



**COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, MBA PROGRAMME**

**THE DETERMINANTS OF SUSTAINABILITY OF HEALTH DONOR
FUNDED PROJECTS
A CASE STUDY OF SINGLE PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION UNIT (SPIU),
MINISTRY OF HEALTH**

A Thesis Submitted to the University of Rwanda; College
of Business and Economics, in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Award of the Masters' Degree in
Business Administration

By KAREMERA Augustin

Supervisor: Dr. BARAYANDEMA Jonas

Kigali, August 2016

DECLARATION

I, KAREMERA Augustin, declare that the research report hereby submitted for the Master's Degree in Business Administration, to University of Rwanda, Postgraduate Program, Gikondo Campus, apart from the help recognized, is my own work through the professional guidance of my supervisor whose name appears on the title page and has not been submitted before for any other academic qualifications at any University or Institution of Higher Learning.

KAREMERA Augustin

Signature Date: / / 2016

APPROVAL

I, Dr. BARAYANDEMA Jonas, hereby approve that, this work is original to the best knowledge of KAREMERA Augustin and it has never been submitted in any university for any award. I therefore certify that this work is his own contribution to the Partial Fulfillment of Academic Requirements for the Award of Master's Degree in Business administration at University of Rwanda, Postgraduate Program, Gikondo Campus.

Date...../...../ 2016

Dr. BARAYANDEMA Jonas

Signature of supervisor

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to:

To my wife; KAYITESI Pamella

To my Children, TETA Ralissa

KAREMERA, RANDA Ryan

KAREMERA & BERACA Rick

KAREMERA

To all my family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I thank the almighty God for protecting, strengthening and inspiring me during my life in general and in this research in particular.

Special appreciations are expressed to all lecturers from University of Rwanda, Postgraduate Program, Gikondo Campus especially in Business administration; for their contribution in educating Rwandans and to all the academic staff University of Rwanda, for sharing their knowledge and expertise throughout courses and conferences and to administrative staff.

Special thanks are extended to my friends and colleagues of class since they become great motivators in this work. I am profoundly grateful to my supervisor Dr. BARAYANDEMA Jonas, for his hard support, his attention, time, encouragement and guidance made me successfully complete within time.

May God bless you richly.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- AIDSc** : Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
- ART** : Anti-Retroviral Treatment
- CDC** : Center for Decency Control
- GAVI** : Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization
- GHI** : Global Health Initiatives
- HDFP** : Health Donor Funded Projects
- HIV**: Human Immunodeficiency Virus
- MDG** : Millennium Development Goals
- MoH** : Ministry of Health
- NGOs** : Non-Governmental Organizations
- SPIU** : Single Project Implementation Unit
- SPSS** : Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
- UNAIDS** : United States Agency for International Development
- UNDP** : United Nations Development Program
- WHO** : World Health Organization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	i
APPROVAL	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x
ABSTRACT	xi
CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
1.0. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Background of the study	1
1.2. Problem statement.....	4
1.3. Research objectives.....	6
1.3.1. General objective of the study	6
1.3.2. Specific objectives	6
1.4. Research questions.....	6
1.5. Research hypotheses	7
1.6. Scope of the study	7
1.6.1. Geographical scope.....	7
1.6.2. Time scope	7
1.7. Significance of the study.....	8
1.7.1. Interest to the researcher	8
1.7.2. Academic interest.....	8

1.7.3. Interest for the community.....	8
1.7.4. Interest for Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU).....	8
1.8. Structure of the thesis study.....	8
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	10
2.1. Definition of key concepts.....	10
2.1.1. Sustainability.....	10
2.1.2. Project sustainability.....	11
2.1.3. Sustainability management.....	12
2.2. Determinants of project sustainability.....	13
2.3. Indicators of sustainability.....	15
2.3.1. Dimensions of project sustainability.....	16
2.3.2. Sustainability Analysis.....	17
2.3.3. The four elements leading to sustainability of health donor funded projects.....	19
2.4. Determinants of health donor funded projects sustainability and sustainability indicators...	20
2.4.1. Sustainability usually follows the diagrammed pathway.....	20
2.4.2. Scope of sustainability.....	21
2.4.3. Contribution of sustainability of projects to the performance of health donor funded projects.....	23
2.5. Challenges faced by sustainability of health donor funded projects.....	24
2.5.1. Identify and strengthen processes to ensure that evidence is used in policy.....	24
2.5.2. Institutionalize impact sustainability.....	24
2.5.3. Improve sustainability designs to answer policy-relevant questions.....	24
2.5.4. Make progress with small and impact sustainability.....	25
2.5.5. Expand knowledge and use of systematic reviews.....	25
2.6. The strategies used to address challenges faced by sustainability of projects in organization.....	25

2.7. Conceptual framework.....	26
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	27
3.1. Introduction.....	27
3.2. Research design	27
3.3. Data collection	28
3.3.1. Population of the study	28
3.3.1.1. Target population.....	28
3.3.1.2. Sample size	28
3.3.2. Data collection techniques	28
3.3.2.1. Questionnaire	28
3.3.2.2. Documentary review	29
3.3.3. Validity and reliability of data collection techniques	29
3.4. Data processing and analysis	29
3.4.1. Data processing.....	29
3.4.1.1. Editing.....	30
3.4.1.2. Coding.....	30
3.4.1.3. Tabulation	30
3.4.2. Data analysis	30
3.4.2.1. Statistical Method	30
3.4.2.2. Descriptive Method.....	31
3.5. Limitation of the study.....	32
CHAPTER 4: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	33
4.1. Introduction.....	33
4.2. Overview of Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU)	33
4.3. Data presentation	34

4.4. Data analysis and interpretation.....	34
4.4.1. Factors (determinants) affecting the sustainability of projects	35
4.4.2. Indicators of projects sustainability	40
4.4.3. Challenges faced by sustainability of projects in organization.....	42
4.4.4. Strategies used for fighting the challenges faced by sustainability of projects	44
4.5. Correlational analysis between factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability and indicators of the sustainability.....	47
4.5. Discussion of research findings and hypotheses testing	49
4.5.1. Discussion of research findings	49
4.5.2. The hypotheses testing.....	49
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, GENERAL CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	51
5.1. Summary disclosure and general conclusion.....	51
5.2. Recommendations.....	54
5.2.1. To Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) and Donors	54
5.2.2. To the area of further researchers	54
REFERENCES	55
General books	55
Annual reports.....	59
APPENDICES	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Factors (determinants) affecting project sustainability.....	35
Table 2: Indicators of projects sustainability	40
Table 3: Challenges faced by sustainability of projects in organization	43
Table 4: Strategies used for fighting the challenges faced by sustainability of projects	45
Table 5: Correlational analysis between factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability and indicators of the sustainability	48

ABSTRACT

The precise objectives of this study are to analyze the determinants of sustainability of health donor funded projects through the case study of single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) for Ministry of Health, particularly in the health sector; where the main donors are Global Fund, Center for Disease Control (CDC), CDPF and United States Agency for International Development(USAID); To determine factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability; to find out challenges faced by sustainability of health donor funded projects and to carry out the correlational analysis between factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability and indicators of the sustainability. The findings through the collected information are showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty (40) respondents occupy 100% of respondents, Strongly Agree that the Community involvement is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; so the community involvement is an important factor for the sustainability of projects is the genuine involvement of local people as active participants and equal partners whose concerns and experience are intrinsic to the project's success. The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents occupy 100% strongly Agree that the Professional support is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; therefore Professionals can play a number of different roles in health donor funded projects all of which require trust and good working relationships with local people and other professionals. The information collected in the table above is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the twenty five (25) respondents as employees Strongly Agree and the fifteen respondents as employees Agree that the Shared ownership is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; where the shared ownership can have a long-term impact on project sustainability. The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents as employees strongly agree that the responsiveness is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; where this means ensuring that the activities provided address local needs, and that all those involved with the project volunteers and professionals have the skills they require.

Key words: Sustainability; Project sustainability and Sustainability management.

CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.0. Introduction

In chapter one the current researcher has to introduce the work in general, outlining the problem statement, the objectives of the study and research questions. The researcher has also to clarify the significance of the study, the scope of the study and the organization of the thesis.

1.1. Background of the study

Project sustainability is a major challenge in many developing countries. Large number of projects implemented at huge costs often tends to experience difficulties with sustainability. All major donors, such as the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and the bilateral aid agencies have been expressing concerns on this matter. According to several recently conducted studies, while the trend with implementation is showing significant improvement, the trend with post implementation sustainability is rather disappointing increasingly, fewer projects are being sustained. This means that while huge expenditures are being incurred by these countries in implementing projects, poor sustainability is depriving them from the returns expected of these investments. This further means that while the debts from development expenditure are increasing, gains from these expenditure have either not been forthcoming fully or been accrued at a lower rate; (World Bank, 2014).

A new trend has developed within development assistance with the establishment of health donor funded projects as a way to support countries in their health development effort. The characteristics of these initiatives are a focus on specific diseases and populations, which often include a component of public-private partnership; (WHO, 2008).

In the beginning of 2000, the global development actors put special efforts into combating communicable disease, focusing especially on HIV. In this wake, more than 80 Global Health Initiatives (GHI)/ Health Donor Funded Projects (HDFP) were established and are now active in the Public Health Field; (WHO, 2008).

Some of the bigger GHIs/HDFP include the World Bank's Mult Country HIV/AIDS Programme (MAP), the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis (GFTM), the US

Government's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) and the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation (GAVI). Combined MAP, GFATM and PEPFAR are contributing more than two thirds of the total direct external funding projects for AIDS to the scaled up HIV response in source poor countries; (GFATM, 2007).

The funding of projects sustainability for HIV and AIDS response is very complex interplay of domestic public spending, private sector funding and support from non governmental organizations (NGOs), multilateral and bilateral aid and individual out-of-pocket spending; (UNAIDS, 2010).

Many developing countries are receiving substantial funding for HIV and AIDS projects which partly are channeled in separately from regular resources for health and without proper control and ownership by Ministry of Health. Donor funding is aimed at offering technical solutions to social problems without altering basic social structures. The main goal of donor funding is to alleviate poverty in the long term, directly or indirectly. Donor funding can be generated by government or nongovernment agencies. These funds can be given bilaterally (given from one country directly to another country) or multilaterally (from a donor country to an international organisation, who on their part distribute the funds), where the proportion is currently about 70% bilaterally and 30% multilaterally; (UNDP, 2011).

Africa is characterised by a huge division between the private and public sector, both in terms of facilities and funding towards these two divisions. HIV/AIDS is identified as the biggest problem facing the public sector. This in turn places considerable strain on the public health system in many African countries. The standard of healthcare in South Africa is considered the best on the African continent. Toward sustainability of project management process; every organization both profit or non-profit organization, has its objectives and goals in mind to achieve their goal in order to satisfy the social need of the beneficiaries and in the effort to achieve these purposes supervision more often than not play a vital role; (Carrol Richardson, 2012).

