens. Further Brett points out that public participation and involvement in decision making can succeed for certain projects depending on the circumstances. This approach of public participation however, fails in situations where local conditions make collective action very difficult, or where it is manipulated by implementing authorities to justify their own actions or poor performance.

In a review of literature Muhangi (2007), points out that the rationale for public participation may include; being a means of improving empowerment, a way of responding to society needs, ownership of projects by the local people, and making projects cheaper by allowing mobilization of local resources. This theory therefore is believed to promote more equitable distribution of the benefits that accrue from development activities and in line with the above, Chambers (1997) argues that participation empowers citizens so that they can continue to direct and support future changes.

Brett (2003) recommends for a more people-driven development that emphasizes the need for institutional strengthening and building local capacity and accountability for sustainability of projects. Brett observes that citizenship is marked first of all, by active participation in public affairs and decision making and that interest in public issues and devotion to public causes are the key signs of civic duty.

Participatory theory was found to be relevant to this study because it supports and argues for institutional strengthening, stakeholders perspectives, public accountability and facilitated negotiation as critical components of the PM & E process. The theory argues that project beneficiaries who participate in the programme activities are empowered to demand services, develop a sense of ownership of the programme and a sense of belonging to the projects. Participation theory therefore provides a good theoretical framework and foundation on which this study is based.
2.3 Institutional Strengthening and Performance of Public Private Partnership Projects

Uphoff (1986) defines institutional strengthening as measures designed to improve the performance of an organisation. Further Uphoff expounds this definition to include the measures designed to improve the organisation’s capability to execute selected activities while striving to achieve the objectives of that intervention. From this definition it is evident that strengthening institutions and organizations provides an opportunity to optimise performance of development projects and more specifically public private partnership projects. Usually too much is expected from the government agencies in terms of project intervention delivery, despite the fact that they often have limited capacity hence less attention is given to building relations at all levels with other organizations that are involved in co-implementation and partnership-building with the private sector (Uphoff and Buck, 2006).

Alexandria General Water Authority (AWGA) (2011) outlines several measures that managers can adapt in order to strengthen their organizations performance. The measures proposed include: Improvements in utility efficiency which must be accompanied by government decisions to provide the legal and institutional framework for successful utility performance, including sector planning and improved conflict management among stakeholders to resolve disputes; the second measure is in institutional building initiatives. Next is effective communication which is one of the key requirements for a successful outcome. The project approach includes several powerful communication devices. These include a team structure and implementation teams, and regularly coordinated meetings. Lastly, is the use of power point presentations and thorough preparations for Steering Committee meetings and workshops ensures clarity and produces a high level of confidence.

2.4 Stakeholder Perspectives and Performance of Public Private Partnership Projects

Yuan, Skibniewski, Li, and Zheng (2010) argues that the desire for more efficient and effective PPP (Public Private Partnership) projects renders the performance management to be increasingly important, in which the influence of the stakeholders must be considered. According to their study results, the objective attributes are all important. Integrating all stakeholders’ benefits and selecting the appropriate qualitative level of performance objective in the process of decision making are two particularly important problems because of stakeholders’ different preferences. Lemos and Bensusan (2000) on the other hand, looked at multi-stakeholder processes and observed that they can aid in the specification and selection
of appropriate indicators. Verification, triangulation and peer review can greatly enhance the accuracy, reliability and credibility of the chosen indicator and measurement, and of the governance assessments based on these measures. Stakeholder consultation can serve this purpose. Having the indicator measures and assessments cross-checked and verified by different stakeholders in the context of multi-stakeholder fora and dialogues can help reduce subjectivity and bias.

M&E stakeholders are those people who have a stake in the programme. They are persons who take decisions using the M&E data and findings. Stakeholders may not necessarily agree on the measured results or their interpretation and assessment but such dialogues among stakeholders and between stakeholders and governments at different levels create opportunities to forge agreement on appropriate actions to take and aspects to track in order to ensure that issues are addressed and stimulus project governance is improved over time (Gaventa and Blauert, 2000).

Monitoring and evaluation framework agreed among the key stakeholders at the end of the planning stage, is essential in order to carry out monitoring and evaluation systematically. This framework serves as a plan for monitoring and evaluation and timely decision making requires information from regular and planned monitoring and evaluation activities. According to Larry (2001), planning for monitoring and evaluation must start at the time of programme or project design, and they must be planned together with indicators. Stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation can produce effective communication for various other objectives which may include communication of early wins and enlist engagement of those who are indifferent (Larry 2001).

With an emphasis on practical or action oriented learning, participatory evaluation is an educational experience for participants as well as a means for local capacity building (Estrella and John 1998). Characterized as a process of individual and collective learning, participatory evaluation enables participants to acknowledge their strengths and weaknesses, their social reality and their visions and perspectives of development outcomes (Suarez-Herrera 2009). Understanding the various factors that affect the conditions and dynamics of their project, the basis for their successes and failures, and the potential solutions or alternative actions (Estrella, and John, 1998), participants develop skills which enable them plan, solve problems, and make decisions. Collectively, participants learn from experience, gain the
abilities to evaluate their own needs, analyze priorities and objectives and assume action oriented planning (Jackson and Kassam 1998).

2.5 Public Accountability and Performance of Public Private Partnership Projects

Roberts and Scapens (1985) define accountability as giving and demanding of reasons for conduct from an individual or an institution. Käyhkö (2011) outlines a number of approaches that can be used in evaluating public accountability in PPPs: First, public accountability is approached as a strategic issue with the help of three subordinate questions; by exploring the various aspects of public management and the results definition, by scrutinizing public accountability as a question of legitimacy and ethics, and by raising issues which concern the citizen.

Käyhkö (2011) further argues that ensuring public accountability can be useful in setting high level strategic objectives. Käyhkö puts more emphasis on the need for transformation from a pragmatic tone to the actual quality-oriented performance and ethical thinking. Therefore, critical public accountability comprises of: A relationship where at least two parties are involved and that there is an exchange where by on one side there is a transfer of authority and/or resource, while in return there is some form of account or answerability and on the other side there is control based on this account or answerability. It is this final public element that is the essence of critical public accountability and separates the concept from other related ones such as answerability and responsiveness. Bovens (2005) definition of the public element is appropriate with the proviso of recognizing that the account being given in public is a normative demand.

McMillan and Chavis (1986) argued that awareness is growing that participation by project beneficiaries in design and implementation brings greater ownership of project objectives, accountability and encourages the sustainability of project benefits. Objectives should be set and indicators selected in consultation with stakeholders, so that objectives and targets are jointly owned.

