Asian Journal of Economics, Finance and Management

Volume 6, Issue 1, Page 30-41, 2024; Article no.AJEFM.1478

Unpacking Project Implementation: The Effective Role of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in Local Non-Governmental Organization in Somaliland

Jibril S. Nimco [a] and Ambrose Kyalo Kaumbulu [a*]

[a] School of Business, Amoud University, Somalia.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. Authors JSN and AKK designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors JSN and AKK managed the analyses of the study. Author AKK managed the literature searches. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Original Research Article

Received: 18/11/2023
Accepted: 22/01/2024
Published: 27/01/2024

ABSTRACT

Monitoring and evaluation have gained prominence as a key tool for program success. Thus, NGOs have strived to integrate Monitoring and Evaluation system to promote program performance. This is evident with the ever-increasing demands for M&E experts and request for expression of interest for M&E consultants in the local dailies. However, in developing countries, NGOs are faced with several challenges in addition to inability to resourcefully respond to changing needs. Especially in Somaliland, the implementation of M&E in non-governmental organizations is still limited. The ineffectiveness of their work has also been observed owing to the inability by NGOs to demonstrate and achieve project results, despite the huge resources at their disposal. It is against this backdrop that this study determined the factors affecting the implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems in local NGOs in Borama city, Somaliland. The study was guided by the following objectives: to establish the effect of budgetary allocation, stakeholder participation and level of training on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems in local non-governmental organization projects in Borama city, Somaliland. The study adopted cross sectional survey on 10 local NGOs with a total of 60 respondents. The data was collected using a questionnaire. The data

**Corresponding author: Email: ambrosekyalo25@gmail.com;*

collected was analyzed by descriptive statistics and inferential statistics through multiple linear regression. The study found that budgetary allocation had no significant effect on the implementation of M&E with β = 1.339 and p-value = 0.538. The study also found that stakeholder participation had a significant effect on the implementation of M&E with β = 8.680 and p-value = 0.000. The study further revealed that level of training had a significant effect on the implementation of M&E in the Local NGOs with β = 7.919 and p-value = 0.001. The study concluded that the budgetary allocation, stakeholder participation and level of training under the study significantly affected the implementation of M&E systems. The study recommends that the local NGOs needs to implement effective M&E systems as they enhance the performance and sustainability of established projects.

Keywords: Monitoring and evaluation system; project implementation; budgetary allocation; stakeholder participation; training; NGOs; Somaliland.

1. INTRODUCTION

The primary goals of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) process are to enhance project performance and produce anticipated or intended outcomes. By evaluating the progress, performance, and outcomes of projects and programmes, or even institutions and organisations, whether international or local NGOs, governments, or individuals, the goal of monitoring and evaluation is to improve current and future management of inputs, outputs, outcomes, and impact in projects and programmes being executed [1,2]. As a crucial component of management practices and principles, monitoring and evaluation advances planning, implementation, and accountability of project undertakings, all of which have a favourable impact on decision-making [3]. It entails regular reporting and evaluation of the project's effects. Project managers can plan for and keep track of changes to the project guide and their impact by using monitoring and evaluation. It also enhances management techniques going forward [4].

“Based on the program theory Program theory of evaluation has grown in use over the past decade. It assesses whether a program is designed in such a way that it can achieve its intended outcomes. The program theory is a guidance theory in the evaluation of projects as it shows the capacity of the program to attend to specific problems that need to be reviewed within projects. It further offers guidance on what areas need to be emphasized on during the evaluation process” [5]. “The program theory hinges on detailed description of the process or mechanisms such as information about the important steps, links, and phases of the expected transformation process as well as some implementation issues. Therefore, Development Banks and bilateral aid agencies also regularly apply M&E to measure development effectiveness as well as demonstrate transparency” [6]. Governmental and non-governmental organizations are increasingly coming under pressure to improve monitoring and evaluation of activities, with particular emphasis on measuring the effects of their interventions on beneficiaries.

Monitoring and evaluation system (M&E) is a set of indicators, instruments, and measurements and enables ongoing programme performance and progress tracking (monitoring). Additionally, the system offers a framework for evaluating a program's efficacy and/or quality of execution (process and outcome evaluation) [7]. Monitoring and evaluation, according to [8], is the process of methodically gathering and examining data on a project that is already underway and contrasting the project's impact and outcome with its goals. With stakeholders demanding accountability and transparency from NGOs and other institutions, including the government, the need for M&E as management tools to demonstrate performance has increased [9].