In Rwanda, sustainability of projects are very important tool for effective and efficient allocation of resources sustaining project to attain its goals, sustainability of projects in Rwanda is used by financial and non-project management in terms of making the good management of goods and service provided. Since sustainability of projects operate, which influences its operations, proper care must be exerted into the implementation of these systems in order to achieve the maximum

aim. This sensitive interest in sustainability is, in part, a result of significant losses incurred by several project management, (Gerrad Ferray, 2009).

Therefore, sustainability is an integral part of our day-to-day operational management, it is used to continuously assess the progress made with the project when viewed against its goals and objectives; involves the logical framework through which we track inputs, processes, activities, outputs and outcomes. These are already outlined in the project proposal that is forwarded to donors in the planning stage of the project. Thus, sustainability is based on targets set and activities planned during the planning phase. Sustainability is important as it might be necessary to modify activities should it emerge that they are not achieving the desired results.

Sustainability thus deals with strategic issues such as project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and project sustainability in the light of the objectives formulated at the outset of the project. Sustainability includes looking at the aims and objectives of the project i.e what difference did this project set out to make? What impact should it have had, assessing the progress made towards what we wanted to achieve at the outset; looking at the strategy chosen to implement the project.

The international community's commitment to global health and access has been increasing; in addition to traditional sources of funding from bilateral and multilateral institutions, such as development banks and United Nations (UN) agencies, private foundations and public-private partnerships are playing much larger roles as resources to improve health in developing countries. The types of assistance available include: Financial assistance (loans or grants); Commodities; Technical expertise; Training; study tours; fellowships and Research funding. Some donors' funding are being directed toward the entire health sector as part of a sector-wide approach (SWA) to aid or toward the national government budget instead of to specific programs or interventions, which means that health program managers must take additional steps to get access to funding for specific health programs.

Ministries of health need to collaborate with other government ministries, which are likely to carry out negotiations with donor agencies. Ministries of health must be able to justify the demand for additional funding for management activities. Challenges associated with donor

assistance include a country's inability to use donor funds effectively because of limited infrastructure, the unpredictability of donor assistance from year to year, and the complex monitoring and evaluating requirements that vary by donor. In recognition of some of these challenges, donors and recipient countries have been working together to improve collaboration and harmonize funding requirements. Performance-based funding is another trend being used to improve the effectiveness of development aid.

With heavy demand for assistance funds, proposals must satisfy donors' concerns about consistency with government policies, government commitment, health care reform, project impact and sustainability. Many donors follow a two-stage proposal process, requiring the submission and approval of a project profile or letter of intent, followed by a more detailed project proposal. Project documents often include: project goals (development objectives); project purpose (immediate objectives); outputs; activities and inputs and resources. Private foundations tend to follow more flexible procedures for reviewing grant proposals and overseeing grant-funded projects, but most donors require periodic progress reports and evaluation.

1.2. Problem statement

When the regarded operators lack a clear understanding in the segmentation of duties toward sustainability of project management processes implementation, they do not follow the control in place or they may exceed the control's intent; this limits flexibility and lowers productivity. Indeed Lack of proper sustainability function in organization continues to be a big challenge. Governments have to control organizations fail in order to achieve their intended objectives of being going concerns making surplus, delivering services to the public as well as satisfying the needs of all stakeholders; (Friedrich Platz, 2011).

According to Hanefeld (2010), the channeling of health donor funded projects is still dictated by external donors who not only determine and develop the policy content, but in addition control the policy implementation process and in some countries and instances completely by pass the states.

Hanefeld (2010), claims that in highly donor dependent countries, such as Zambia, the control of some of the funds for health projects and HIV and AIDS is beyond the countries own control. Hence governments are unable to make their priorities based purely on health projects needs and demands. Health donor funded projects have made a pathway in HIV and AIDS programming and added resources. However, there are evident challenges with their approach to countries like Zambia, as Health donor funded projects have negatively impacted coordination, long-term planning, funding predictability, sustainability and equity.

Aid coordination has been on the development agenda for a long time, as the lack of coordination hinders progress and makes it difficult for national governments in order to provide relevant health services; (Hanefeld, 2010).

Despite, the provision of donor funding, health projects in beneficiaries institutions have performed poorly in terms of organizational management, operation and maintenance after handing over of the projects by the implementing partners and donor agents. Therefore, many donor agents would continue their operations and cease slowly day by day often due to lack of local sustainable funding for maintenance and repairs of the health structures. Some other donor agents fall into the consequence of unsustainability of the health projects, as they operate for a few years or months and then fade away.

Rwanda is making substantial progress towards improvement of health and is working towards achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, which is a challenging task because the country has had genocide in 1994, has few natural resources, is landlocked, and has high population growth. Like many impoverished sub-Saharan countries, Rwanda's health system has had an uncoordinated plethora of donors, shortage of health staff, inequity of access and poor quality of care in health facilities. Rwanda describes three health system developments introduced by the Rwandan government that are improving these barriers to care means that the coordination of donors and external aid funded with government policy and sustainability the effectiveness of aid; a country-wide independent community health insurance scheme and the introduction of a performance-based pay initiative. If these innovations are successful, they might be of interest to other sub-Saharan countries. However, Rwanda still does not have sufficient financial resources for health and will need additional external aid for some time to attain the Millennium Development Goals.

Therefore, this study intends to analyse factors leading to sustainability of health donor funded projects through the case study of single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) for Ministry of Health, Rwanda.

1.3. Research objectives

1.3.1. General objective of the study

The overall aim of this study is to analyse the determinants of sustainability of health donor funded projects through the case study of single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) for Ministry of Health, particularly in the health sector; where the main donors are Global Fund, Center for Disease Control (CDC), CDPF and United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

1.3.2. Specific objectives

The secondary objectives are a direct consequence of the primary objectives such as the following:

- To determine factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability;
- To find out challenges faced by sustainability of health donor funded projects;
- To carry out the correlational between factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability and indicators of the sustainability.

1.4. Research questions

Subsequent from the above research objectives, the current researcher would like to make out the following research questions such as:

- What are the factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability?
- What are the challenges faced by health donor funded projects managers?
- Is there any correlational between identified factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability and indicators of the sustainability?

1.5. Research hypotheses

From the above research questions, the current researcher would like to make out the following research hypotheses such as:

- There are several factors that leading to health donor funded projects sustainability in SPIU such as reconciling different agendas; funding; community involvement; professional support; credibility; shared ownership; dynamic individuals; responsiveness; networking or building partnerships and critical factors for a project successful.
- There are numerous challenges faced by health donor funded projects managers in SPIU such as to identify and strengthen processes to ensure that evidence is used in policy; institutionalize impact sustainability; improve sustainability design to answer policy-relevant questions; make progress with small and impact sustainability and expand knowledge and use of systematic reviews.
- There is positive correlation between identified factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability and indicators of the sustainability.

1.6. Scope of the study

This refers to the boundaries of a study also referred to as delimitation. It is the parameters of a research where the researcher should indicate the variables to be studied, like geographical scope and time scope which are periods in years.

1.6.1. Geographical scope

This study has largely focused on Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) under supervision of Ministry of Health (MoH) as public institution located in Kicukiro District, in Kigali City.

1.6.2. Time scope

This study has taken into consideration for the period of four years means from 2012 to 2015, where this time has been taken into consideration because of the available data.

1.7. Significance of the study

1.7.1. Interest to the researcher

This research has enabled the researcher to put into practice the applied studies obsessed by the reality. This study allowed the researcher to acquire the knowledge and skills in domain of determinants of sustainability of health donor funded project.

As student of University of Rwanda in Postgraduate Program, especially in Business Administration, this research has to improve knowledge and skills based on determinants of sustainability of health donor funded project. In addition this study has to enable the researcher to fulfill the necessary requirements for the award of Master's degree of Science in Business Administration as a part of regulation of University of Rwanda.

1.7.2. Academic interest

The study further has to be served as guideline to future researchers who are interested in advancing on the related research.

1.7.3. Interest for the community

This research has to be significant to understand the role of sustainability of projects in efficient and effective performance of projects as well as tracking the performance of projects. The research findings have to be used in order to strengthen the notion that sustainability of projects is an efficient and effective tool in determining the performance of projects.

1.7.4. Interest for Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU)

The study has intended to give recommendations on how in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) can create a better environment needs by sustainability of projects. This study has also to add the stock of knowledge of sustainability of projects to other projects implementation.

1.8. Structure of the thesis study

This research is made up of five chapters as presented below:

The first chapter is composed by the introductory part of the study which includes background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research objectives, research questions, the significance of the study, the scope of the study and organization of the study. It generally gives an overview of what the study is intended to analyze.

The second chapter concerns the literature review relating to the subject, where the definitions of the key concepts used in this research topic have been identified. The third chapter presents the research methodology and describes the methodologies that have been used in order to achieve the setting objectives while concrete results and presentation are discussed in chapter four in terms of sustainability of projects for their effects on Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU). The fourth chapter has represented the data analysis and the interpretation of the results obtained by using the research methodology in chapter three.

Finally, chapter five is a concluding chapter, summarizing the findings of the study and then presenting relevant and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter concentrates on the overview of existing literature review and the explanation of key words which are related to the sustainability of projects of projects. It focuses on available literature in the field of study by different authors. The classical theory of concepts, also referred to as the empiricist theory of concepts, the classical theory says that concepts have a definitional structure. Features entailed by the definition of a concept must be both necessary and sufficient for membership in the class of things covered by a particular concept.

2.1. Definition of key concepts

2.1.1. Sustainability

Sustainability term is defined in the Brundtland (2014) as “development that meets the needs and aspirations of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. Thus, sustainable aspect is the organizing principle for sustaining finite resources necessary to provide for the needs of future generations of life on the planet. It is a process that envisions a desirable future state for human societies in which living conditions and resource-use continue to meet human needs without undermining the "integrity, stability and beauty" of natural biotic systems.

Sustainability can be defined as the practice of reserving resources for future generation without any harm to the nature and other components of it. Sustainability ties together concern for the carrying capacity of natural systems with the social, political, and economic challenges faced by humanity. Sustainability project is the study of the concepts of sustainable development and environmental project. There is an additional focus on the present generations' responsibility to regenerate, maintain and improve planetary resources for use by future generations. It can also be defined as any construction that can be maintained over a long period of time without damaging the environment and the development balancing near-term interests with the protection of the interests of future generations;(Brundtland 2014).

Sustainability is a continuous function that uses the systematic collection of data on specified indicators, to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and

progress in the use of allocated funds. Sustainability is a continuous assessment that aims at providing all stakeholders with early detailed information on the progress or delay of the ongoing assessed activities. It is an oversight of the activity's implementation stage where its purpose is to determine if the outputs, deliveries and schedules planned have been reached so that action can be taken to correct the deficiencies as quickly as possible; (Görgens Albino, 2009).