2.6 Facilitated Negotiations and Performance of Public Private Partnership Projects

Participatory monitoring and evaluation is increasingly being perceived as a social process for negotiating between people’s needs, expectations and world views (Estrella, 2000). The negotiation process allows participants to gain a better understanding of their own and others interest, perceptions and roles in the evaluation. The inclusion of multiple stakeholders in the
monitoring and evaluation process is perceived by practitioners as contributing towards the building of trust and changing of perceptions, behaviors, and attitudes among stakeholders which improves the outcome of the project (Campilan, 2000). PM&E inevitably requires negotiation to reach an agreement about who will participate, what will be monitored or evaluated, how and when data will be collected and analysed, what the information means, and how findings will be shared, and what action will be taken hence the need of a facilitator (Rossman, 2012). The resulting insights can be used to improve the performance of interventions, and also to prepare better when negotiating with other actors.

In order to identify what is to be monitored and evaluated and for what purpose(s), PM&E uses a process that tries to offer forums that allow different stakeholders to articulate their needs and make collaborative decisions. PM&E enables people to understand the views and values they share, work through their differences with others, develop longer-term strategies, and take carefully researched and planned actions which fit their contexts, priorities, and styles of operating (Parachini, 1997). PM&E therefore requires learning about people’s concerns, and how different stakeholders look at (and hence measure) project results, outcomes, and impacts. How these differing (and often competing) stakeholder claims and perspectives are negotiated and resolved, especially when particular groups and/or individuals are powerless compared to others, remains a critical question in building a participatory monitoring and evaluation process (Gaventa and Blauert, 2000).

Opening up project management service providers or government staff to comments from beneficiaries or other stakeholders can be perceived as threatening and may lead to some resistance. Therefore, for a PM&E process to deliver, a culture that rewards innovation and openness about failure is required and may need to be formed (Bovens, 2005). It is also important that norms, procedures and incentives are in place that supports transparency, accountability, learning and flexibility since the number, role, and skills of stakeholders, and contextual conditions change over time.

2.7 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of the study can be summarized in the figure below. It shows the relationship between independent variable and dependent variable. Furthermore it also shows other factors, moderating and intervening variables that can play in and affect both independent and dependent variables in this study.
The conceptual framework of this study shows how the independent variables; institutional strengthening, stakeholder perspectives, public accountability and facilitated negotiations influence the performance of private partnership projects (dependent variable).

**Figure 1: Conceptual Framework.**

**Independent variables**

- **Institutional Strengthening**
  - Number of seminars/workshops/training sessions on PM&E
  - Team building activities done
  - Appraisals done

- **Stakeholder Perspectives**
  - Programs involving stakeholder integration
  - Number of partnerships
  - Number of focus groups held/meetings/open forums

- **Public Accountability**
  - Level of transparency in project execution
  - Auditing of resources
  - Number of published reports

- **Facilitated Negotiations**
  - Needs identification forums
  - Number of negotiated positions
  - M&E plan development forums

**Moderating variables**

- Government policy
- Political environment

**Dependent variable**

- Performance of PPPs
  - Client satisfaction
  - Project quality
  - Timeliness (milestone dates)
  - Cost efficiency

**Intervening variables**

- Resources adequacy
- Client demand

Source: Author (2014)
2.8 Knowledge Gap

Although literature has been reviewed on participatory monitoring and evaluation showing how its various aspects assist in the systematic recording and periodic analysis of information that has been chosen and recorded, most of these studies have been done in other countries whose strategic approach and financial footing is different from that of Kenya. Most of them also have focused on either publicly owned or privately owned institutions. None of them therefore focused on how this is done in PPPs. It is evident therefore that a literature gap exists on the relationship between participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects. This study therefore sought to fill this gap by focusing on the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya.

2.9 Summary of Literature Review

This study was grounded on the public participation theory which has over the years gained prominence in response to demands for greater individual and community control over the activities of governments towards its citizens. Poorly functioning public sector institutions and weak governance are major constraints to growth and equitable development in many developing countries. Integrating all stakeholders’ benefits and selecting the appropriate qualitative level of performance objective in the process of decision making are some of the challenges which face participatory approaches of monitoring and evaluation because of the various stakeholder preferences. The areas and extent of disagreement among stakeholders can, in themselves, provide valuable insights and point to issues requiring greater attention.

Ensuring public accountability can be useful in setting high level strategic objectives. Objectives should be set and indicators selected in consultation with stakeholders, so that objectives and targets are jointly owned. In addition having stakeholders participate in a facilitated negotiation process allows them to gain a better understanding of their own and others’ interest, perceptions and roles in the evaluation. The resulting insights can be used to improve the performance of interventions, and also to prepare better when negotiating with other actors.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
The chapter discusses the methodology that was followed in the process of conducting the study. The chapter begins by setting out the research design that was used to enable the researcher achieve the objectives of the study. The population of interest, sampling procedure and sample size, data collection instruments, their validity and reliability as well as the procedure to be used when collecting data and the techniques that were used to organize, analyze and present the data are also discussed.

3.2 Research Design
This study used descriptive survey research design. According to Gatara (2010), descriptive design is appropriate because it is less expensive and can enable the researcher to examine data from a wider area within a short time. A descriptive design provides qualitative or numeric descriptions of trends, attitudes and perceptions of the population by studying a sample of that population (Kothari, 2008; Best and Khan, 2003). Since this study was interested in determining the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variable without manipulating any variable, the research design was suitable as it focused on the current phenomenon in regard to the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya.

3.3 Target Population
A population refers to all the items, an entire group of individuals, events or objects that conform to a given specification (Mugenda & Mugenda, 1999). The population of this study was composed of various stakeholders in the PPPs including government representatives from the concerned ministries, management staff of the authorities, project managers of the private partners and county representatives (MCAs and engineers) adding up to 252 (Public Private Partnership unit, 2014). These target respondents were chosen because of their role in the performance of public private partnership projects.
### Table 3.1: Target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government representatives from the concerned ministries</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management staff of the authorities</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project managers of the private partners</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County representatives (MCAs and engineers)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>252</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: PPP Unit, 2014**

#### 3.4 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

According to Trochim (2005), sampling is the process of selecting units from a population of interest. The advantage of sampling is that by selecting a part of the subject on which measurement is being taken in a population, conclusions may be drawn about the entire population. This method is also economic and time saving. A combination of stratified sampling and simple random sampling was used in this study. Stratified sampling was used to ensure representation from the different stakeholders constituting the strata. Through simple random sampling, 152 respondents were picked from the population using the ratio of 0.603 computed by dividing 152 with 252.