The M&E system is a comprehensive tool that provides direction for monitoring and filtering ongoing initiatives, documenting subsequent data, and methodically assessing that data in relation to the project's predetermined goals and objectives [10]. For an M&E system to be dependable and independent, it must be pertinent to the project and the organisation [6]. A decisive M&E system is one that provides information that may be effectively applied to improve project success. In addition, the system ought to facilitate stakeholder identification of the project's possible advantages, ways to enhance project monitoring and screening, and a summary of the project's accomplishments,

prospects, and future endeavours [11]. A successful M&E system should aim to improve staff engagement and communication as this fosters a sense of teamwork within the project and helps draw in personnel support. According to [4], stakeholders are the people who directly own and are impacted by the project's accomplishments and impacts, hence their involvement in it should also not be disregarded. An M&E system is primarily used as a foundation for assessing how well project delivery processes are working [12].

In the developed countries, many international organizations such as the United Nations, USAID, the World Bank group and the Organization of American States have been utilizing M & E process for many years. The process is also growing in popularity where the governments have created their own national M&E systems to assess the development projects, the resource management and the government activities or administration. Globally, monitoring and evaluation has been applied for poverty reduction strategies and implemented by many countries especially among the developing ones [13]. In Africa, Donors have adopted the use the M & E system since it enables them evaluate a project's chances of success by weighing its many components against the amount of financing needed. Additionally, the system assists in determining areas in which methods and funding require improvement. The outcomes of ongoing monitoring and evaluation can assist in demonstrating to donors that their funds are being spent and distributed fairly [14,11,4]. “In Somaliland, LNGOs are faced with several challenges in addition to inability to resourcefully respond to changing needs. The common problem facing Somaliland NGOs is how to run a project successfully and efficiently like in many other developing countries is to determine whether they have achieved their stated goals or not. In many NGOs, monitoring and evaluation is something that is used by a stakeholder to assess project requirements and project performance” [15].

In Somaliland context the implementation of M&E by local NGOs statistics shows that 35% had developed some type of indicator framework for M&E, 21% conducted monitoring activities, 61% had a planned or ongoing impact evaluation and 39% had no M&E report for public consumption. In Borama monitoring and evaluation is poor and is about 47%. In Borama, there is still a limited use of M&E in non-governmental organisations. The ineffectiveness of their work has also been observed owing to the inability by NGOs to demonstrate and achieve project results, despite the huge resources at their disposal. Studies on functioning of local NGOs project implementation, monitoring and evaluation show that short term project objectives of local NGOs have been achieved with positive, but often scattered little results. Yet, many studies conducted in context of Somaliland remain limited in empirical findings on addressing effective role of monitoring and evaluation practices on local NGOs executing projects in Borama [16,17]. It is from this backdrop that the researcher prompted to investigate factors affecting implementation of M&E systems in a bid to recommend on the best result-based M&E system that is more effective and efficient for NGO projects. Therefore, this study attempted to determine the factors affecting the implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems in Borama, Somaliland.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Theoretical Literature Review

2.1.1 Program Theory

Over the past decade, the program theory of evaluation has become more popular. It evaluates if a program's design allows it to provide the desired results. The programme theory serves as a guidance theory for project assessment since it demonstrates the program's ability to address particular issues that require examination within projects. Additionally, it provides direction on the areas that should be prioritised during the assessment procedure [18,19].

The benefit of using program theory is that it can provide information that could lead to further explanations of the issue, potential remedies, and other courses of action that could be taken to achieve the desired outcomes. Moreover, it can be applied to improve judgement and broaden ideas for resolving any project's issues [20]. This theory's methods, however, are constrained since they place an undue emphasis on gathering data to inform the evaluation process, which could be expensive for initiatives with limited funding.

Therefore, a variety of instruments may be used to assess the M&E system's implementation, intermediate variables, and results; nevertheless,

careful assessment of their validity, applicability, and reliability is required [21]. While establishing data collection procedures, these criteria need to be carefully examined, but other evaluation-related considerations also need to be carefully considered. In addition to the intermediate goals, programme implementation, mediating effects processes, and expected outcomes, data collection is also necessary regarding the target population's characteristics [22]. Thus, much like with stakeholders, some variables are too significant to be disregarded and must to be assessed and included in the studies. Theory-based assessments should take into account the client's use of programme components, the amount of treatment actually received, the client's involvement, and the integrity of the services offered

2.1.1 Implementation Theory

Leonid Hurwicz established implementation theory in 2013 under the auspices of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). A single "thing" that needs to be implemented is never referred to as implementation. Any time a new way of thinking, behaving, or organising is incorporated into a social system of any type, it takes the form of a complex bundle of material and cognitive practices, or better yet, an "ensemble." There are numerous moving components in even what seem to be extremely straightforward implementation processes. Accordingly, the goal of any implementation process will be defined as "complex intervention" in the following [23].