Sustainability is a process that helps improving performance and achieving actual desired results. Its goal is to improve current and future management of outputs, outcomes and impact. It is mainly used to assess the performance of projects, institutions and programmes set up by governments, international organizations and NGOs. It establishes links between the past, present and future actions. Sustainability of projects can be managed by the donors financing the assessed activities, by an independent branch of the implementing organization, by the project managers or implementing team themselves or by a private company. The credibility and objectivity of sustainability reports depend very much on the independence of the evaluator or evaluating team in charge. Their expertise and independence is of major importance for the process to be successful; (Görgens Albino, 2009).

2.1.2. Project sustainability

The term project sustainability came to the forefront of the international agenda at the World Commission on Environment and Development (Brundtland Commission). The Brundtland Commission report defined sustainable development as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. Project is considered sustainable when it continues to deliver benefits to the project beneficiaries and other constituencies for an extended period after the financial assistance has been terminated. It is therefore a continuation of a project's goals, principles, and efforts to achieve desired outcome ensuring that the goals of the project continue to be met through activities that are consistent with the current conditions and workforce development needs of the region, including the needs of both workers and industry; (Gallagher A.; Johnson D.; Glegg G. and Trier C., 2004).

Project sustainability comprises three core pillars social, economic and environmental and is the capacity for all three to endure simultaneously. With an ever increasing global population, scarcity of natural resources, and growing needs, project sustainability has gained a foothold at

the top of the international development agenda as an approach to development that will have the ability to endure and to ensure that development proceeds in such a way as to ensure that future generations can endure also. But as Redclift notes, the abundance of what are often contradictory approaches and reasoning towards project sustainability may be attributable to the number of ways in which different people and groups can identify the objects of project sustainability differently, (Redclift, 2010).

Complexity between the achievement of development, the desire for modernity, and the attainment of project sustainability presents a tricky situation in developing and emerging economies (Redclift, 2011). The social responses to the issue of project sustainability often vary greatly depending on context and prioritisation of needs. Ecologically centered approaches may give a preference to preservation of natural resources in their sustainable approach to development. An economically centered approach might inversely focus on financial prospering as the focus of development activities. What project sustainability requires however is a systems-thinking approach, taking into consideration all three aspects, the human, the social and economic dimensions to development? The system includes everything, everyone and all the others that are interconnected, the environment, and all the factors that have any impact such as biology, climate, politics, and beyond. “It is a way of thinking that gives us freedom to identify root causes of problems and see new opportunities” (Wright and Meadows, 2009). Systems-thinking approaches and project sustainability theory go hand-in-hand, interlinking the various dimensions, the human, the natural and the economical to see how each factor is extrinsically linked to the other and the other and so on to see how development initiatives have a broader impact on the whole.

2.1.3. Sustainability management

Sustainability management is the systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, program, or policy, including its design, implementation, and results. Sustainability should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors; (Görgens Albino, 2009).

An important goal of sustainability management is to provide recommendations and lessons to the project managers and implementation teams that have worked on the projects and for the ones that will implement and work on similar projects. Sustainability is also indirectly a means to report to the donor about the activities implemented. It is a means to verify that the donated funds are being well managed and transparently spent. The evaluators are supposed to check and analyze the budget lines and to report the findings in their work; (Görgens Albino, 2009).

2.2. Determinants of project sustainability

➤ Reconciling different agendas

Many factors interact as individuals and organizations attempt to reconcile different responsibilities, objectives and agendas. The way in which these issues are handled affects the sustainability of the project, either fostering good working relationships between all those involved, or alienating individuals and organizations. Local health donor funded projects work best when all involved, professionals and local people, feel that their concerns are being addressed; (Zuintnen N., 2004).

➤ Funding

Secure funding is a critical factor in determining whether a project is sustainable. Local health donor funded projects tend to need two types of funding: money to help them set up and funding to cover running costs. Both are equally important but many projects find funding for running costs very difficult to obtain. As a result, projects have constantly to reinvent themselves so that they qualify again for set-up funding. Some projects are trapped in this cycle; this is not only time-consuming but hinders the natural development of the project. This is where generating increasing levels of income through trading may help some community health donor funded projects break from this cycle of funding dependence; (Zuintnen N., 2004).

➤ Community involvement

An important factor for the sustainability of projects is the genuine involvement of local people as active participants and equal partners whose concerns and experience are intrinsic to the project's success. The level of community support determines whether a project becomes

established, how quickly and successfully it consolidates and how it responds and adapts to meet changing needs. It is therefore important that involving local communities' starts at the planning stage, when decisions are being made about what type of project is required.

➤ **Professional support**

Professionals can play a number of different roles in health donor funded projects all of which require trust and good working relationships with local people and other professionals. In order to establish good rapport professionals need time, resources and authority to invest in a project. Flexibility is critical in the way professionals interpret their own and others' roles and in the activities they and the projects undertake; (Lescrauwaet A. K. et al, 2006).

➤ **Credibility**

A project has to be seen as plausible in terms of ideas and activities, structure and organization, by all those who come in contact with it. Without such credibility it will lack support and fail to obtain financial support.

➤ **Shared ownership**

Where project ownership is exclusive, those in control are less likely to respond positively to the needs and ideas of the wider group. This can have a long-term impact on project sustainability.

➤ **Dynamic individuals**

In most projects, one or more dynamic individuals are crucial because they generate enthusiasm and support. In some instances this is enough to compensate for the absence of other factors. These individuals can either be professionals or community members.

➤ **Responsiveness**

To maintain interest and support, projects have to be responsive to the changing agendas and needs of users, volunteers and professionals. This means ensuring that the activities provided

address local needs, and that all those involved with the project volunteers and professionals have the skills they require.

➤ **Networking or building partnerships**

Projects that build links with different organizations are more likely to be sustainable. They support and learn from each other, and are able to exploit others' agendas, for example, for new funding opportunities.

➤ **Critical factors for a project successful**

Many of the success criteria for social enterprise identified in the Plunkett Foundation's publication 'Organizational structures for Rural Social Enterprise' are also factors affecting the sustainability and success of community health donor funded projects, including;

- Shared commitment
- People centered
- Clarity of objectives
- Effective governance
- Leadership
- Flexibility and responsiveness
- Consistency of purpose
- Maintaining membership
- Entrepreneurial and innovative

There are many hurdles to moving from a grant based community food project to becoming a successful social enterprise which is able to generate at least some of its income through trading. However it seems clear that there are key features for success in common between community health donors funded projects and social enterprises; (EUROSTAT, 2005).

2.3. Indicators of sustainability

This portion is aiming to make out the the general theories related to the indicators of sustainability such as follow:

2.3.1. Dimensions of project sustainability

There are several dimensions to project sustainability. Depending on the nature of a sector or a project each of these dimensions has the capacity to influence project sustainability in one or way or another; (Blake William, 2014).

These dimensions are listed below:

- **Continued operation and maintenance of project facilities** i.e. (**Logistics Dimension**), has the project received necessary support (both budgetary and institutional) to enable it to maintain required level of facilities?
- **Continued flow of net benefits**i.e., (**for economic sector projects**) has all the cost and benefits under varying conditions weighted properly and does the project guarantee an acceptable level of financial and economic return? (**Economic Dimension**)
- **Continued community participation** (in projects where active community participation is crucial for both stimulating new actions as well as for cost recovery) i.e. (**Community Dimension**), has the project involved the community? Has it succeeded in maintaining a desirable level of participation of the community in the project activities?
- **Equitable sharing and distribution of project benefits**i.e.(**Equity Dimension**), has the project incorporated mechanisms that guarantee equitable access to and distribution of project benefits on a continuous basis?
- **Institutional constancy**i.e. (**Institutional Dimension**) has the project considered adequately the institutional requirements and thus made provisions so that management support to project operations continues, during the life of the project.
- **Maintenance of environmental stability**i.e. (**Environmental Dimension**), has the project considered environmental implications so that negative impacts on environment are either avoided or mitigated during the life of the project?

Considerations of all these dimensions are key to sustainability of projects; experience suggests that weakening of any one of these has the potential to risk the sustainability of the entire project in the long run; (Blake William, 2014).

2.3.2. Sustainability Analysis

The multi-dimensional attributes of sustainability as stated above, imply that to enhance project sustainability a rigorous sustainability analysis is needed at the time of formulation of a project or a programme. It is expected that such an analysis which is to be followed up by development of a sustainability strategy will assist in incorporating the elements of sustainability, right at the design stage of a project; (Carrol Richardson, 2012).

➤ What is a Sustainability Analysis?

Sustainability analysis is the identification and analysis of degree of presence or absence of the factors that are likely to impact, either positively or negatively on the prospects of sustained delivery of project benefits; (Chris Tung, 2008).

Planning for sustainability presents a tool for checking the aspects of sustainability, at the time of designing of a project. The 'Check List' which include a member of analysis, such as economic and financial analysis; social analysis etc, are important and should be undertaken to ensure incorporation of sustainability enhancement inputs during the preparation and the design stage of a project, where these analysis include the following:

- Relevancy
- Acceptability
- Economic and Financial Viability
- Environmental Sustainability
- Implementation and Sustainability Strategy
- Post-implementation operation and maintenance

Relevancy refers to review of consistency (or lack of it) between the objectives of the proposed project with national, sectoral, provincial and district priorities. Quite often, it is seen that when a project is taken up without due regard to various priorities set by the government, its ability to attract required support from various parties and its capacity to operate in a conducive environment, gets severely restricted. Therefore, 'Relevancy' test is expected to help analyzing

these issues and assess the relationships between the proposed actions and their consistency with different priorities that have been set by the government; (Clark Sedore,2014).

Acceptability issues relate to the level and degree of acceptability of a project to the community, the local representatives, the executing agency etc. Weak acceptability by anyone or more of these parties has the risk of compromising long term sustainability of a project. Economic/Financial viability refers to economic and financial profitability of project induced products and services. For these products to be of benefits, both to the producers as well as the economy the product cost must reflect real market costs and the product prices, the real market prices and that the latter should be consistently higher than the former. In some cases, the project induced products and services may not reflect the market cost and nor the price which may mean that which the project will benefit the direct participants or the target population; then it will incur economic losses at the national level; (Farag, Nandakumar, 2009).

It is now widely recognized that under the current situation of globalization and liberalization, any project induced products which cannot be produced and sold under market determined cost and prices and cannot earn profit under these conditions, are neither likely to be sustained nor would these be beneficial to the economy. Environmental sustainability relates to project induced environmental impacts both positive and negative. If negative impacts are foreseen and no mitigational measures are planned, then ultimately the project may yield benefits at a reduced rate or worse still and depending on the extent of environmental costs, such negative impacts may in fact contribute to the net losses to the economy; (Reinhard Kopiez, 2014).