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) define a sample as a portion of population, while sampling refers to the selection of subject of cases from population of interest. According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), from normal distribution the sample size was estimated to be:

\[
s = \frac{X^2NP (1 - P)}{d^2 (N - 1)} + X^2P (1 - P).\]

Where:

- \(s\) = required sample size.
- \(X^2\) = the table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level (3.841).
- \(N\) = the population size.
- \(P\) = the population proportion (assumed to be .50 since this would provide the maximum sample size).
- \(d\) = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (.05).
Table 3.2: Sampling frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government representatives from the concerned ministries</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management staff of the authorities</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project managers of the private partners</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County representatives (MCAs and engineers)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PPP Unit, 2014

3.5 Data Collection Instruments

The study used questionnaire in order to collect data. Kirakowski (1998) defines a questionnaire as a method for the elicitation, recording and collecting of information. The questionnaires were used because they are inexpensive. The questionnaire had both open and closed ended questions. Qualitative data was collected from open ended items while quantitative data was collected from closed ended items in the questionnaire. The closed ended questions made use of a five point Likert scale where respondents were required to fill according to their level of agreement with the statements. The unstructured questions were used to encourage the respondents to give an in-depth response where closed ended questions are limiting. The questionnaire was designed in this study comprising of two sections. The first part included the demographic characteristics questions designed to determine the profile of the respondents while part two dealt with the identified independent variables.

3.6 Validity of Research Instruments

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), validity is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represent the phenomenon under study. In addition, Berg and Gall (1989) defines validity as the degree by which the sample of test items represents the content the test is designed to measure. Content validity was employed by this study as a measure of the degree to which data collected using a particular instrument represents a specific domain or content of a particular concept.

Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) contend that the usual procedure in assessing the content validity of a measure is to use a professional or expert in a particular field. In this study the
content was enhanced by reviewing the research tool with the lecturers in the department of Extra-Mural Studies and in particular the supervisor. The content validity of the research instrument was also evaluated through the actual administration of the pilot group. Content validity draws an inference from test scores to a large domain of items similar to those on the test (Polkinghorne, 1988).

3.7 Reliability of Research Instruments

According to Ngechu (2004) reliability refers to the consistency of measurement and is frequently assessed using the test–retest reliability method. Reliability is increased by including many similar items on a measure, by testing a diverse sample of individuals and by using uniform testing procedures.

The researcher selected a pilot group comprising of 10% of the sample population to test the reliability of the research instrument. One of the advantages of conducting this piloting study was to give advice and warnings about where the main research project may fail. The aim was to correct inconsistencies arising from the instruments, which ensured that they measure what is intended. The research instruments were subjected to overall reliability analysis using the split half method. This was done by collecting data from a given number of respondents into two halves (often odd-even). The two halves were correlated using Pearson's correlation. A coefficient of 0.7 or more implies that there is a high degree of data reliability (Trochim, 2005).

3.8 Data Collection procedures

The researcher obtained a letter from the University to ensure that the research was done in a manner according to the expectations of all authorities. In addition the researcher also pursued a permit from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation permitting the research. Questionnaires are the most commonly used methods when respondents can be reached and are willing to co-operate. Therefore this study collected data using a self-administered questionnaire through drop and pick later method where trained research assistants delivered the questionnaires at the respondents’ places of work. However, where it proved difficult for the respondents to complete the questionnaire immediately, the research assistants left the questionnaires with the respondents and picked them up on a later date.
3.9 Data Analysis and Presentation

The completed questionnaires were checked for completeness to ensure consistency and then the data was coded and grouped into various categories. Quantitative data was analyzed by descriptive analysis using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, V. 21.0) to describe the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya. Descriptive statistics include frequency, percentage, mean score and standard deviation. The findings were presented by use of tables. On the other hand, a conceptual content analysis was adopted for the qualitative data and the findings presented in prose. In addition, multiple regressions were used to measure the strength of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. The regression equation is:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \alpha \]

Where: \( Y \) is the dependent variable (Performance of PPPs),
\( \beta_0 \) is the constant/Y-intercept,
\( \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \) and \( \beta_4 \) are the slopes of the regression equation,
\( X_1 \) is the Institutional Strengthening
\( X_2 \) is the Stakeholder Perspectives,
\( X_3 \) is the Public Accountability,
\( X_4 \) is the Facilitated Negotiations,
\( \alpha \) is an error term.

3.10 Ethical Considerations

Some of the ethical issues that arose in this study were voluntary participation of respondents, deception to participants, anonymity and confidentiality of information given, analysis and reporting, harm or danger to participants and any other professional code of ethics that may be in breach. The researcher holds a moral obligation to treat the information with utmost propriety given the sensitivity of some of the information collected. Further, since the respondents were reluctant to disclose some information, the researcher needed to reassure the respondents of use and confidentiality of the information given and that it was solely used for the research study.
### 3.11 Operationalization of Variables

The operationalization of variables is shown in Table 3.3

**Table 3.3: Operational Definition of Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research objective</th>
<th>Type of variable</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measurement scale</th>
<th>Data collection Methods</th>
<th>Approach of Analysis</th>
<th>Tools of analysis</th>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To establish the influence of institutional strengthening on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya | Independent variable | Institutional strengthening | - Number of seminars/workshops/training sessions on PM&E  
- Team building activities done  
- Appraisals done | Nominal            | Questionnaires            | Quantitative Qualitative                                                                 | Mean Percentage  | Descriptive Content Regression |
| To determine the impact of stakeholder perspectives on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya | Independent variable | Stakeholder perspectives  | - Programs involving stakeholder integration  
- Number of partnerships  
- Number of focus groups held/meetings/open forums | Nominal            | Questionnaires            | Quantitative Qualitative                                                                 | Mean Percentage  | Descriptive Content Regression |
| To assess the influence of public accountability on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya | Independent variable | Public accountability    | - Level of transparency in project execution  
- Auditing of resources  
- Number of published reports | Nominal            | Questionnaires            | Quantitative Qualitative                                                                 | Mean Percentage  | Descriptive Content Regression |
To determine the influence facilitated negotiations on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Facilitated negotiations</th>
<th>Nominal Variable</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Quantitative Qualitative</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
<th>Descriptive Content Regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs identification forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of negotiated positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M&amp;E plan development forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Performance of public private partnership projects</th>
<th>Nominal Variable</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Quantitative Qualitative</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
<th>Descriptive Content Regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeliness (milestone dates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the interpretation and presentation of the findings. It presents analysis of the data on the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya. The chapter also provides the major findings and results of the study.