The creation of a comprehensive collection of conceptual tools that help practitioners and scholars recognise, characterise, and interpret key components of implementation processes and their results is the goal of the development of implementation theory. These, when combined, provide a thorough description and explanation of all the components of a complicated dynamic system [24].

According to [25] implementation theory is based in monitoring and evaluation in ensuring all the stakeholder group are fully involved the development and establishment of an operational system. Whilst their respective roles are distinct, participant recognition is afforded to their interlinking contribution to monitoring and evaluation, consistent with the change programme structure based on alignment and integration management across various business functions and work streams that further link local and global parts of the operation. There is necessity for integration between parts of the business and associated evaluation of the change programme, whose effectiveness is enhanced by established channels of communication between the various stakeholders' groups.

2.2 Empirical Literature Review

"Monitoring and evaluation system is component intended to screen, track, and compare project outcomes to declared or planned targets" [26]. "It is a thorough endeavour that provides direction for monitoring and filtering an ongoing project, gathering data, and methodically assessing the data for comparison in accordance with the project's predetermined goals and objectives" [27]. "M&E systems should be designed for and managed throughout a project's life since they are an essential system of reflection and communication that supports project implementation" [28].

In order to comprehend successes or failures, the effectiveness of the M&E system is centered on procedures, expected and actualized accomplishments, contextual elements, results chain analysis, and causation. A development project's goals should be in line with the needs of the beneficiaries, the organization's plans, and the degree to which they address the corporate plan of the organisation and human development priorities like gender equality and empowerment. Initiatives for development should align with local and national policies and priorities, as well as their desired results and outputs [29]. Stakeholders can assess if the organisation implementing the project has the necessary technical and legal authority to carry out projects on their behalf by conducting monitoring and evaluation activities [7,17].

[30] provided four categories of characteristics that influence monitoring and evaluation. These include staff training, stakeholder participation, adherence to cooperative governance methods, and the potency of M&E. Additionally, [31] listed four categories of characteristics that affect monitoring and evaluation. These include staff training, M&E funding levels, budgetary allocation, and the choice of M&E tools and methodologies. Therefore, budgetary allocation, stakeholder participation, and staff training were conceptualized as elements impacting monitoring and evaluation systems in this study.

Project budgets or budgetary allocations should clearly and adequately fund activities related to monitoring and appraisal. To provide the monitoring and evaluation function the proper prominence it deserves in project management, a budget for monitoring and evaluation can be clearly defined within the total project budget [32]. According to [33], the budgetary allotment for M&E should be between 5 and 10 percent of the overall project expenditure. In order to ensure that funds are set aside expressly for M&E and are accessible to carry out vital M&E tasks, it is crucial for M&E personnel to provide input on M&E budget demands throughout the project design stage.

[34] found that the availability of skills, methods, resources, and resource accountability are critical factors essential to effectively monitor and evaluate government projects. This was discovered in a study aimed at identifying the factors that influence the performance of government project M&E in Kenya's Narok East sub-county Constituency Development Fund (CDF) projects. [35] held the same opinion. The stage in the project life cycle, the M&E team's strength, and the M&E systems were all found to have a positive and statistically significant impact on a project's success.

According to the International Fund for Agricultural Development's (IFAD) project M&E handbook, a project's financial and human resources should be its primary areas of concentration when it comes to M&E [7]. One of the main obstacles to the implementation of M&E, they note, is budgetary constraints. They suggest allocating funds to pay direct salaries for M&E personnel, train and hire local experts in the field for consultation, and allocate indirect salaries for field staff and management. They also suggest paying for services like training on data collection and analysis, M&E travel expenses, budget consultations, media development, and publication expenses to guarantee high-quality materials to be shared with other clients of M&E [10]. Thus, deciding which revenues will be used to meet which M&E goals and objectives is the subject of the financial allocation procedure. Budgetary allocation is viewed in this context as an essential part of the M&E planning system rather than as a stand-alone activity. The priorities specified in the M&E's plans, goals, and objectives should be taken into consideration while allocating or redirecting resources. A project's budgeting method may end up impeding rather than facilitating the agency's goals and objectives if resources are allocated improperly.