Implementation and Sustainability strategy refers to consideration of project management arrangements e.g. is the implementation period realistic? Is there a well-defined implementation plan with clearly defined functions and responsibilities and have necessary provisions been made thereof. Quite often weak management and inadequate sustainability provisions contribute to implementation problems which than weakens the project sustainability, eventually. Post implementation operation and maintenance (O&M) refers to management support (either by the executing agency or the community or both) required after implementation of a project. Quite often projects tend to encounter sustainability problems due to weak or inadequate O&M support. The sustainability analysis is to be followed by development of a sustainability strategy,

so as to ensure that all sustainability enhancing elements are incorporated right at the design stage of a project; (Friedrich Platz, 2014).

➤ **What is a sustainability strategy?**

The sustainability strategy is a follow up activity of sustainability analysis and is expected to indicate the way various elements of sustainability are to be identified, assessed and incorporated into a project or a programme, right at the design stage. The strategy is expected to specify various complements, constraints to sustainability and make provisions for their incorporation, tackling during: (i) formulation/design; (ii) implementation, and (iii) operation and maintenance stages of a project; (Gerrad Ferray, 2009).

2.3.3. The four elements leading to sustainability of health donor funded projects

According to Raffegau (1998), managing for impact is only possible if institutions have reliable information about the progress of activities and their outcomes, the reasons for success and failure, and the context in which activities are taking place. This information is the output of institutions' sustainability procedures. Analysing this information with key stakeholders can support good decisions that improve the project. To know if institutions are managing for impact, the following elements are monitored:

- **Guiding the Project Strategy for Poverty Impact:** understanding the goals and objectives of the project and then allocating the available resources and guiding relationships between stakeholders to maximise impacts.
- **Creating a Learning Environment:** inspiring and helping those involved with the project to reflect critically on progress, to learn from mistakes and to generate ideas for making improvements.
- **Ensuring Effective Operations:** planning, organising and checking staff inputs, equipment, partner contracts, financial resources, annual work plans, and communications to implement activities effectively and efficiently.
- **Developing and using the sustainability System:** designing and implementing information gathering and reflective learning processes to generate insights that help institutions to improve operations and strategic directions.

2.4. Determinants of health donor funded projects sustainability and sustainability indicators

According to Robson Keith (1998); the general theories related the determinants of health donor funded projects sustainability and sustainability indicators are the following:

2.4.1. Sustainability usually follows the diagrammed pathway

Preliminary Discussion: About six weeks before a control begins, the control team talks with the leader of the area to be reviewed to confirm the schedule and begin to outline the work to be done; (Robson Keith, 1998).

Control Outline: The outline is a tool for planning an engagement. It includes the scope and objectives of the control and begins to describe the kinds of interviews, analysis, document reviews and other procedures needed. The control team prepares the outline about four weeks before the control; (Raffegau, 1989).

Engagement Memo: About two weeks before the control, the control team sends the client a memo describing the engagement and confirming timing, location and anticipated needs.

Entrance Meeting: At the beginning of the engagement, the control team will meet with the primary leadership of the area to discuss scope, answer questions and begin the work.

Testing, Interviews and Analysis: The controllers conduct interviews, analyze data, compare viewpoints and generally examine the subject area from top to bottom. As they do so, they compare the actual practices to standards or procedures in place. They also incorporate best/good practices to help evaluate whether processes are running optimally. If exceptions are identified, (the process is supposed to work one way but works another) these observations are collected and discussed with leadership of the area.

Observations, Discussion, and Management Agreement: The controller documents any observations and discusses the results with management. Sometimes management will clarify the observation; other times the controller offers a recommendation for solving the issue. However, the best solutions often come from the leadership and their staff. Regardless of where the solution comes from, the controller will ask the leadership to commit to a course of action and a date of completion. Controllers can only advise and report on the final decisions. They cannot make or change company policy.

Preliminary Report: The controller prepares a report. The report contains the purpose, scope, and results of the engagement. This report will be provided to the leadership for review and comment.

Exit Meeting: Each control ends with an exit meeting. Comments and corrections to the preliminary report are typically discussed and concluded at the exit meeting.

Final Report: All final reports are copied to the leadership of the area, as well as to the manager, direct reports and board.

Follow-up: Sustainability tracks all issues identified during the engagement. It isn't sustainability's role to push for completion, but the department does have an obligation to track and report whether issues are getting resolved on time; (Raffegaue 1989).

2.4.2. Scope of sustainability

The institute of sustainability defines the scope of sustainability as the “examination and sustainability of the adequacy and effectiveness of the organization system of sustainability and the quality of performance in carrying out assigned responsibilities”. Thus sustainability is concerned with sustainability of sustainability as well as the quality of actual performance, and this according to institute of sustainability involving the following five areas; (Raffegaue 1989).

➤ **Reliability and integrity of information**

Sustainability should review the reliability and integrity of financial operating information and the means used to identify measure, classify and report such information. This involves examination to ascertain whether financial and operating record and report contain accurate, reliable, timely, complete and useful information.

➤ **Safe guarding of assets**

Sustainability should review the means of safeguarding assets and, as appropriate, verify the existence of such assets. The system of safeguarding assets should be evaluated to assess the risk of losses from theft, fire, improper activities and exposure to element.

➤ **Compliance with policies, plans, procedures, laws and regulations**

Sustainability should review the system established to ensure compliance with those policies, plans, procedures, regulations and laws which could have a significant impact on the operations and reports and should determine whether the organization is in compliance. Sustainability is responsible for determining whether the systems are adequate and effective and whether the activities are complying with the appropriate requirement.

➤ **Economical and efficient use of resources**

Sustainability should apprise the company and efficiency and whether established operating standards are understood and are being met

Some sustainability who perceives it as of their important functions to comment on individual managerial actions and decisions often understood this objective. They do not realize that almost anything can be criticized on hind sight. This perception often creates conflict between sustainability and line managers, thereby reducing the effectiveness of sustainability considerably. The institute of sustainability stated that the role of sustainability in this regard should be determined whether the operating standards have been established by the management of measuring economy and efficiency, whether deviation from operating standards are identified, analyzed and communicated to those responsible for corrective action.

➤ **Accomplishment of established objective and goals for operations and programs**

Sustainability should review the operations or programs to ascertain whether results are consistent with established objectives and goals and whether the operations or programs are being carried out as planned. It can be seen that it is not only deals with a review of custodianship and safeguarding of assets, compliance with policies, and reliability of accounting information but it is also emphasizes new areas like reviewing the economical and efficient use of resources and organizational performance. They have to consider the size, scope of controls whether simple or technical. The company's operations and functions whether will need strong sustainability function; (Sawyer, 2012).

The geographical dispersion in case the company has branches

- I. The cost of maintaining controls
- II. The status of the company that is public company need sustain strong controls

- III. Nature of the products and services the company provides
- IV. Scope of the function that means how much per department it will cover.

2.4.3. Contribution of sustainability of projects to the performance of health donor funded projects

The following sustainability activities can be found in the workplace. All employees fit into the organizational picture of sustainability, whether or not their job responsibilities are directly related to these example activities.

➤ Segregation of Duties

Duties are divided among different employees to reduce the risk of error or inappropriate actions. For example, responsibilities for receiving cash or checks, preparing the deposit, and reconciling the deposit should be separated.

➤ Authorization and Approval

Transactions should be authorized and approved to help ensure the activity is consistent with departmental or institutional goals and objectives. For example, a department may have a policy that all purchase requisitions and invoice vouchers must be approved by the director. It is important that the person who approves transactions have the authority to do so and the necessary knowledge to make informed decisions.

➤ Reconciliation and Review

Performance reviews of specific functions or activities may focus on compliance, financial, or operational issues. Reconciliation involves cross-checking transactions or records of activity to ensure that the information reported is accurate. For example, revenue and expense activity recorded on accounting reports should be reconciled or compared to supporting documents to ensure that the transactions are recorded in the correct account and for the right amount.

➤ **Physical Security**

Equipment, inventories, cash, checks, and other assets should be physically secured and periodically counted and compared with amounts shown on control records. For example, the periodic confirmation of equipment by individual departments is a physical security control.

2.5. Challenges faced by sustainability of health donor funded projects

The following aspects are the challenges faced by sustainability of health donor funded projects :

2.5.1. Identify and strengthen processes to ensure that evidence is used in policy

Studies are not an end in themselves, but means to the end of better policy, programs and projects, and so better lives. At starting to document cases in which impact sustainability have, and have not, influenced policy to better understand how to go about this, requires evidence to be provided to justify providing support to new programs, an example which could be followed by other agencies.

2.5.2. Institutionalize impact sustainability

The development community is very prone to faddism. Impact sustainability could go the way of other fads and fall into disfavor in need to demonstrate the usefulness of impact sustainability to help prevent this happening, hence my first point. But also need take steps to institutionalize the use of evidence in governments and development agencies. This step includes ensuring that ‘results’ are measured by impact, not outcome sustainability.

2.5.3. Improve sustainability designs to answer policy-relevant questions

Quality impact sustainability embed the counterfactual analysis of attribution in a broader analysis of the causal chain, allowing an understanding of why interventions work, or not, and yielding policy relevant messages for better design and implementation. There have been steps in this direction, but researchers need better understanding of the approach and to genuinely embrace mixed methods in a meaningful way.

2.5.4. Make progress with small and impact sustainability

Are all accept that should be issues-led not methods led, and use the most appropriate method for the sustainability questions at hand. But the fact is that there is far more consensus for the sustainability of large n interventions, in which experimental and quasi-experimental approaches can be used, then there is about the approach to be used for small n interventions. If the call to base development spending on evidence of what works is to be heeded, then the development sustainability community needs to move to consensus on this point.

2.5.5. Expand knowledge and use of systematic reviews

Single impact studies will also be subject to criticisms of weak external validity. Systematic reviews, which draw together evidence from all quality impact studies of a particular intervention in a rigorous manner, give stronger, more reliable, messages. There has been an escalation in the production of systematic reviews in development in the last year. The challenge is to ensure that these studies are policy relevant and used by policy makers; (Joshi P., 2005).

2.6. The strategies used to address challenges faced by sustainability of projects in organization

- i. Innovative fundraising techniques, such as giving circles and fostering relationships with investors can help to address financial challenges.
- ii. Clear, consistent marketing and branding will help communicate a nonprofit's social mission to funders and the community in which it resides.
- iii. Engaging in health donors activities that outline financial and programmatic outcomes as a result of funding support demonstrates the value of a nonprofit's operations and helps to determine mission impact. Additionally, clearly and consistently communicating health donors efforts and findings to funders and investors demonstrates accountability.
- iv. Establishing and engaging community board leadership and a system of community volunteers provides a resource of varied experiences and expertise while bringing a sense of ownership to the communities that nonprofits serve.
- v. Fostering a culture of giving and addressing the "willingness to give" gap may address fundraising challenges in communities where many residents have very limited resources to spare.