4.1.1 Response Rate

The study targeted a sample size of 152 respondents from which 129 filled in and returned the questionnaires making a response rate of 84.9%. This response rate was good and representative and conforms to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) stipulation that a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a rate of 60% is good and a response rate of 70% and over is excellent.

4.2 Demographic Characteristics

The study sought to establish the duration of work in the institution of the respondents.

Table 4.1: Duration of work with the institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of Work</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 21 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the years of service/working with the institution the findings in table 4.1 show that 63 (48.8%) of the respondents had worked for 6-10 years, 33 (25.6%) had worked for less than 5 years, 16 (12.4%) had worked for 16-20 years, 9 (7.0%) had worked for 11-15 years, while 8 (6.2%) had worked for above 21 years. The study therefore established that the respondents were in a good position to respond to questions in the research instrument.
4.3 Institutional Strengthening and Performance of Public Private Partnership Projects

The study sought to establish the influence of institutional strengthening on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya.

Table 4.2: Participation of stakeholders in monitoring and evaluation of PPP projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings, majority of the respondents, 97 (75.2%) indicated that stakeholders (MCAs) in a public private partnership agreement did not participate in the process of monitoring and evaluation of these projects while 32 (24.8%) indicated that stakeholders in a Public Private Partnership agreement participated in the process of monitoring and evaluation of these projects. The respondents indicated that the level of participation of the stakeholders was mostly at the planning level and that it was minimal.
Table 4.3: Influence of Institutional strengthening on performance of PPP project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E has been used as a strategy to improve organization performance through training/seminars/workshops</td>
<td>3.5581</td>
<td>.83128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E has promoted team building initiatives which is a pre-requisite to better performance</td>
<td>3.5116</td>
<td>.91101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E has been effective in ensuring that the objectives of the project are met</td>
<td>3.7597</td>
<td>.69095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E has enabled the management to monitor the progress of the project by assessing actual change against stated objectives</td>
<td>3.1938</td>
<td>.76644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Monitoring and evaluation (PM&amp;E) has been used to assess whether development investments are worthwhile</td>
<td>3.5116</td>
<td>.80091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E has provided government officials and development partners with better means for learning from past experience</td>
<td>3.6589</td>
<td>.98024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E has improved conflict management among stakeholders</td>
<td>3.6124</td>
<td>.12020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E has ensured understanding of plans and initiatives by simplifying and making use of power point presentations</td>
<td>3.5504</td>
<td>.86037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving all stakeholders with varied views has strengthened the institution</td>
<td>3.9287</td>
<td>.78074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the extent that institutional strengthening influence PPP Performance, the respondents indicated that involving all stakeholders with varied views has strengthened the institution, PM&E has been effective in ensuring that the objectives of the project are met, PM&E has provided government officials and development partners with better means for learning from...
past experience, PM&E has improved conflict management among stakeholders, PM&E has been used as a strategy to improve organization performance through training/seminars/workshops, PM &E has promoted team building initiatives which is a pre-requisite to better performance, Participatory Monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) has been used to assess whether development investments are worthwhile and PM&E has ensured understanding of plans and initiatives by simplifying and making use of power point presentations to a great extent as expressed by a mean score of 3.9287, 3.7597, 3.6589, 3.6124, 3.5581, 3.5116, 3.5116 and 3.5504 respectively. The respondents indicated PM&E enables the management to monitor the progress of the project by assessing actual change against stated objectives to a moderate extent as shown by a mean score of 3.1938.

4.4 Stakeholders’ Perspectives and Performance of Public Private Partnership Projects

The study also sought to establish the extent of agreement with various statements on the impact of stakeholders’ perspectives on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya. The study findings are depicted in table 4.4 below.
Table 4.4: Influence of stakeholders’ perspectives on performance of PPP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrating all stakeholders’ views has improved the performance of the projects</td>
<td>3.0310</td>
<td>.87484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having partnerships in a PPP arrangement has ensured support for the project</td>
<td>3.7907</td>
<td>.78735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are open forums/meetings held which involve stakeholders</td>
<td>3.6419</td>
<td>.93763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting the appropriate indicators in a PPP project has been difficult due to stakeholders’ different preferences</td>
<td>3.5039</td>
<td>.95419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders have aided in the selection of appropriate indicators improving the quality of the project</td>
<td>3.7054</td>
<td>.80314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings, the respondents indicated that to a great extent, having partnerships in a PPP arrangement has ensured support for the project, stakeholders have aided in the selection of appropriate indicators improving the quality of the project, there are open forums/meetings held which involve stakeholders and selecting the appropriate indicators in a PPP project has been difficult due to stakeholders’ different preferences as shown by a mean score of 3.7907, 3.7054, 3.6419 and 3.5039 respectively. The respondents were undecided on that integrating all stakeholders’ views has improved the performance of the projects as expressed by a mean score of 3.0310.

The respondents further indicated that stakeholders perspectives have affected the performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi county in several ways including, performance improvement; integration of all stakeholders; successful project implementation; contribution of stakeholders; through partners; open forums and meeting; supporting projects and minimization of conflict.
4.5 Public Accountability and Performance of Public Private Partnership Projects

The study sought to establish the extent that the respondents agreed with several statements on the influence of public accountability on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya.

Table 4.5: Influence of public accountability on performance of PPP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public accountability has been vital in ensuring the effective implementation of PPP projects</td>
<td>2.9457</td>
<td>.96294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public accountability has helped in exploring how public management influences the outcome of a project</td>
<td>3.6822</td>
<td>.78047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM &amp;E has enabled transparency on the PPP projects undertaken by the institution</td>
<td>3.7364</td>
<td>.88627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public accountability has helped in assessing the legitimacy and ethical aspects of the project.</td>
<td>3.4341</td>
<td>.64467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public accountability has helped in scrutinizing the effective utilization of the scarce resources during the implementation</td>
<td>3.5194</td>
<td>.92394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public accountability has helped in raising the issues that concern the citizens.</td>
<td>3.5814</td>
<td>.80183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular auditing of resources has influenced the performance of PPP projects</td>
<td>3.4961</td>
<td>.94476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports concerning the PPP projects are published by the institution</td>
<td>3.8047</td>
<td>.84167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the findings, majority of the respondents indicated that to a great extent reports concerning the PPP projects are published by the institution, PM&E has enabled transparency on the PPP projects undertaken by the institution, public accountability has helped in exploring how public management influences the outcome of a project, public accountability has helped in raising the issues that concern the citizens and public accountability has helped in scrutinizing the effective utilization of the scarce resources during the implementation as expressed by a mean score of 3.8047, 3.7364, 3.6822, 3.5814 and 3.5194 respectively. The respondents indicated that to a moderate extent, regular auditing of resources has influenced the performance of PPP projects, public accountability has helped in assessing the legitimacy and ethical aspects.
of the project and public accountability has been vital in ensuring the effective implementation of PPP projects as expressed by a mean score of 3.4961, 3.4341 and 2.9457 respectively.