Mbogo and [36] findings further indicated that budgetary allocation practices of IRC had a significant effect on humanitarian project planning. The results showed that a unit increase in budgetary allocation enhanced humanitarian project planning by a factor of 0.108. This positive link between budgetary allocation and humanitarian project planning supports the Program theory and theory of Change, which predict that programs or projects perform well when resources are well allocated and systems exist to ensure accountability. In addition, the finding supported the finding by [37] who found that allocation of financial resources helped to improve the utilization of M & E activities and projects' performance.

According to [30], stakeholder participation entails empowering development beneficiaries with regard to resource and need identification, resource use planning, and the actual implementation of development efforts. In addition to promoting inclusiveness and facilitating meaningful engagement by varied stakeholder groups, involving stakeholders in debates regarding the what, how, and why of programme activities typically empowers them [38]. Similarly, according to [39] research on the institutional determinants of M&E system implementation among community-based development projects in Kenya's Kibera slum, staff competency, institutional accountability, management support, and resource allocation all have a significant impact on the M&E system's ability to be implemented successfully. Therefore, for this project to succeed, all relevant parties must be fully on board and resources and funding must be allocated on time to provide a prompt and efficient programme implementation.

In Nakuru County, Kenya, [40] conducted a study on the factors that influence efficient monitoring and evaluation of county government-funded infrastructure development projects. The study discovered that stakeholder participation significantly affects the efficient implementation of M&E. In addition, A study by [41] on influence of project management practices on implementation of donor funded education projects in Kajiado County, in Kenya, revealed that the key stakeholders in the project are important to project success. Thus, effective implementation of M&E activities requires active participation of the stakeholders involved. The

study noted that stakeholders' involvement promotes project ownership and sustainability especially when they are involved throughout the life cycle of the project. The study recommended that stakeholders need to be engaged in the formulation and implementation processes, paying attention to their needs to ensure their maximum participation in the project. All the studies above concluded that there is a positive relationship between stakeholder participation and implementation of M&E systems.

Training is a process that helps people acquire useful knowledge, abilities, and attitudes. According to [42], in research Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of Monitoring and Evaluation of Government Projects in Kenya, project managers need to prioritize training in fundamental project management skills and knowledge. The academic standing attained in a specialized field is what training is all about. Training should be provided on a regular basis in accordance with the education and experience levels of the workers. To guarantee the process's success, the personnel putting the M&E strategy into action must receive training in contemporary techniques for data collecting and analysis.

In a study on the factors influencing efficient monitoring and assessment of county government-funded infrastructure development projects in Nakuru, Kenya, [40] discovered that staff training level significantly affects how monitoring and evaluation are implemented. He mentioned that the team uses a participative approach to M&E activities to share their technical abilities with other stakeholders. In order to improve the efficacy of M&E, he also suggested that capacity building be done. Furthermore, a study by [43] on factors affecting implementation of monitoring and evaluation programs in kazi kwa kijana project in Tanzania, recommends that capacity building should be added as a major component of the project across the country, and this calls for enhanced investment in training and human resource development in the crucial technical area of monitoring and evaluation.

Numerous research on the factors affecting the implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems of local non-governmental organisations have been conducted outside of Somaliland, according to the reviewed literature. Budgetary allocation, staff training, and stakeholder participation have been found to have both having both significant and insignificant effect on execution of M&E of local non-governmental organisations. As a result of contradictory results from different studies and the empirical literature being anecdotal in the context of Somaliland, the study was based on the following hypothesis:

> H_{01}: Budgetary allocation has no significant effect on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation in local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland.
>
> H_{02}: Stakeholder participation has no significant effect on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation in local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland.
>
> H_{03}: Level of training has no significant effect on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation in local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study used descriptive survey research design and explanatory research design. This particular design was ideal since the research entailed collecting and comparing data from the phenomenon at the same time of study. Mugenda [44] argued that descriptive survey designs are appropriate where the overall objective is to establish whether significant associations among variables existed at some point in time. The design was ideal since it seeks to describe the characteristics of certain groups, estimate the proportion with certain characteristics and make predictions. Thus, the design was chosen because of its ability to ensure minimization of bias and maximization of the reliability of evidence to collected [45]. This design involved the collection of quantitative data for carrying out inferential analysis. Explanatory research design was adopted to test hypothesis and determine the relationship among the study variables. A census was conducted on all 60 respondents. Primary data was collected using a structured questionnaire. A structured questionnaire was formed from a blend of close-ended items. This provided uniformity of responses and enabled the researcher to collect a large amount of data in a short time. Validity and reliability of the research instruments was determined. Collected data from respondents was cleaned and edited to ensure completeness and consistency. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation. And inferential statistics was used to analyze the study using multiple linear regression method to determine the nature of relationship