2.7. Conceptual framework

Figure 1: Conceptual framework

Conceptual framework shows and presents the aim and literature of variables. This study consists two variables which are determinants of projects sustainability and the sustainability indicators



Source:Zuintnen Newton(2004) and Rogrigo Dominguez (2013)

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

As discussed earlier, this study intends to analyse factors leading to health donor funded project sustainability and indicators of sustainability. In this regards, this chapter describes relevant research methods applied to collect, process and analyse data. The chapter provides as well information on validity and reliability of data and discusses the limitations of the study.

3.2. Research design

There is no one definition that can best describe research design or imparts the full range of important aspects. According to Cooper & Schindler(2006), the research design constitutes the way through which data are collected and analysed. This study follows a non experimental design with exploratory, descriptive and explanatory cross sectional methods which use both qualitative and quantitative approaches.

The study explores and describes factors that lead to health donor funded projects sustainability and sustainability indicators. It attempts to establish the relationship that exists between research variables and aims at identifying how one variable affects the other with intention to provide an empirical explanation to the causality and causes and effects relationship between the variables.

3.3. Data collection

3.3.1. Population of the study

3.3.1.1. Target population

The target population of the study who are supposed to be questioned are 40 employees of Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) in Ministry of Health who can provide the information data related to factors leading to health donor funded project sustainability and indicators of sustainability with the case of SPIU.

3.3.1.2. Sample size

The sample size has been selected properly; the information was collected about the sample in order to make statements about the whole population as employees of Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU). Due to the small number of employees of Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU); who have duties related to the sustainability and evaluating project; they were all contacted and are respected to the number of 40 staff as respondents; therefore the purposive sampling technique has been preferred and has been used when the researcher has selected the respondents to be questioned.

3.3.2. Data collection techniques

The thesis relied on questionnaire technique and key documents from the projects.

3.3.2.1. Questionnaire

A questionnaire technique is a survey that is intended by the researcher for using in mailed or administered survey; it was composed of closed ended questions. The researcher has set up written questions and distributed to the respondents, so that they gave their own opinions and then it ward up, to the research opinions. This technique helped the researcher to quantify different data to get a clear picture on the topic of the study. That is the reason why primary data has been firstly gathered by the researcher. In this research, the primary data was composed by

information from quantitative information data of relevant persons involved in the Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU).

3.3.2.2. Documentary review

Analysis of documentation is other major aspect in data collection which concerns with the written record in order to relate with the study of the topic during research in much different materials such as books, reports and dissertations to the topic that is analyzed; (Bailey, 2012).

With this technique, the researcher has gone through the reports, books and other documents related to the research topic. This technique helped the researcher to have different opinions of different data that have been collected during the research.

3.3.3. Validity and reliability of data collection techniques

Pilot studies allowed the researcher to identify potential problems in the proposed study. A pilot study is the process of carrying out a preliminary study, going through the entire research procedure with a small sample of questionnaire. The testing of questionnaire is conducted to thirty persons during one week before to test the reliability and validity of the questionnaires. The aims are to test whether the designed questions are logical and contextual, if questions are clear and easy to understand, whether the stated responses are exhaustive and how long it takes to complete the questionnaire. The pre-test also allows the researcher to check on whether the variables collected can easily be processed and analyzed. Any question which is found ambiguous or interpreted differently during the pre-testing are rephrased so that it can have the same meaning to all respondents. Views that have been given by the respondents during pre-testing has been analyzed through SPSS 20th version spread sheet and has been used in order to improve the questionnaires before actual collection of data.

3.4. Data processing and analysis

3.4.1. Data processing

The data that were collected from respondents was in a row form, which was easy to interpret and analyze for conclusions. Data processing has been used to transform the respondent's views

into meaningful information. Therefore, enough is done to process it before proper analysis could be made. On this note, editing, coding and tabulating of data have been done in order to be able to handle it easily.

3.4.1.1. Editing

Mbaagah (2009), defines editing as the process whereby errors in completed data collected, schedule and the questions are identified whenever possible. For some unclear responses, the researcher has to go back to the respondents so as to make them clarify their responses.

3.4.1.2. Coding

According to Kakooza (2006), coding refers to the «assigning of symbol or a number to a response for identification purpose». This process has been used in order to summarize data by classifying different responses, which was made into categories for easy interpretation and analysis.

3.4.1.3. Tabulation

Frequency distribution tables have been used after editing and coding of data. Tables have been constructed according to the main themes in the questionnaire to summarize all the findings of the study.

3.4.2. Data analysis

The process of data analysis has been used by the researcher after data collection in order to make deep interpretation and understanding by using statistical and descriptive analysis methods.

3.4.2.1. Statistical Method

The statistical methodology provides a forum for original, high-quality articles reflecting the varied facets of contemporary statistical theory as well as of significant applications. In addition to helping to stimulate research, the journal intends to bring about interactions among statisticians and scientists in other disciplines broadly interested in statistical methodology.

Emphasis is on importance, interest, and originality formal novelty and correctness alone are not sufficient to warrant a publication. Statistics is a set of mathematical methods which, from the collection and analysis of real data, can develop probabilistic models allowing predictions; (Meretmuriu, 2014).

The statistical method offered the opportunity to measure and quantified the results of research. This method is the one which has facilitated in quantifying and numbering the results of the research and presenting information on the graphs, charts and tables.

3.4.2.2. Descriptive Method

Descriptive research is used to describe characteristics of a population or phenomenon being studied. It does not answer questions about how/when/why the characteristics occurred. Rather it addresses the "what" question (What are the characteristics of the population or situation being studied?). The characteristics used to describe the situation or population is usually some kind of categorical scheme also known as descriptive categories. For example, the periodic table categorizes the elements. Scientists use knowledge about the nature of electrons, protons and neutrons to devise this categorical scheme. We now take for granted the periodic table, yet it took descriptive research to devise it.

Descriptive research generally precedes explanatory research. For example, over time the periodic table's description of the elements allowed scientists to explain chemical reaction and make sound prediction when elements were combined. Hence, research cannot describe what caused a situation. Thus, Descriptive research cannot be used to as the basis of a causal relationship, where one variable affects another. In other words, descriptive research can be said to have a low requirement for internal validity. The description is used for frequencies, averages and other statistical calculations. Often the best approach, prior to writing descriptive research, is to conduct a survey investigation. Qualitative research often has the aim of description and researchers may follow-up with examinations of why the observations exist and what the implications of the findings; (Patricia and Rangarjan, 2014).

CHAPTER 4: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1. Introduction

This chapter is emphasizing on the analysis of the results from the data collection in relation with the research objectives and questions of the study where the data are presented in analytical and quantitative approaches.

4.2. Overview of Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU)

Rwanda initiated Single PIUs in a couple of ministries at the end of 2008. Policy related to SPIUs originated in Rwanda's Central Public Investment and External Finance Bureau (CEPEX) back then a semi-autonomous agency under the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN) tutelage. In 2008 some of its core functions, notably the Public Investment Program (PIP), the preparation of the development budget and the high-level coordination of external finance, were moved to the Ministry of Finance proper, which left CEPEX to focus solely on project management.

As part of this overhaul CEPEX re-thought the way it went about giving support to project management. One of the ideas was to establish an SPIU in a few pilot ministries notably the Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA), the Ministry of Agriculture (MINAGRI), the Ministry of Health (MINISANTE), the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC) and the Ministry of Local Affairs (MINALOC). This was supported by consulting work on SPIUs done by HQS consulting (2007).

The implementation of SPIUs in the aforementioned ministries was quite rushed. Despite the help from CEPEX ministries were ill-prepared for the transition from multiple PIUs to a single PIU and experiences varied substantially by ministry. The SPIU in MINAGRI struggled to implement the SPIU in a coherent way. MINAGRI hired four programme managers to oversee the work of the Ministry's various projects (including the ones with their own PIUs) according to the four pillars of its sector strategy (the PSTA). These managers got drawn into project implementation issues and sometimes ran projects themselves. In general, the envisaged benefits like sharing staff across projects were few and far between.

It is hard to see, however, how this could have been done differently given the limited capacity in the ministry and the constraints imposed by development partners. In the health sector, a mini-SPIU has been in place since 2006, managing projects funded by the Global Fund. This mini-SPIU also managed two World Bank projects and one Department for International Development (DFID) project, treating each large scale economic project on a case-by-case basis. This SPIU grew organically with a focus on cutting overhead costs in a pragmatic way.

MINISANTE already had some kind of mini-SPIU in place from 2006 onwards managing Global Fund projects, plus two World Bank and one DFID funded project. In 2011 MINISANTE drew up a new SPIU organigram and developed a procedures manual with the aim of bringing all health-related projects under the SPIU umbrella. There is now a clear institutional set up for this to happen, with on-going negotiations with the main health development partners as to how exactly this will be implemented i.e. how the shared functions will be financed, the designation of a focal point; (Ministry of Health, SPIU, 2015).

4.3. Data presentation

Under this section, the researcher analyzed and interpreted data collected on the determinants of sustainability of health donor funded projects with the case of Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), Ministry of Health.

Under this section, the researcher analyzed and interpreted data collected toward direct quantitative data (questionnaire technique) that were distributed among the respondents. This chapter is groaned in such a way that the information from primary data was analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) then the researcher came out with research analysis and interpretation.

4.4. Data analysis and interpretation

Under this section, the researcher analyzed and interpreted data collected toward direct quantitative data (questionnaire technique) that were distributed among the respondents. This chapter is groaned in such a way that the information from primary data was analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) then the researcher came out with research analysis and interpretation.

4.4.1. Factors (determinants) affecting the sustainability of projects

This part is aiming to make the analysis of factors (determinants) that affecting the sustainability of projects

Table 1: Factors (determinants) affecting project sustainability

Factors affecting the sustainability of projects	Reaction of respondents	Number of respondents	Percentage
Reconciling different agendas	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Funding	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Community involvement	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Professional support	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Credibility	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0

	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Shared ownership	Strongly Agree	25	62.5
	Agree	15	37.5
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Dynamic individuals	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Responsiveness	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Networking or building partnerships	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Critical factors for a project successful	Strongly Agree	28	70
	Agree	12	30
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100

Source: Primary data, May 2016

The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty (40) respondents occupier 100% of respondents, Strongly Agree that the Reconciling different agendas is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; therefore, many factors interact as individuals and organizations attempt to reconcile different responsibilities, objectives and agendas. The way in which these issues are handled affects the sustainability of the project, either fostering good working relationships between all those involved, or alienating individuals and organizations. The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents as employees Strongly Agree that the Funding is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; for that reason, secure funding is a critical factor in determining whether a project is sustainable. Local health donor funded projects tend to need two types of funding: money to help them set up and funding to cover running costs.