The respondents were also required to give their views on how public accountability influence the performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County and they indicated that public accountability improves performance of the projects, ensures effective utilization of scarce resources, encourages transparency and accounting, brings about high efficiency, improves performance and ensures delivery of project benefits and accountability.

4.6 Facilitated Negotiations and Performance of Public Private Partnership Projects

The study sought to establish whether the respondents had participated in any negotiations on PPP projects in their organization.

Table 4.6: Participation of stakeholders in Facilitated Negotiations of PPP projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings majority of the respondents (MCAs), 90 (69.8%) indicated that they had not participated in any negotiations of projects in their organizations while 39 (30.2%) indicated they had. Those who responded positively indicated that the level of participation was minimal during negotiations.

The study also sought to establish the extent of agreement with various statements on the influence of facilitated negotiations on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County.
Table 4.7: Influence of facilitated negotiations on performance of PPP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation with stakeholders has been done for the PPP projects</td>
<td>3.2248</td>
<td>.95407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has used negotiations as forums that allow</td>
<td>3.3488</td>
<td>.98001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different stakeholders to make collaborative decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were needs identification forums at the onset of the project</td>
<td>4.3566</td>
<td>.70943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that has greatly contributed to the success of the PPP projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations have enabled people to understand the views and</td>
<td>3.6899</td>
<td>.93053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values they share.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E plan development forums has influenced the performance of PPP projects</td>
<td>3.5039</td>
<td>.61890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating with stakeholders has not been done because it is a waste of</td>
<td>3.5271</td>
<td>.66403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations have helped in identifying how different stakeholders</td>
<td>3.6357</td>
<td>.97578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measure project results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation builds trust, changes behavior and attitude of the stakeholders improving the outcome of the project</td>
<td>3.7054</td>
<td>.98745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations have promoted flexibility in decision making</td>
<td>3.7287</td>
<td>.77349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the extent that facilitated negotiations influence performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, the respondents indicated that to a great extent there were needs identification forums at the onset of the project that has greatly contributed to the success of the PPP projects, negotiations have promoted flexibility in decision, negotiation builds trust, changes behavior and attitude of the stakeholders improving the outcome of the project, negotiations have enabled people to understand the views and values they share, negotiations have helped in identifying how different stakeholders measure project results, negotiating with stakeholders has not been done because it is a waste of time and M&E plan development forums has influenced the performance of PPP projects in Nairobi County, Kenya as expressed by a mean score of 4.3566, 3.7287, 3.7054, 3.6899, 3.6357, 3.5271 and 3.5039 respectively. In addition the respondents indicated that statements of facilitated negotiations that influence performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya to a moderate extent include the
organization has used negotiations as forums that allow different stakeholders to make collaborative decisions and negotiation with stakeholders has been done for the PPP projects as shown by a mean score of 3.3488 and 3.2248 respectively.

4.7 Relationship between the Independent Variables and the Dependent Variable

The study used inferential statistics to come up with the regression model explaining the relationship between institutional strengthening, stakeholder perspectives, public accountability and facilitated negotiations (independent variables) and performance of PPP projects (dependent variable).

Table 4.8: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 is a model fit which established how fit the model equation fits the data. The adjusted R² was used to establish the predictive power of the study model and it was found to be 0.725 implying that 72.5% of the variations in performance of PPP projects are explained by institutional strengthening, stakeholder perspectives, public accountability and facilitated negotiations leaving 27.5% percent unexplained. Therefore, further studies should be done to establish the other factors (27.5%) affecting performance of PPP projects.

Table 4.9: ANOVA results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>7.619</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.905</td>
<td>4.161</td>
<td>0.00339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>56.762</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64.381</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The probability value of 0.00339 indicates that the regression relationship was highly significant in predicting how institutional strengthening, stakeholder perspectives, public accountability and facilitated negotiations affected performance of PPP projects. The F calculated at 5 percent level of significance was 4.161 and since F calculated is greater than the F critical (value = 2.4472), this shows that the overall model was significant.
Table 4.10: Coefficients of Determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>2.279</td>
<td>2.44E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Strengthening</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>2.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Perspectives</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>3.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Accountability</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>3.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated Negotiations</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>2.832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The established regression model for the study was:

\[ Y = 0.998 + 0.796 X_1 + 0.817 X_2 + 0.646 X_3 + 0.759 X_4 \]

The regression equation above has established that taking all factors into account (institutional strengthening, stakeholder perspectives, public accountability and facilitated negotiations) constant at zero, performance of PPP projects will be 0.998. The findings presented also show that taking all other independent variables at zero, a unit increase in the institutional strengthening would lead to a 0.796 increase in the scores of performance of PPP projects and a unit increase in the scores of stakeholder perspectives would lead to a 0.817 increase in the scores of performance of PPP projects. Further, the findings show that a unit increase in the scores of public accountability would lead to a 0.646 increase in the scores of performance of PPP projects. The study also found that a unit increase in the scores of facilitated negotiations would lead to a 0.759 increase in the scores of performance of PPP projects. Overall, stakeholder perspectives had the greatest effect on the performance of PPP projects, followed by institutional strengthening, then facilitated negotiations while public accountability had the least effect to the performance of PPP projects. All the variables were significant (p<0.05).
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the discussion of key data findings, conclusions drawn from the findings and the recommendations made. These conclusions and recommendations drawn are focused on addressing the objective of the study.