between the two variables. Multiple linear regression was used to determine a strong measure of relationship between study variables. The data was analyzed at 5% margin of error, confidence level of 95% and 0.05 level of significance. Results were presented in tables and charts. It is for this reason that it was used to predict quality of M&E in Borama local NGOs as a factor influencing the implementation of M&E in Borama, Somaliland.

The study was guided by the following multiple linear regression model:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \epsilon_i$$

Where:

Y= Implementation of monitoring and evaluation
X_1= Budgetary allocation
X_2= Stakeholder participation
X_3= Level of training
ϵ_i= Error term
β_0= Constant term
β_1 β_2 & β_3= Regression coefficients

3.1 Findings

3.1.1 Response rate

Data was collected from all the targeted population of 60 projects from 10 local NGOs with a total of 60 respondents giving a response return rate of 100%. Data was collected on demographic characteristics of the respondents, on budgetary allocation, stakeholder participation, level of training and implementation of monitoring and evaluation.

3.2 Descriptive Analysis

The characteristics of survey data were analyzed using descriptive parameters such as standard deviation and mean. The result of analysis was shown in Table 1.

The descriptive results as shown in table 1, indicates that the aggregate mean score for budgetary allocation was 3.81 and standard deviation of 1.146. According to the 5-point Likert scale employed, this shows that the respondents agreed to the items measuring budgetary allocation, the standard deviation show that there was moderate deviation of responses. The aggregate mean and standard deviation of stakeholder participation was 3.58 and 1.144 respectively. This showed that the respondent agreed with the statements and there was moderate deviation. Level of training had a mean of 3.98 and standard deviation of 1.021, thus, showing that respondents agreed with the items and will low deviation. Project implementation had mean had a mean of 3.77 and standard deviation of 1.056. this shows that the respondents agreed with the items under the study with a low deviation.

3.3 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis is a set of independent variables used to predict the value of a dependent variable. Multiple linear regression was used to determine a strong measure of relationship between study variables. Multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to examine the influence of variables under the study. This study investigates the relationship between factors influencing M&E and implementation of M&E. Factors influencing M&E were characterized as budgetary allocation, stakeholder participation, and level of training. And implementation of M&E was characterized as quality of M&E data, cost effectiveness, utilization of M&E information, duration and frequency of M&E and documentation and lessons learnt. To establish the levels of influence or the relationship between the predictor variables and the independent variable, linear regression analysis was analyzed.

3.4 Test of Hypotheses

The study sought to investigate the factors influencing the implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems in local non-governmental organization in Borama city, Somaliland. In order to achieve this objective, three hypotheses were formulated: Budgetary allocation has no significant effect on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems of local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland (H_{01}), Stakeholder participation has no significant effect on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems of local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland (H_{02}), and Level of training has no significant effect on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems of local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland (H_{03}) Multiple linear regression was performed to determine the statistical significance of the hypothesized relationships at 95% level of significance. To establish the levels of influence or the relationship between the

predictor variables and the independent variable, linear regression analysis was analyzed and the results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 shows the model summary with a Pearson correlation of 0.710 indicating that there is a very strong positive correlation between factors influencing M&E and implementation of M&E systems. The coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.504 which illustrates that the three indicators of factors influencing M&E examined in this study jointly account for 50.4% variation in implementation of M&E systems. The results imply that budgetary allocation, stakeholder participation, and level of training predict implementation of M&E. The findings also imply that 49.6% of the variations in implementation of M&E systems were explained by other factors not considered in the model of the study.

Table 3 presents the results of ANOVA of the model fitted to test the factors influencing M&E and implementation of M&E. the results show F-statistic is 18.969 which is greater than the critical value of 2.77 (F (3, 59) 0.05) and P-value = 0.000 which is less than 0.05 implying that the model was statically significant. The study therefore rejected the hypothesis. And stated the model of the study had goodness of fit for the dataset it is applied on. These results establish that factors influencing M&E which are budgetary allocation, stakeholder participation and level of training are significantly predicted the implementation of monitoring and evaluation in local NGOs in Borama, Somaliland.