The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty (40) respondents occupier 100% of respondents, Strongly Agree that the Community involvement is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; so the community involvement is an important factor for the sustainability of projects is the genuine involvement of local people as active participants and equal partners whose concerns and experience are intrinsic to the project's success. The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents occupier 100% strongly Agree that the Professional support is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; therefore Professionals can play a number of different roles in health donor funded projects all of which require trust and good working relationships with local people and other professionals.

The collected information is showing that in SPIU, all forty (40) respondents occupier 100% of the respondent, strongly agree that the credibility is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; because of without such credibility it will lack support and fail to obtain financial support. The information collected in the table above is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the twenty five (25) respondents as employees Strongly Agree and the fifteen (15) respondents as employees Agree that the Shared ownership is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; where the shared ownership can have a long-term impact on project sustainability.

The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents as employees Strongly Agree that the Dynamic individuals are the factor

affecting the sustainability of SPIU; therefore in most projects, one or more dynamic individuals are crucial because they generate enthusiasm and support. The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents as employees strongly agree that responsiveness is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; where this means ensuring that the activities provided address local needs, and that all those involved with the project volunteers and professionals have the skills they require. The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents as employees Strongly Agree that the Networking or building partnerships is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU.

In SPIU, 28 respondents Strongly Agree and 12 respondents Agree, that in sustainability of project service, the critical factors for a project successful is one of the key factors affecting the sustainability of their project; therefore the critical factors for a project successful involves in shared commitment, people centered, clarity of objectives, effective governance, leadership, flexibility and responsiveness, consistency of purpose, maintaining membership and entrepreneurial and innovative of project sustainability.

Many factors interact as individuals and organizations attempt to reconcile different responsibilities, objectives and agendas. The way in which these issues are handled affects the sustainability of the project, either fostering good working relationships between all those involved, or alienating individuals and organizations.

Secure funding is a critical factor in determining whether a project is sustainable. Local health donor funded projects tend to need two types of funding: money to help them set up and funding to cover running costs. Both are equally important but many projects find funding for running costs very difficult to obtain. As a result, projects have constantly to reinvent themselves so that they qualify again for set-up funding. Some projects are trapped in this cycle; this is not only time-consuming but hinders the natural development of the project.

An important factor for the sustainability of projects is the genuine involvement of local people as active participants and equal partners whose concerns and experience are intrinsic to the project's success. The level of community support determines whether a project becomes

established, how quickly and successfully it consolidates and how it responds and adapts to meet changing needs.

Professionals can play a number of different roles in health donor funded projects all of which require trust and good working relationships with local people and other professionals. In order to establish good rapport professionals need time, resources and authority to invest in a project.

A project has to be seen as plausible in terms of ideas and activities, structure and organization, by all those who come in contact with it. Without such credibility it will lack support and fail to obtain financial support.

Where project ownership is exclusive, those in control are less likely to respond positively to the needs and ideas of the wider group. This can have a long-term impact on project sustainability.

In most projects, one or more dynamic individuals are crucial because they generate enthusiasm and support. In some instances this is enough to compensate for the absence of other factors. These individuals can either be professionals or community members.

To maintain interest and support, projects have to be responsive to the changing agendas and needs of users, volunteers and professionals. This means ensuring that the activities provided address local needs, and that all those involved with the project volunteers and professionals have the skills they require.

Projects that build links with different organizations are more likely to be sustainable. They support and learn from each other, and are able to exploit others' agendas, for example, for new funding opportunities.

Many of the success criteria for social enterprise identified in the plunkett foundation's publication 'organizational structures for rural social enterprise' are also factors affecting the sustainability and success of community health donor funded projects, including; shared commitment; people centered; clarity of objectives; effective governance; leadership; flexibility and responsiveness; consistency of purpose; maintaining membership and entrepreneurial & innovative.

4.4.2. Indicators of projects sustainability

This portion is pointing the analysis on indicators of projects sustainability toward SPIU.

Table 2: Indicators of projects sustainability

Indicators of projects sustainability	Reaction of respondents	Number of respondents	Percentage
Continued operation and maintenance of project facilities	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Continued flow of net benefits	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Continued community participation	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Equitable sharing and distribution of project benefits	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Institutional constancy and Maintenance of environmental stability	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100

Source: Primary data, May 2016

The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty (40) respondents occupier 100% of respondents, Strongly Agree that the continued operation and maintenance of project facilities is the indicator of SPIU sustainability; therefore it has the project received necessary support (both budgetary and institutional) to enable it to maintain required level of facilities. The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents as employees Strongly Agree that the continued flow of net benefits is the indicator of SPIU sustainability; therefore it has all the cost and benefits under varying conditions weighted properly and does the project guarantee an acceptable level of financial and economic return.

The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty (40) respondents occupier 100% of respondents, Strongly Agree that the continued community participation is the indicator of SPIU sustainability; therefore it has the project involved the community and it has succeeded in maintaining a desirable level of participation of the community in the project activities.

The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents occupier 100% strongly Agree that the equitable sharing and distribution of project benefits is the indicator of SPIU sustainability; therefore it has the project incorporated mechanisms that guarantee equitable access to and distribution of project benefits on a continuous basis. The collected information is showing that in SPIU, all forty (40) respondents occupier 100% of the respondent, Strongly Agree that the Institutional constancy and Maintenance of environmental stability are the indicators of SPIU sustainability; therefore they have the project considered adequately the institutional requirements and thus made provisions so that management support to project operations continues, during the life of the project and they have the project considered environmental implications so that negative impacts on environment are either avoided or mitigated during the life of the project.

Depending on the nature of a sector or a project each of these dimensions has the capacity to influence project sustainability in one or way or another where the continued operation and maintenance of project facilities i.e. (Logistics Dimension), has the project received necessary support (both budgetary and institutional) to enable it to maintain required level of facilities?

Continued flow of net benefits (for economic sector projects) has all the cost and benefits under varying conditions weighted properly and does the project guarantee an acceptable level of financial and economic return?

Continued community participation (in projects where active community participation is crucial for both stimulating new actions as well as for cost recovery) i.e. (Community Dimension), has the project involved the community? Has it succeeded in maintaining a desirable level of participation of the community in the project activities?

Equitable sharing and distribution of project benefits(Equity Dimension), has the project incorporated mechanisms that guarantee equitable access to and distribution of project benefits on a continuous basis?

Institutional constancy(Institutional Dimension)has the project considered adequately the institutional requirements and thus made provisions so that management support to project operations continues, during the life of the project.

Maintenance of environmental stability(Environmental Dimension), has the project considered environmental implications so that negative impacts on environment are either avoided or mitigated during the life of the project?

Considerations of all these dimensions are key to sustainability of projects; experience suggests that weakening of any one of these has the potential to risk the sustainability of the entire project in the long run.

4.4.3. Challenges faced by sustainability of projects in organization

This part is aiming to make the study on the different challenges hindering the sustainability of projects in organization as SPIU.

Table 3: Challenges faced by sustainability of projects in organization

Challenges faced by sustainability of projects in organization	Reaction of respondents	Number of respondents	Percentage
Identify and strengthen processes to ensure that evidence is used in policy	Strongly Agree	5	12.5
	Agree	35	87.5
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Institutionalize impact sustainability	Strongly Agree	1	2.5
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	39	97.5
	Total	40	100
Improve sustainability designs to answer policy-relevant questions	Strongly Agree	3	7.5
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	37	92.5
	Total	40	100
Make progress with small and impact sustainability	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Expand knowledge and use of systematic reviews	Strongly Agree	17	42.5
	Agree	23	57.5
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100

Source: Primary data, May 2016.

In SPIU, the 5 respondents Strongly Agree and 35 respondents Agree that in sustainability of project service, the project met with the Identify and strengthen processes to ensure that evidence is used in policy as challenge met by Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) for sustainability of project where all six respondents Strongly Agree that the Identify and strengthen processes to ensure that evidence is used in policy to the challenge met by the project about sustainability of project.

In SPIU, 1 respondent Strongly Agreed and 39 respondents Strongly Disagreed that in sustainability of project service, the Institutionalize impact sustainability funds as challenge met by Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) for sustainability of project; therefore the impact sustainability could go the way of other fads and fall into disfavor in need to demonstrate the usefulness of impact sustainability to help prevent this happening, hence my first point. But also need take steps to institutionalize the use of evidence in governments and development agencies. This step includes ensuring that ‘results’ are measured by impact, not outcome sustainability. In SPIU, 3 respondents Strongly Agree and 37 respondents Strongly Disagree that in sustainability of project service, the project met with the improve sustainability designs to answer policy-relevant questions as challenge met by Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) for sustainability of project. In SPIU, forty respondents Strongly Agree that in sustainability of project service, the project met with the make progress with small and impact sustainability as challenge met by Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) for sustainability of project.

In SPIU, 17 respondents Strongly Agree and 23 respondents agree that in sustainability of project service, the project met with the expand knowledge and use of systematic reviews as challenge met by Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) for sustainability of project, so the systematic reviews, which draw together evidence from all quality impact studies of a particular intervention in a rigorous manner, give stronger, more reliable, messages. There has been an escalation in the production of systematic reviews in development in the last year. The challenge is to ensure that these studies are policy relevant and used by policy makers.

4.4.4. Strategies used for fighting the challenges faced by sustainability of projects

This portion is levelling to make the analysis of strategies used to address challenges faced by sustainability of projects in organization as SPIU

Table 4: Strategies used for fighting the challenges faced by sustainability of projects

Strategies used for fighting the challenges faced by sustainability of projects	Reaction of respondents	Number of respondents	Percentage
Innovative fundraising techniques, such as giving circles and fostering relationships with investors, can help to address financial challenges	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Clear, consistent marketing and branding will help communicate a nonprofit's social mission to funders and the community in which it resides	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Engaging in health donors activities that outline financial and programmatic outcomes as a result of funding support demonstrates the value of a nonprofit's operations and helps to determine mission impact. Additionally, clearly and consistently communicating health donors efforts and findings to funders and investors demonstrates accountability	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Establishing and engaging community board leadership and a system of community	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0

volunteers provides a resource of varied experiences and expertise while bringing a sense of ownership to the communities that nonprofits serve	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100
Fostering a culture of giving and addressing the “willingness to give” gap may address fundraising challenges in communities where many residents have very limited resources to spare	Strongly Agree	40	100
	Agree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
	Total	40	100

Source: Primary data, May 2016

The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty (40) respondents occupier 100% of respondents, Strongly Agree that the innovative fundraising techniques, such as giving circles and fostering relationships with investors, can help to address financial challenges is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU. The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents as employees strongly Agree that the Clear, consistent marketing and branding will help communicate a nonprofit’s social mission to funders and the community in which it resides is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU.

The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty (40) respondents occupier 100% of respondents, Strongly Agree that the engaging in health donors activities that outline financial and programmatic outcomes as a result of funding support demonstrates the value of a nonprofit’s operations and helps to determine mission impact. Additionally, clearly and consistently communicating health donors efforts and findings to funders and investors demonstrates accountability is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU.