5.2 Summary of Findings
The study sought to establish the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya.

5.2.1 Institutional Strengthening and Performance of PPP Projects
The study revealed that majority 97 (75.2%) of the stakeholders (MCAs) in a public private partnership agreement did not participate in the process of monitoring and evaluation of these projects. The study also established that involving all stakeholders with varied views has strengthened the institution as depicted by a mean of 3.9287, that PM&E has been effective in ensuring that the objectives of the project are met with a mean of 3.7597, PM&E has provided government officials and development partners with better means for learning from past experience, PM&E has improved conflict management among stakeholders, PM&E has been used as a strategy to improve organization performance through training/seminars/workshops. It was clear that PM&E has promoted team building initiatives which is a pre-requisite to better performance, Participatory Monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) has been used to assess whether development investments are worthwhile and PM&E has ensured understanding of plans and initiatives by simplifying and making use of power point presentations to a great extent in Nairobi County, Kenya.

5.2.3 Stakeholders’ Perspectives and Performance of PPP Projects
The study established that having partnerships in a PPP arrangement has ensured support for the project with a mean of 3.7907, that stakeholders have aided in the selection of appropriate indicators improving the quality of the project with a mean of 3.7054, there are open
forums/meetings held which involve stakeholders and selecting the appropriate indicators in a PPP project has been difficult due to stakeholders’ different preferences in Nairobi County, Kenya.

5.2.3 Public Accountability and Performance of PPP Projects
The study established that various reports concerning the PPP projects are published by the institution with a mean of 3.8047, PM&E has enabled transparency on the PPP projects undertaken by the institution, public accountability has helped in exploring how public management influences the outcome of a project, public accountability has helped in raising the issues that concern the citizens and public accountability has helped in exploring how public management influences the outcome of a project.

5.2.4 Facilitated Negotiations and Performance of PPP Projects
The study revealed that majority 90 (69.8%) of the stakeholders (MCAs) had not participated in any facilitated negotiations of projects in their organizations. The study further established that negotiations influence performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya, the stakeholders indicated that to a great extent (a mean of 4.3566) there were needs identification forums at the onset of the project that has greatly contributed to the success of the PPP projects, negotiations have promoted flexibility in decision making, it builds trust, changes behavior and attitude of the stakeholders improving the outcome of the project, negotiations have enabled people to understand the views and values they share, negotiations have also helped in identifying how different stakeholders measure project results, the study also reveals that negotiating with stakeholders has not been done because it is a waste of time and M&E plan development forums has influenced the performance.

5.3 Discussion
This section focuses on linking the study findings to previous studies related to the topic as contained in the literature review section.

5.3.1 Institutional Strengthening and Performance of PPP Projects
The study revealed that stakeholders in a public private partnership agreement did not participate in the process of monitoring and evaluation of these projects. There is need to build relations at
all levels with other organizations that are involved in co-implementation and partnership-building with the private sector (Uphoff and Buck, 2006). The study further revealed that involving all stakeholders with varied views has strengthened the institution, PM&E has been effective in ensuring that the objectives of the project are met, PM&E has provided government officials and development partners with better means for learning from past experience, PM&E has improved conflict management among stakeholders, PM&E has been used as a strategy to improve organization performance through training/seminars/workshops, PM&E has promoted team building initiatives which is a pre-requisite to better performance, Participatory Monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) has been used to assess whether development investments are worthwhile and PM&E has ensured understanding of plans and initiatives by simplifying and making use of power point presentations to a great extent.

The study results also echoes Alexandria General Water Authority (AWGA) (2011) which outlines several measures that managers can adapt in order to strengthen their organizations’ performance which include effective communication which is one of the key requirements for a successful outcome. The project approach includes several powerful communication devices. These include a team structure and implementation teams, and regularly coordinated meetings. Another important measure is the use of power point presentations and thorough preparations for Steering Committee meetings and workshops ensures clarity and produces a high level of confidence.

5.3.2 Stakeholders Perspective and Performance of PPP Projects

The study established that having partnerships in a PPP arrangement has ensured support for the project, stakeholders have aided in the selection of appropriate indicators improving the quality of the project, there are open forums/meetings held which involve stakeholders and selecting the appropriate indicators in a PPP project has been difficult due to stakeholders’ different preferences in Nairobi County, Kenya. This is in line with Larry (2001) who posits that stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation can produce effective communication for various other objectives which may include communication of early wins and enlist engagement of those who are indifferent. This finding also correlate with Yuan, Skibniewski, Li, and Zheng (2010) who argues that the desire for more efficient and effective PPP (Public Private
Partnership) projects renders the performance management to be increasingly important, in which the influence of the stakeholders must be considered.

The study further revealed that stakeholders perspectives have affected the performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County in several ways including performance improvement; integration of all stakeholders; successful project implementation; contribution of stakeholders; through partners; successful project implementation; open forums and meeting; supporting projects; open forums; and minimization of conflict. This correlates with Suarez-Herrera (2009) who states that participatory evaluation enables participants to acknowledge their strengths and weaknesses, their social reality and their visions and perspectives of development outcomes.

These findings in addition correlate with Yuan, Skibniewski, Li and Zheng (2010) who argue that integrating all stakeholders’ benefits and selecting the appropriate qualitative level of performance objective in the process of decision making are two particularly important problems because of stakeholders’ different preferences. The findings are also in line with (Estrella and John 1998; Jackson and Kassam 1998) who state that participatory approaches acknowledge that there are several stakeholders who are or ought to participate in the evaluation. A core feature of participatory evaluation is recognizing who actually participates. Stakeholders become directly or indirectly involved in agreeing what to be achieved. These findings also concur with Brett (2003) who puts much emphasis on the issue of participatory groups and rural development. Brett (2003) calls for a more people-centered development practice that emphasizes the need to strengthen institutional and social capacity supportive of greater local control, accountability and self-reliance.

5.3.3 Public Accountability and Performance of PPP Projects

The study established that reports concerning the PPP projects are published by the institution, PM &E has enabled transparency on the PPP projects undertaken by the institution, public accountability has helped in exploring how public management influences the outcome of a project, public accountability has helped in raising the issues that concern the citizens and public accountability has helped in exploring how public management influences the outcome of a project. This is in concurrence with McMillan and Chavis (1986) who argue that there is growing
awareness that participation by project beneficiaries in design and implementation brings greater ownership of project objectives, accountability and encourages the sustainability of project benefits. The study is also in line with Käyhkö (2011) who outlines a number of approaches that can be used in evaluating public accountability in PPPs among them that public accountability is approached as a strategic issue with the help of three subordinate questions; by exploring the various aspects of public management and the results definition, by scrutinizing public accountability as a question of legitimacy and ethics, and by raising issues which concern the citizen.