Table 1. Descriptive Analysis of Variables

Variable	Aggregate mean score	Aggregate standard deviation score
Budgetary Allocation	3.81	1.146
Stakeholder Participation	3.58	1.144
Level of Training	3.98	1.021
Implementation of M & E	3.77	1.056

Table 2. Empirical model summary

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.710	.504	.477	8.859

Source: Research Data, 2023

Table 3. Empirical Model ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4465.677	3	1488.559	18.969	.000
	Residual	4394.520	56	78.474		
	Total	8860.197	59			

a. Dependent Variable: IME
b. Predictors: (Constant), BA, SP, LOT

Source: Research Data, 2023

Table 4. Empirical Model Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	β	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	37.161	5.568		6.673	.000
Budgetary allocation (BA)	1.339	2.162	.071	.620	.538
Stakeholder participation (SP)	8.680	1.881	.470	4.615	.000
Level of training (LOT)	7.919	2.262	.382	3.501	.001

a. Dependent Variable: IME

Source: Research Data, 2023

The Table 4 implies that the optimal equation of the study can now be obtained as:

Implementation of M&E systems = 37.161 + 1.339BA + 8.680SP + 7.919LOT + ϵ

H_{01}: Budgetary allocation has no significant effect on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation in local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland.

The study sought to test the hypothesis that budgetary allocation has no significant effect on the implementation of M&E in LNGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland. According to the results in Table 4, budgetary allocation had β = I.339 and p-value = 0.538. Since p-value was greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected implying that holding other factors constant at zero, so budgetary allocation has no significant effect on the implementation of M&E systems in LNGO projects in Borama city. The findings also imply that a unit increase in budgetary allocation would result to 1.339 units increase on implementation of M&E systems in LNGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland.

H_{02}: Stakeholder participation has no significant effect on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation in local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland.

The study also sought to test the hypothesis that stakeholder participation has no significant effect on the implementation of M&E in LNGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland. From Table 4, stakeholder participation has β = 8.680 and p-value = 0.000. Since the p-value is less than 0.05. Then, the null hypothesis was rejected indicating that holding other factors constant at zero, so stakeholder participation significantly affected the implementation of M&E systems in LNGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland. The findings also imply that a unit increase in stakeholder participation would result to 8.680 units increase on implementation of M&E systems in LNGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland.

H_{03}: Level of training has no significant effect on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation in local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland.

The study further sought to test the hypothesis that level of training has no significant effect on the implementation of M&E in LNGOS in Borama city, Somaliland. According to the results in Table 4, level of training has β = 7.919 and p-value = 0.001. Since p-value was less than 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected implying that holding other factors constant at zero, thus, the level of training significantly affected the implementation of M&E systems in LNGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland. The findings also imply that a unit increase in level of training indicators would result to 7.919 units increase of implementation of M&E systems in LNGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland.

5. CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

The study investigated the factors influencing the implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems in local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland. In order to establish the role, three hypotheses were formulated to address the three variables. The three latent variables; budgetary allocation, stakeholder participation and level of training were regressed on the implementation of M&E and the results indicated that budgetary allocation had no significant effect on the implementation of M&E in Borama city, Somaliland. From the results of the analysis the study found and concluded that implementation of M&E systems in local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland have effective budgetary allocation in terms of amount budgeted for M&E, source of funds and consistency of allocation. The study also concluded stakeholder participation had a significant effect on the implementation of M&E systems in local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland. This implied stakeholder participation in terms of frequency of meetings, involvement in M&E activities and project supervision have effective impact on the implementation of M&E in local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland. Moreover, the findings of third objective indicated that level of training significantly affected the implementation of M&E systems in local NGO in Borama city, Somaliland. This implied that level of training in terms of relevant M&E training, level of education and frequency of training were effective on the implementation of M&E in local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland.

5.2 Policy Implications

The study makes important policy recommendations in light of the outcomes and

findings discussed in the preceding sections. Based on the findings and conclusion drawn above, the researcher has shown in this report that budgetary allocation, stakeholder participation, and level of training significantly influence the implementation of M&E in local NGO projects in Borama city, Somaliland. In spite of its limitations, the study is a significant tool for improving the implementation of M&E in local NGOs in Borama city, Somaliland. Basing generalization on the findings in 5.1 the study makes the following recommendations: The monitoring and evaluation activities should allocate enough resources and facilitate so as to enhance a good implementation.