The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents occupier 100% strongly Agree that the Establishing and engaging community board leadership and a system of community volunteers provides a resource of varied experiences and expertise while bringing a sense of ownership to the communities that nonprofits serve is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU. The collected information is showing that in SPIU, all forty (40) respondents occupier 100% of the respondent, Strongly Agree that theFostering a culture of giving and addressing the “willingness to give” gap may address fundraising challenges in communities where many residents have very limited resources to spare is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU.

4.5. Correlational analysis between factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability and indicators of the sustainability

According to the conceptual framework of the study; this portion presents the correlational analysis between factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability such as reconciling different agendas, funding, community involvement, professional support, credibility, shared ownership, dynamic individuals, responsiveness, networking or building partnerships and critical factors for a successful project and indicators of the sustainability such as continued operation and maintenance of project facilities,continued flow of net benefits,continued community participation,equitable sharing and distribution of project benefits andinstitutional constancy and maintenance of environmental stability whereas the results findings regarded to the relationship among those two aspects are presented in the following analysis by using the regression analysis toward Spearman's Correlation presented in table number five:

Table 5: Correlational analysis between factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability and indicators of the sustainability

Correlational analysis between factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability and indicators of the sustainability		Factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability	Indicators of the sustainability
Regression analysis toward	Factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability	Correlation Coefficient	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.
		N	40
Spearman's Correlation	Indicators of the sustainability	Correlation Coefficient	.748*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
		N	40

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

Legend:

- [-1.00 - 0.00 [: Negative correlation;
- [0.00 - 0.25 [: Positive and very low correlation;
- [0.25 - 0.50 [: Positive and low correlation;
- [0.50 - 0.75 [: Positive and high correlation and
- [0.75 - 1.00] : Positive and very high correlation.

According to the regression analysis toward variation of Spearman's Coefficient correlation is between -1 and 1. Therefore, the regression analysis toward Spearman's Coefficient correlation has significance when it is equal or greater than 0.01. According to the research, the correlation of 0.748 (74.8%) is located in the interval [0.50-0.75 [categorized as positive and high correlation. As the significant level is at 0.01 (1%), the p-value of 0.000 (i.e. 0.0%) is less than 1%. Therefore, the third research hypothesis has been formulated according to the thirdresearch objective and thirdresearch question where the theories approved in chapter two and the research findings assessed in chapter four provide the researcher to say that the third research hypothesis said that there is positive correlational between identified factors leading to health donor funded

projects sustainability and indicators of the sustainability; has been tested, verified and confirmed.

4.5. Discussion of research findings and hypotheses testing

This section is aiming to assess the discussion of research findings and hypotheses testing such as analysed as follow:

4.5.1. Discussion of research findings

According to the specific research objectives such as to determine factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability; to find out challenges faced by sustainability of health donor funded projects and to carry out the correlational analysis between factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability and indicators of the sustainability which helped the researcher to collect the information related to the study's purposes that are analyzed in chapter four. Therefore, regarding to the research hypotheses which responded positively to the research questions of the study and related to the research objectives and research questions, thus the researcher concluded the discussion of research findings by saying that the past research theories and current research theories assessed by current researcher are positively related through the research results approved in chapter four.

4.5.2. The hypotheses testing

Subsequent from the research objectives and research questions, the researcher would like to test the following the research hypotheses such as:

H₁: There are several factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability.

H₂: There are numerous challenges faced by health donor funded projects managers.

H₃: There is positive correlational between identified factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability and indicators of the sustainability.

The first research hypothesis assessed the several factors that are leading to health donor funded projects sustainability such as reconciling different agendas; funding; community involvement; professional support; credibility; shared ownership; dynamic individuals; responsiveness; networking or building partnerships and critical factors for a project successful where at least all

respondents respected by the number of 40 strongly agreed that those mentioned factors lead to health donor funded projects sustainability. Therefore, the first research hypothesis has been formulated according to the first research objective and first research question where the theories approved in chapter two and the research findings assessed in chapter four provide the researcher to say that the first research hypothesis alleged that there are several factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability; has been tested, verified and confirmed.

The second research hypothesis analyzed the numerous challenges faced by health donor funded projects managers such as identify and strengthen processes to ensure that evidence is used in policy; institutionalize impact sustainability; improve sustainability designs to answer policy-relevant questions; make progress with small and impact sustainability and expand knowledge and use of systematic reviews where at least all respondents respected by the number of 40 strongly agreed that those mentioned aspect are the several challenges faced by faced by sustainability of health donor funded projects. Therefore, the second research hypothesis has been formulated according to the second research objective and second research question where the theories approved in chapter two and the research findings assessed in chapter four provide the researcher to say that the second research hypothesis intituled that there are numerous challenges faced by health donor funded projects managers; has been tested, verified and confirmed.

The third research hypothesis examined correlational analysis between identified factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability and indicators of the sustainability as follow by using and refering to Spearman's Correlation analysis.

The numeric data allow users on sustainability in order to justify their efforts, but also highlight the direct relationship between factors leading to health donor funded projects sustainability and larger project performance for improving the indicators of the sustainability.

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, GENERAL CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the previous four chapters; conclude on the whole study and gives recommendations related to the understanding the processes and determinants of sustainability of health donor funded projects.

5.1. Summary disclosure and general conclusion

The first chapter presented the subject under the study where it gives the background to the study, highlighted the problem statement, articulated the research objectives including general and specific objectives as well as the research questions. It also defined the scope of the study undertaken and significance of this research work. The second chapter which was the literature review, talked about the key concepts related to the research variables of the study. It also highlighted theoretical issues related to the topic and presented the conceptual framework of the study.

The third chapter of this study discussed the methodology used. It talked about the methods, tools and procedures used in carrying out this study. It clarified the research design, population and sampling technique, sample size, data collection and data analysis techniques.

The researcher wanted also to know the discussions of the respondents through quantitative data collection, where the researcher and respondents reviewed that the main focus (objective) of Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) toward the research findings where the collected information showed that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all fourty (40) respondents occupier 100% of respondents, Strongly Agree that the Reconciling different agendas is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; therefore, many factors interact as individuals and organizations attempt to reconcile different responsibilities, objectives and agendas. The way in which these issues are handled affects the sustainability of the project, either fostering good working relationships between all those involved, or alienating individuals and organizations. The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all fourty respondents as employees Strongly Agree that the Funding is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; for that reason, secure funding is a critical factor in

determining whether a project is sustainable. Local health donor funded projects tend to need two types of funding: money to help them set up and funding to cover running costs.

The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty (40) respondents occupier 100% of respondents, Strongly Agree that the Community involvement is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; so the community involvement is an important factor for the sustainability of projects is the genuine involvement of local people as active participants and equal partners whose concerns and experience are intrinsic to the project's success. The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents occupier 100% strongly Agree that theProfessional support is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; therefore Professionals can play a number of different roles in health donor funded projects all of which require trust and good working relationships with local people and other professionals.

The collected information is showing that in SPIU, all forty (40) respondents occupier 100% of the respondent, strongly agree that thecredibility is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; because of without such credibility it will lack support and fail to obtain financial support. The information collected in the table above is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the twenty five (25) respondents as employees Strongly Agree and the fifteen respondents as employees Agree that theShared ownership is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; where the shared ownership can have a long-term impact on project sustainability.

The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents as employees Strongly Agree that theDynamic individuals are the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; therefore in most projects, one or more dynamic individuals are crucial because they generate enthusiasm and support. The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents as employees strongly agree that theresponsiveness is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU; where this means ensuring that the activities provided address local needs, and that all those involved with the project volunteers and professionals have the skills they require. The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents as employees Strongly Agree that theNetworking or building partnerships is the factor affecting the sustainability of SPIU.

In SPIU, 28 respondents Strongly Agree and 12 respondents Agree, that in sustainability of project service, the critical factors for a project successful is one of the key factors affecting the sustainability of their project; therefore the critical factors for a project successful involves in shared commitment, people centered, clarity of objectives, effective governance, leadership, flexibility and responsiveness, consistency of purpose, maintaining membership and entrepreneurial and innovative of project sustainability.

The collected information showed that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty (40) respondents occupier 100% of respondents, Strongly Agree that the continued operation and maintenance of project facilities is the indicator of SPIU sustainability; therefore it has the project received necessary support (both budgetary and institutional) to enable it to maintain required level of facilities. The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents as employees Strongly Agree that the continued flow of net benefits is the indicator of SPIU sustainability; therefore it has all the cost and benefits under varying conditions weighted properly and does the project guarantee an acceptable level of financial and economic return.

The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty (40) respondents occupier 100% of respondents, Strongly Agree that the continued community participation is the indicator of SPIU sustainability; therefore it has the project involved the community and it has succeeded in maintaining a desirable level of participation of the community in the project activities.

The collected information is showing that in Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), the all forty respondents occupier 100% strongly Agree that the equitable sharing and distribution of project benefits is the indicator of SPIU sustainability; therefore it has the project incorporated mechanisms that guarantee equitable access to and distribution of project benefits on a continuous basis. The collected information is showing that in SPIU, all forty (40) respondents occupier 100% of the respondent, Strongly Agree that the Institutional constancy and Maintenance of environmental stability are the indicators of SPIU sustainability; therefore they have the project considered adequately the institutional requirements and thus made provisions so that management support to project operations continues, during the life of the project and they have the project considered environmental implications so that negative impacts on environment are either avoided or mitigated during the life of the project.

5.2. Recommendations

5.2.1. To Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) and Donors

The following recommendations are therefore made to improve the understanding the processes and determinants of sustainability of health donor funded projects:

- i. The performance management system and tools must be designed to address the particular needs of project sustainability.
- ii. The implementation of the performance management system has to be supported and driven by top leadership and management of project sustainability.
- iii. Leaders should be encouraged to develop the capacity to create a shared vision, inspire staff and build a performance management system that drives the entire organization towards of project sustainability.
- iv. A communication process should be put in place which will explain the benefits of the performance management system communicate progress with the implementation and reduce uncertainties, fears and anxieties of project sustainability.
- v. Managers must be encouraged to engage in careful, systematic and professional planning and implementation of the performance management system. Implementation time frames must be respected. All documentation and forms must be completed properly and professionally, especially performance agreements and personal development plans of project sustainability.
- vi. A proactive communication strategy and process must be followed throughout the implementation of the performance management system of project sustainability.

5.2.2. To the area of further researchers

It is suggested for the further researchers who will spirit to enter in deep domain of effectiveness of the determinants of sustainability of health donor funded projects, to refer to this research thesis by checking the comments and meaning toward application of sustainability of health donor funded projects. Therefore, I recommend that the similar study be extended to other parts of organizations towards a broader generalization of project sustainability.