5.3.4 Facilitated Negotiations and Performance of PPP Projects

The study revealed that majority 90 (69.8%) of the stakeholders (MCAs) had not participated in any negotiations projects in their organizations. The study further revealed that negotiations influence performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya. These findings correlate with Campilan (2000) who argues that negotiation process allows participants to gain a better understanding of their own and others interest, perceptions and roles in the evaluation. The inclusion of multiple stakeholders in the evaluation and monitoring process is perceived by practitioners as contributing towards the building of trust and changing of perceptions, behaviors, and attitudes among stakeholders which improves the outcome of the project. These findings also concur with Parachini (1997) who state that PM&E enables people to understand the views and values they share, work through their differences with others and develop longer-term strategies.

The study revealed that to a great extent there were needs identification forums at the onset of the project that has greatly contributed to the success of the PPP projects, negotiations have promoted flexibility in decision, negotiation builds trust, changes behavior and attitude of the stakeholders improving the outcome of the project, negotiations have enabled people to understand the views and values they share, negotiations have helped in identifying how different stakeholders measure project results, negotiating with stakeholders has not been done because it is a waste of time and PM&E plan development forums has influenced the performance. This is in line with Estrella (2000) who state that negotiation is increasingly being perceived as a social process for negotiating between people’s needs, expectations and world views.
5.4 Conclusion

From the findings, the researcher concludes that institutional strengthening influence performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County. Therefore it is important to involve all stakeholders with varied views to strengthen the institution. This will also ensure that the objectives of the project are met and that government officials and development partners have a better means for learning from past experience as well as improving conflict management among stakeholders.

The researcher also concludes that various stakeholder perspectives such as involvement in the selection of appropriate indicators, open forums/meetings and integration of all stakeholders influence the performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County. This therefore ensures support for the project in a PPP arrangement leading to more realistic propositions thereby preventing and reducing conflict between stakeholders.

The researcher further concludes that public accountability influences performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County. It was evident that PM&E enables transparency on the PPP projects undertaken by institutions since these reports are published enabling more openness and accountability. This will be important since the stakeholders will be able to monitor their resources and hence ensure effective and efficient use of the scarce resources.

From the study findings, the researcher also concludes that facilitated negotiations influence performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County which is as a result of the needs identification forums at the onset of the project that greatly contribute to the success of the PPP projects. The study revealed that negotiations promote flexibility in decision making, helps build trust, change the behavior and attitude of the stakeholders thereby improving the outcome of the project and enable people to understand the views and values they share. The researcher finally concludes that it is important that all stakeholders are involved in all the PPP projects. This is because the study findings revealed that stakeholder perspectives had the greatest effect on the performance of PPP projects, followed by institutional strengthening, and then facilitated negotiations while public accountability had the least effect to the performance of PPP projects.
5.5 Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions in this chapter, the researcher recommends that institutions should involve all the stakeholders in ensuring that the objectives of the projects they undertake are met. This is because PM&E will offer the institution and the development partners a platform to learn more from previous projects and also help avoid conflicts thereby improving quality of social and organizational interactions and communication and (inter)group skills. Moreover as interventions take place over several years, flexibility is essential, since the number, role, and skills of the stakeholders, and contextual conditions change over time. Sensitization and training is also needed because most community members and their leaders are not well conversant with PM&E. This will in turn improve mutual understanding of problems, opportunities and options for change.

The researcher also recommends that institutions should partner in a PPP arrangement to ensure support for the project from the stakeholders who aid in the selection of appropriate indicators improving the quality of the project. This will result in better understanding among stakeholders of institutional environment and resource availability, leading to more realistic propositions and in addition prevent and reduce conflict between stakeholders. Further, the researcher recommends that PM&E should be employed to bring about transparency on the PPP projects undertaken by institutions which help in exploring how public management and accountability influences the outcome of a project.

For a PM&E process to deliver, the researcher recommends a culture that rewards innovation and openness about failure to be nurtured. It is also important that norms, procedures and incentives are put in place that supports transparency, accountability, and learning. The researcher recommends that organizations should organize forums that will allow different stakeholders to articulate their needs and make collaborative decisions and be more willing to question previously accepted norms and constraints. This will enable people understand the views and values they share, work through their differences with others and develop longer-term strategies.
5.6 Suggestion for Further Studies

A similar study should be done in other counties since their operations are different from that of Nairobi County to see whether they will yield the same findings. Further studies should also be done to establish the factors affecting the adoption of participatory monitoring and evaluation. Research can also be carried out to try other models and establish the other factors affecting the performance of public private partnership projects since there are unexplained factors (27.5%) in the regression model.
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Appendix I: Research Questionnaire

Questionnaire on the Influence of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) on the Performance of Public Private Partnership (PPP) Projects in Nairobi County, Kenya

The aim of this questionnaire is to help in collecting data for this research. All answers will be treated in strict confidence. You are requested to answer all the questions to the best of your knowledge. Thank you.

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

1) Name of the institution you work for (Optional) .................................................................

2) Your Position in the Institution .........................................................................................

3) How long have you worked with this institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>[ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 21 years</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART II: MAIN ISSUES

SECTION A: INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING AND PERFORMANCE OF PPP PROJECTS

4) Have all the stakeholders in a Public Private Partnership agreement participated in the process of monitoring and evaluation of these projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>[ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please indicate their level of participation.

........................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................

5) Below are several statements on the Influence of PM&E on Institutional Strengthening and PPP Performance. On a scale of 1-5 where 5= Very great extent, 4= Great extent, 3= Moderate extent, 2= little extent and 1= Not at all, please indicate by ticking (✓) in the box the extent of your agreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E has been used as a strategy to improve organization performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through training/seminars/workshops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM &amp;E has promoted team building initiatives which are a pre-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PM&E has been effective in ensuring that the objectives of the project are met.

PM&E has enabled the management to monitor the progress of the project by assessing actual change against stated objectives.

Participatory Monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) has been used to assess whether development investments are worthwhile.

PM&E has provided government officials and development partners with better means for learning from past experience enhancing the quality of the project.

PM&E has improved conflict management among stakeholders which has reduced time wastage.

PM&E has ensured understanding of plans and initiatives by simplifying and making use of power point presentations increasing communication with stakeholders.

Involving all stakeholders with varied views has strengthened the institution where stakeholders are free to air their opinions.