There should be more involvement of the stakeholders in planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects. The project implementer should ensure that stakeholders meet regularly to be appraised on project progress. Local communities should be sensitized to the need for M&E. There is a need to harmonize the training curricula for M&E practitioners. There seems to be a glaring disparity in what different organizations consider monitoring and evaluation. Standardization is needed in terms of the tools and techniques used to enhance the growth of M&E as a distinct discipline.

5.3 Limitation and Future Research

This study investigated factors influencing the implementation of M&E in local non-governmental organizations in Borama city, Somaliland. But it emphasizes budgetary allocation, stakeholder participation and level of training. The study found that stakeholder participation and level of training have significant effect on the implementation of M&E in local NGO projects in Borama city. But only budgetary allocation had no significant effect on the implementation of M&E in local NGOs in Borama. Based on this issue, the researcher recommended that a study should be conducted to include other local NGOs in Somaliland, with more elements of factors influencing M&E. This will help to further to determine the effect of implementation of M&E systems on NGOs project success in Somaliland.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Bester A. Results-based management in the United Nations Development System: Progress and challenges. A report prepared for the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, for the Quadrennial Comprehensive [Policy Review]. 2012;2730.
2. UNDP. Handbook on monitoring and evaluation for results, UN: Millenium development goals report 2006; 2017.
3. Kissi E, Agyekum K, Baiden BK, Tannor RA, Asamoah GE, Andam ET. Impact of project monitoring and evaluation practices on construction project success criteria in Ghana. Built Environ Proj Asset Manag. 2019;9(3):364-82.
4. Mabare CM, Otieno M. Influence of monitoring and evaluation strategies on performance of county government funded projects; A case of Trans Nzoia County government, Kenya. Int J Novel Res Hum Soc Sci. 2019;6(6):(67-95).
5. Donaldson ML. Teachers' perspectives on evaluation reform. Center for American Progress; 2012.
6. Gaarder MM, Briceño B. Institutionalisation of government evaluation: Balancing trade-offs. J Dev Eff. 2010;2(3):289-309.
7. Njama AW. Determinants of effectiveness of a monitoring and evaluation system for projects: a case of AMREF Kenya WASH programme; 2015 ([doctoral dissertation]. University of Nairobi).
8. Hunter DEK, Nielsen SB. Performance management and evaluation: exploring complementarities. New Dir Eval. 2013;2013(137):7-17.
9. Gorgens M, Kusek JZ. Making monitoring and evaluation systems work. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2010.
10. Ndakwe RA, Muchelule Y. Components of monitoring and evaluation systems on performance of nongovernmental organisations: A case of Trócaire Somalia. Int J Soc Sci Manag Entrep (IJSSME). 2022;6(1).
11. Njeru IM, Luketero SW. Influence of monitoring and evaluation strategies on performance of medical camp projects in hospitals in Kenya: A case of Embu North Sub County. Int Acad J Inf Sci Proj Manag. 2018;3(1):61-73.
12. Tukei JMO, Tukei L, Alupo CD, Achire OJP. The influence of human capacity for