REFERENCES

General books

- Audrey et al, (2013).Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Bailey, (2012). Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative methods.3rd edition. Alta Mira Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Bestrool Kyle, (2000)."Accounting for sustainability: Combining qualitative and quantitative research in developing 'indicators' of sustainability". International Journal of Social Research Methodology: Frankfut.
- Blake William, (2014). Critical-Path Planning and Scheduling. 1959 Proceedings of the Eastern Joint Computer Conference: New Jersey.
- Brundtland (2014). Green Cities, Growing Cities, Just Cities?: Urban planning and the Contradictions of Sustainable Development," Journal of the American Planning Association, New Jersey.
- Carrol Richardson, (2012)."Accounting for sustainability: Combining qualitative and quantitative research in developing 'indicators' of sustainability". International Journal of Social Research Methodology.
- Chris Tung, (2008). The Project Management Question and Answer Book. American Management Association, Philadelifia.
- Clark Sedore, (2014). Catholic social teaching, sustainable development and social solidarism in the context of social security, Copernican Journal of Finance & Accounting.
- Ekstrom, (2010).Effects on Antiretrovirals for HIV on African Health System, Maternal and Child Health. Stockholm: Department of Public Health Sciences Division of international Health, IHCAR. Retrieved from: <http://www.arvmac.eu/>.
- EUROSTAT (2005), "Measuring progress towards a more sustainable Europe, sustainable development indicators for the European Union", Luxembourg: Office for official publications of the European Communities.

- Farag, Nandakumar, Wallack, Gaumer and Hodgin (2009).Communicating Sustainability for the Green Economy. New York: M.E. Sharpe."Sustainable development | Define Sustainable development at Dictionary.com".
- Friedrich Platz and Reinhard Kopiez, (2014).Global Public Health: Sustainability Foundations. Oxford University Press.
- Friedrich Platz, (2011)."The Emergence of a Standards Market: Multiplicity of Sustainability Standards in the Global Coffee Industry".Organization Studies.
- Gallagher, A.; Johnson, D.; Glegg, G. and Trier, C. (2004), "Construct of sustainability in coastal zone management", Marine Policy, 28: 249-255.
- Gerrad Ferray, (2009).Bringing human health and wellbeing back into sustainable development.
- Görgens Albino, (2009). Appropriate Sustainable Technology: Tools, Choices, and Implications. New York: Academic Press.
- Hagood and Price, (2012).Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences. Seventh Edition. Boston MA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Hanefeld, J., (2010). The impact of Global Health donor funded projects at the national and sub-national level, a policy analysis of their role in implementation process of anti retroviral treatment (ART): roll out in Zambia and South Africa. AIDS care Vol. 22, No. Supplement 1, 2010; 93-102.
- Hendrickson, (2009). Management of the Hanford Engineer Works in World War II, How the Corps, DuPont and the Metallurgical Laboratory fast tracked the original plutonium works.
- Joshi P., (2005). Total Project Control (2nd Edition): A Practitioner's Guide to Managing Projects as Investments.
- Kaiser Famil, (2013). United Nations (2014). Prototype Global Sustainable Development Report (Online unedited ed.). New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division for Sustainable Development.
- Kakooza (2006).“Principles of Research methodology”, (2nd Edition) Europe Prentice Hall Edition.
- Kelley James, (2013). CPM in Construction Management, Seventh Edition. McGraw Hill.
- Klastorin Ted, (2003). The idea of sustainable development and Sustainability Science.

- Kusek and Rist, (2001).Urban Sustainability in Theory and Practice: Circles of Sustainability. London: Routledge.
- Kusek, (2002). "National Contexts Matter: The Co-Evolution of Sustainability Standards in Global Value Chains".
- Lescrauwa A.-K.et al. (2006). Europese duurzaamheidsindicatoren voor kustgebieden in Nederland: een eerste inventarisatie. European sustainability indicators for coastal zones in The Netherlands: a first inventory. VLIZ special publication 31.Vlaams instituut voor de Zee (VLIZ): Oostende, België 128 pp. ISBN 90-81008-14-5 Report on the use of the ICZM indicators; September 2006.
- Lescrauwaet, A.-K. et al. (Ed.) (2006). State of the coast of the Southern North Sea: an indicators-based approach to evaluating sustainable development in the coastal zone of the Southern North Sea . VLIZ Special Publication, 36. Flanders Marine Institute (VLIZ): Oostende, Belgium. 140 pp. ISBN 90-810081-1-0.
- Levine, (2009).Circles of Sustainability Urban Profile Process and Scerri. Andy City.
- Mbaagah (2009).Qualitative research &health donors methods (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Meretmuriu, (2014).Fundamentals of Research Methodology”, a series of papers On the Social Sciences Research Network.
- Mutty B., (2013). Research methodology; Encyclopædia Britannic. 2007. Encyclopædia Britannica.
- NewGrashina, (2003). Project Management: A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling.
- Olive, (2002). "Flexible strategies for long-term sustainability under uncertainty". Building Research.
- Patricia and Rangarjan, (2014). Understanding Research: Coping with the Quantitative-Qualitative Divide. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pickett, (2004).The Concept of Sustainable Economic Development". Environmental Conservation.
- Pieterse, (2009). Innovation Through Collaboration: Scaling up Technological Solutions for Sustainable Development, Environment, Development and Sustainability.

- Raffegeau, (1989).Sustainable growth renewable resources, and pollution".Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control.
- Redclift, (2010)."Appropriate Technology for Socioeconomic Development in Third World Countries". The Journal of Technology Studies.
- Rey-Valette, H.; Damart, S. and Roussel, S., "A multicriteria participation-based methodology for selecting sustainable development indicators: an incentive tool for concerted decision making beyond the diagnosis framework", International Journal of Sustainable Development, 10 (1/2): 122-138
- Robson Keith, (1992). The Sustainable Society: Ethics and Economic Growth. Philadelphia:Westminster Press.
- Rogers, (2014). CPM Mechanics: The Critical Path Method of Modeling Project Execution Strategy. ICS-Publications.
- Rogrigo Dominguez, (2013). "The Economics of Sustainability: A Review of Journal Articles" (PDF). Resources for the future.
- Roussel, S.; Crinquant, N. and Bourdat, E. (2007), "In search of coastal zone sustainability by means of social carrying capacity indicators construction: lessons learned from the Thau lagoon case study (Région Languedoc-Roussillon, France)", International Journal of Sustainable Development, 10 (1/2): 175-194.
- Sawyer, (2012).Interpreting Sustainability in Economic Terms: Dynamic Efficiency Plus Intergenerational Equity".
- Sumner and Tribe, (2008). Sustainable Transport in Freiburg: Lessons from Germany's Environmental Capital". International Journal of Sustainable Transportation.
- Thayer Harry, (2014). Beyond the business case for corporate sustainability. Business Strategy and the Environment.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) (1987), "Our common future", Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Wright and Meadows, (2009).A new model for enabling innovation in appropriate technology for sustainable development.Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy.

Zuintnen, N. (2004), "Indicateurs pour un développement durable : aspects méthodologiques et développements en cours", Working Paper No. 4-04 of the Bureau Fédéral du Plan, Brussels, Belgium.

Annual reports

GFATM, annual report, 2007.

Paris Declaration, annual report, 2005.

UNAIDS, annual report, 2010.

UNDP, annual report, 2015.

WHO, annual report, 2008.

APPENDICES

UNIVERSITY OF RWANDA (UR)
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, MBA PROGRAMME

Dear Respondent;

My names are KAREMERA Augustin, from University of Rwanda, following Masters in Business Administration. I am collecting data required to analyze the determinants of sustainability of health donor funded projects.

I kindly request you to answer the following questions and ensure that data collected will be processed and analyzed with due confidentiality and only for academic purpose.

Please, feel free to expression your opinion about the subject matter and suggest where necessary.

I thank you very much for your kind collaboration and for your precious time spent in answering the following questions

Yours sincerely

KAREMERA Augustin

**QUESTIONS RESERVED FOR SINGLE PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION
UNIT (SPIU) STAFF**

Instructions: 1} Tick in brackets the answer related to the true information

2} So, kindly grade by order of importance form: Strongly Agree (SA)=(5); Agree (A)=(4)Neutral (N)=(3); Disagree (DS) =2) and Strongly Disagree (SD)=(1)

**QUESTIONS RESERVED TO THE RESPONDENTS AS STAFF OF SPIU, MINISTRY
OF HEALTH**

**Q1. THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS ARE FACTORS AFFECTING THE
SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECTS AS SPIU; MINISTRY OF HEALTH-RWANDA:**

Factors affecting the sustainability of projects	SA=5	A=4	N=3	D=2	SD=1
Reconciling different agendas					
Funding					
Community involvement					
Professional support					
Credibility					
Shared ownership					
Dynamic individuals					
Responsiveness					
Networking or building partnerships					
Critical factors for a project successful					

Q2. THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS ARE INDICATORS OF PROJECTS SUSTAINABILITY TOWARD SPIU; MINISTRY OF HEALTH-RWANDA:

Indicators of projects sustainability	SA=5	A=4	N=3	D=2	SD=1
Continued operation and maintenance of project facilities					
Continued flow of net benefits					
Continued community participation					
Equitable sharing and distribution of project benefits					
Institutional stability and Maintenance of environmental stability					

Q3. THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS ARE CHALLENGES HINDERING THE SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECTS IN ORGANIZATION AS SPIU; MINISTRY OF HEALTH-RWANDA:

Challenges faced by sustainability of projects in organization	SA=5	A=4	N=3	D=2	SD=1
Identify and strengthen processes to ensure that evidence is used in policy					
Institutionalize impact sustainability					
Improve sustainability design to answer policy-relevant questions					
Make progress with small and impact sustainability					
Expand knowledge and use of systematic reviews					

Q4. THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS ARE STRATEGIES USED TO ADDRESS CHALLENGES FACED BY SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECTS IN ORGANIZATION AS SPIU; MINISTRY OF HEALTH-RWANDA:

Strategies used for fighting the challenges faced by sustainability of projects in organization	SA=5	A=4	N=3	D=2	SD=1
Innovative fundraising techniques, such as giving circles and fostering relationships with investors, can help to address financial challenges.					
Clear, consistent marketing and branding will help communicate a nonprofit's social mission to funders and the community in which it resides.					
Engaging in health donors activities that outline financial and programmatic outcomes as a result of funding support demonstrates the value of a nonprofit's operations and helps to determine mission impact. Additionally, clearly and consistently communicating health donors efforts and findings to funders and investors demonstrates accountability.					
Establishing and engaging community board leadership and a system of community volunteers provides a resource of varied experiences and expertise while bringing a sense of ownership to the communities that nonprofits serve.					
Fostering a culture of giving and addressing the "willingness to give" gap may address fundraising challenges in communities where many residents have very limited resources to spare.					

Thank you for your valuable time in answering to this questionnaire.

KAREMERA Augustin