---

**SECTION B: STAKEHOLDERS’ PERSPECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE OF PPP PROJECTS**

6) Below are several statements on the Impact of stakeholders’ perspectives on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya. On a scale of 1-5 where 5= Very great extent, 4= Great extent, 3= Moderate extent, 2= Little extent and 1= Not at all, please indicate by ticking (✓) in the box the extent of your agreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrating all stakeholders’ views has reduced the time used during project implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having partnerships in a PPP arrangement has ensured support for the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are open forums/meetings held which involve stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selecting the appropriate indicators in a PPP project has been difficult due to stakeholders’ different preferences affecting timely execution of the project.

Stakeholders have aided in the selection of appropriate indicators improving the quality of the project.

7) In your opinion in what ways do stakeholders perspectives affect the performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County? .................................................................
......................................................................................
......................................................................................

SECTION C: PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE OF PPP PROJECTS

8) Below are several statements on the influence of public accountability on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya. On a scale of 1-5 where 5= Very great extent, 4= Great extent, 3= Moderate extent, 2= Little extent and 1= Not at all, please indicate by ticking (✓) in the box the extent of your agreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public accountability has been vital in ensuring the effective implementation of PPP projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public accountability has helped in exploring how public management influences the outcome of a project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM &amp;E has enabled transparency on the PPP projects undertaken by the institution thereby improving on cost efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public accountability has helped in assessing the legitimacy and ethical aspects of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public accountability has helped in scrutinizing the effective utilization of the scarce resources during the implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public accountability has helped in raising the issues that concern the citizens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular auditing of resources has influenced the performance of PPP projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Reports concerning the PPP projects are published by the institution.

9) In your view, how does public accountability influence the performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

SECTION D: FACILITATED NEGOTIATIONS AND PERFORMANCE OF PPP PROJECTS

10) Have you participated in any facilitated negotiations on PPP projects in your organization?
    Yes [  ]  No [  ]
    If yes specify the level of your participation.
    ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
    ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

11) Below are several statements on the influence of facilitated negotiations on performance of public private partnership projects in Nairobi County, Kenya. On a scale of 1-5 where 5= Very great extent, 4= Great extent, 3= Moderate extent, 2= Little extent and 1= Not at all, please indicate by ticking (✓) in the box the extent of your agreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation with stakeholders has been done for the PPP projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has used negotiations as forums that allow different stakeholders to make collaborative decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were needs identification forums at the onset of the project that has greatly contributed to the success of the PPP projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations have enabled people to understand the views and values they share.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E plan development forums has influenced the performance of PPP projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating with stakeholders has not been done because it is a waste of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations have helped in identifying how different stakeholders measure project results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation builds trust, changes behavior and attitude of the stakeholders improving the outcome of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Negotiations have promoted client satisfaction in decision making.

SECTION E: PERFORMANCE OF PPP PROJECTS

12) What has been the trend of the following aspects of performance of PPPs since approval of the project? Use a scale of 1-5 where 5= greatly improved, 4= improved, 3= constant, 2= deteriorated, 1= greatly deteriorated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your time.
Appendix II: List of Contracting Agencies

1. Kenya National Highways Authority (KeNHA)
2. Kenya Airports Authority (KAA)
3. Kenya Civil Aviation Authority (KCAA)
4. Kenya Railways Corporation (KRC)
5. Nairobi County Government
6. Athi Water Services Board (AWSB)
7. Kenyatta University (KU)
8. Ministry of Land, Housing and Urban Development
9. Kenya Tourist Development Corporation (KTDC)
10. Kenya ICT Authority
11. Ministry of Information Communications and Technology
12. Kenyatta National Hospital (KNH)
13. Ministry of Health
14. Ministry of East Africa Affairs, Commerce and Tourism

Source: PPP Unit, 2014
Appendix III: List of PPPs

1. Dualling of both the Mombasa-Nairobi highway
2. Dualling of Nairobi-Nakuru road
3. Operation and maintenance of the 50 km Nairobi –Thika superhighway
4. 28.6 km dual carriageway Nairobi Southern bypass
5. The Jomo Kenyatta International Airport Terminal 2 (Greenfield Terminal)
6. PPP structure for Food Courts at JKIA
7. Nairobi Commuter Rail Services
8. Nairobi Solid Waste Management
9. Kenyatta University Students Hostels
10. Civil Servants Housing Project in Nairobi
11. 300-bed Hospital at KNH – Private Wing
12. ICT services at Kenyatta National Hospital (KNH)
13. Build, Finance and Operate a First Class Hotel at Bomas of Kenya in Nairobi
14. Nairobi Bulk Water Supply on a PPP basis
15. National Data Centre
16. Development and management of in-flight Catering Kitchen at JKIA
17. Government Flying School at the East African School of Aviation

Source: PPP Unit, 2014
Appendix IV: Letter of Transmittal

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND EXTERNAL STUDIES
SCHOOL OF CONTINUING AND DISTANCE EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EXTRA-MURAL STUDIES
NAIROBI EMC

Your Ref: 
Our Ref: 
Telephone: 318262 Ext. 120

Main Campus
Gandhi Wing, Ground Floor
P.O. Box 30197
NAIROBI

30th June, 2014

REF: UON/CEES/SC 18/332

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

RE: NYABUTO PATRICK NTHENGE - REG NO: L50/81431/2012

The above named is a student at the University of Nairobi, College of Education and External Studies, School of Continuing and Distance Education, Department of Extra-Mural studies pursuing Master of Arts in Project Planning and Management.

He is proceeding for research entitled “influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private partnership Projects in Nairobi County Kenya”.

Any assistance given to him will be appreciated.

CAREN AWILLY
CENTRE ORGANIZER
NAIROBI EXTRA MURAL CENTRE
Appendix V: Letter from National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Tel: +254-20-2213471, 2241349, 310571, 2219420
Fax: +254-20-318245, 318249
Email: secretary@nacostig.org.ke
Website: www.nacostig.org.ke
When replying please quote

Ref: No.

NACOSTI/P/14/1897/2873

Patrick Ntenghe Nyabuto
University of Nairobi
P.O. Box 30197-00100
NAIROBI.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on "Influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation on performance of public private projects in Nairobi County, Kenya," I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Nairobi County for a period ending 15th October, 2014.

You are advised to report to the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Nairobi County before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit two hard copies and one soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

DR. S. K. LANYAT, OGW
FOR: SECRETARY/CEO

Copy to:

The County Commissioner
The County Director of Education
Nairobi County.