M&E on the performance of M&E systems of NGOs in Juba, South Sudan. Int J Technol Manag. 2021;6(1):1-10.
13. World B. Results-based national development strategies assessment and challenges ahead. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2013.
14. Hwang H. Building Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity in young systems: the experiences of Rwanda, Vietnam and Yemen. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2014.
15. Somaliland health and demographic survey. The Somaliland health and demographic survey report; 2020.
16. Ministry of Planning and National Development in Somaliland. Monitoring and evaluation development and vision 2030. Republic of Somaliland; 2012.
17. Duale AJ, Kaumbulu AK. Project team competence and project success of local nongovernmental organizations in Borama District, Somaliland. Asian J Econ Fin Manag. 2023:411-8.
18. Donaldson S. Roles for theory in contemporary evaluation practice: developing practical knowledge, evaluating social programs and problems. Visions New Millenium. 2003;3(3):111-42.
19. Bledsoe K, Donaldson SI. Culturally responsive theory-driven evaluation. Contin Journey Reposition Cult Cult Context Eval Theor Pract. 2015:3-28.
20. McClintock C. Evaluates as applied theorists. Eval Pract. 1990;11(1):1-12.
21. Kaumbulu AK, Muathe S, James R. Governance, quality and operating environment contagious in sustainability: understanding project sustainability from youth empowerment perspective in Kenya. Asian J Econ Fin Manag. 2022:251-67.
22. Nilsen P, Hasson H. Programme theory. In: Handbook on implementation science. Edward Elgar Publishing. 2020;512-8.
23. Murray E, Treweek S, Pope C, MacFarlane A, Ballini L, Dowrick C et al. Normalisation process theory: a framework for developing, evaluating and implementing complex interventions. BMC Med. 2010;8:63.
24. Nilsen P. Making sense of implementation theories, models, and frameworks. Implementation Science 3.0. 2020;53-79.
25. Neumann J, Robson A, Sloan D. Monitoring and evaluation of strategic change programme implementation—lessons from a case analysis. Eval Program Plann. 2018;66:120-32.
26. Mwakyusa RT. Effectiveness of district Council's monitoring and evaluation systems in influencing projects sustainability at district level: A case study of Sengerema District council; 2018 ([doctoral dissertation]. The Open University of Tanzania).
27. Kioko KC. Assessment of factors influencing effective monitoring and evaluation of projects funded by Machakos County government. Kenya; 2017.
28. Okul EO, Nyonje RO, Kyalo DN. Organizational capacity and utilization of evaluation results. Adv Soc Sci Res J. 2021;8(9):87-106.
29. Kusek ZJ, Rist RC. Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system: A handbook for development practitioners. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2014.
30. Philip NK. Factors Influencing performance of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in Non Governmental Organizations within Nairobi County, Kenya [MBA research thesis]: Nairobi University Digital Repository; 2016.
31. Kamau PM. Factors influencing performance of monitoring and evaluation systems in non-governmental organization projects: A case of Aga Khan Foundation in Nairobi, Kenya; 2017 ([doctoral dissertation]. University of Nairobi).
32. Onyango L. Efficacy of monitoring and evaluation framework on implementation of development projects: A comparative analysis of Machakos and Embu counties, Kenya; 2019 ([doctoral dissertation]. Kabarak University).
33. Kala Y. Influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on the performance of county government projects: A case of Mandera central sub-county, Mandera County: Kenya; 2020 ([doctoral dissertation]. University of Nairobi).
34. Nabulu LO. Factors influencing performance of monitoring and evaluation of government projects in Kenya: A case of constituency development fund projects in Narok East Sub-County, Kenya; 2015 ([doctoral dissertation]. University of Nairobi).
35. Kamau CG, Mohamed HB. Efficacy of monitoring and evaluation function in achieving project success in Kenya: A conceptual framework. Sci J Bus Manag. 2015;3(3):82-94.

36. Mbogo FW, Mirara A. Influence of budgetary allocation in monitoring and evaluation of humanitarian projects planning: A case of International Rescue Committee. Int Acad J Inf Sci Proj Manag. 2022;3(7):88-101.
37. Kithinji C, Gakuu C, Kidombo H. Resource allocation, evaluational capacity building M&E Results utilization among community based organizations in Meru County in Kenya. Eur Sci J. 2017;13(16):283-304.
38. Karimi SS, Mulwa AS, Kyalo DN. Stakeholder engagement in monitoring and evaluation and performance of literacy and numeracy educational programme in public primary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya. J Educ Dev Psychol. 2020;10(2):10-24.
39. Ngatia CN. Institutional determinants of participatory monitoring and evaluation systems implementation among community based development projects in Kibera slum, Kenya; 2016 ([doctoral dissertation]. University of Nairobi).
40. Mushori J. Determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation of county government funded infrastructural development projects [M.A. thesis]. Nakuru County, Kenya: Nakuru East Constituency; 2015: University of Nairobi Digital Repository.
41. Muthomi NM. Influence of project management practices on implementation of donor funded education projects in Kajiado County, Kenya; 2015 ([doctoral dissertation]. University of Nairobi).
42. Ong'are P. Factors influencing the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of government projects in Kenya: a case of the national government constituency development fund projects in Dagoretti north sub-county, Nairobi County, Kenya; 2017 ([doctoral dissertation]. University of Nairobi).
43. Mibey HK. Factors affecting implementation of monitoring and evaluation programs in kazi kwa vijana project by government ministries in Kakamega Central District, Kenya [Master's thesis]. Kenya: University of Nairobi; 2011.
44. Mugenda OM, Mugenda AG. Research methods: quantitative and qualitative approaches. Nairobi, Kenya: Acts Press; 2003.
45. Muathe AKKSM, James R. Governance strategy and sustainability: The role of project operating environment of youth empowerment projects in Kenya. Governance. 2020.