

Participative stakeholder involvement approach and implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county, Kenya

Edwin Omondi Arwa¹, Prof. Charles M. Rambo, PhD², Dr. Isaac Abuya, PhD³

¹MA Project Planning and Management, University of Nairobi, Kenya

²Senior Lecturer PhD, University of Nairobi, School of Continuing and Distance Education, Kenya

³Senior Lecturer PhD, University of Nairobi, School of Continuing and Distance Education, Kenya

Abstract: Water projects face implementation challenges of cost and time overruns due to lack of stakeholders' involvement and this has led sustainability constraints. The purpose of the study was to assess the influence of participative stakeholder involvement approach on implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county. The study adopted descriptive survey research design; the data was collected through self-administered structured questionnaire. The research instrument was piloted for content validity and reliability tests. A sample size of 118 respondents was selected using stratified random sampling from a target population of 167 involved in implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county. High Cronbach's coefficient Alpha of 0.8 was obtained. The data was analysed using descriptive statistic of mean, standard deviation, frequencies percentages and inferential statistics of correlation and regression at $\alpha=0.05$ level of significance. The study found out statistically significant relationships between Participative Stakeholder Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects. The null hypothesis H01: Participative stakeholder involvement approach does not significantly influence implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county was rejected since $p=0.000<0.05$. It is recommended that a holistic bottom up approach in implementation of projects should be embraced so that all key stakeholders in projects become part and parcel of the projects and to bring ownership of projects by stakeholders. Further research should be carried out on project planning and design to establish whether stakeholders are involved at these initial stages before implementation of water projects.

Keywords: Participative stakeholders' Involvement approach, Implementation of water projects

I. INTRODUCTION

Access to clean drinking water remains a big problem globally with 783million people unable to access clean drinking water, especially in rural areas due to mismanagement of available water resources and poor or weak government policies (Giupponi, Jakemann, Karssenber and Hare, 2006). Water governance challenges are attributed to conflicts and competing water needs (Akhmouch and Clavreul, 2016). Water is a scarce resource and needs an integrated management approach in making decisions that will capture stakeholder needs (Akhmouch&Clavreul, 2016). According to UNEP (2019), Sustainable Development Goal 6

(SDG 6) focuses on availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all. This agenda builds on the relevant Millennium Development Goals. In Thailand, involvement of stakeholders in the water industry is not well developed and as such there is a shift from an initial government dominated and ineffective management process to a more stakeholder involvement process in water resources development projects (Uraiwong and Watanabe 2017). Involvement of stakeholders in water projects implementation is aimed at making the development demand driven and sustainable. Hansen, (2007) states that there is minimal stakeholder involvement in Australian projects. Somalia also experience minimal involvement of stakeholders in projects and that all projects which had stakeholders as primary beneficiaries never involved the same stakeholders in execution Newell (2001).

Kenya is classified as a water scarce country since it receives an annual renewable fresh water supply of only 647 cubic meters per capita (Birongo and Quyen, 2005). Government devolved the water function to improve service delivery and implementation of water projects, though this has proved to be a mirage. Almost 80% of diseases in "developing" countries are associated with water, causing early deaths. Previous water resource projects have failed due to poor involvement and identification of stakeholder needs and inadequate assessment of social impact of the project (Uraiwong and Watanabe 2017). To address this stakeholder involvement has become key in achieving water projects outcomes (Uraiwong and Watanabe 2017). The problem of stakeholder involvement in water projects is really entrenched in Kenya, a research conducted by Nyabera (2015) established that a vast majority of beneficiaries are never involved in needs assessment and this negatively affected successful implementation of project and ultimately jeopardised water projects sustainability.

Many water projects face implementation challenges and this has led to water projects being unsustainable, experiencing cost overruns, social protests, and the desired water quality not being achieved(Akhmouch&Clavreul, 2016). Lack of clean drinking water globally threatens the lives of humans, it is approximated that 1.4 million people die each year from

contaminated drinking water; and 3.6 million people die each year from waterborne diseases (UNDP, 2006). The crisis is real for those living in the developing world. The water crisis has become a major issue that needs to be addressed in order to improve the lives of poor people that are dying from preventable ailments. If water project is to be successfully implemented, then all key stakeholders that represent the interests of the beneficiaries must be involved in the implementation process. This study seeks to examine the influence of collaborative stakeholder's involvement approach on implementation of sustainable water projects.

This study is expected to contribute to the body of knowledge of project management so as to improve sustainability of water projects by capturing real beneficiary needs. This study may also provide insights in the role that different stakeholders play and how their roles improve chances of projects success and minimizes risks of project failure. It highlights the need for bottom-up approach in project planning, design and implementation. This study may also contribute to formulation of policies related to implementation of water projects by both public and private sector. Involvement of stakeholders in implementing water projects may bring a sense of legitimacy, power and urgency of stakeholders and ownership of projects. The county governments and different government entities dealing with water infrastructure development can use the results of this study to improve on effectiveness and efficiency of water projects implementation by aligning stakeholder needs and interests to organisational goals. Further research can be done on how to implement the different stakeholder involvement approaches by organizations.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Participative Stakeholder Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects

Participative stakeholder Involvement approach according this study implied involvement, contribution, attendance, inclusion and interest. Horney, Spurlock, Grabich and Berke (2016) states that research published previously attempted to quantify the significance of participation of the public on the planning process and emphasized that broader stakeholder involvement aids in making better plans though the researchers highlights two major challenges encountered while engaging the public in formulation of plans which includes lack of interest in planning from the public and the decision of planners to limit participation to more traditional groups and they noted that these challenges had a high probability of preventing inclusion of important ordinary knowledge or local knowledge in to plans resulting in plans becoming less relevant to residents and ineffective in implementation. According to Horney, Spurlock, Grabich and Berke (2016) the technical issues addressed such as engineering and codes for building and the geographic scale of planning has contributed to lack of local people's engagement, also locals may lack the requisite education and resources to engage effectively or there self-interests may be given over the general interests of

everyone. Participation assures sustainability because community members set priorities during planning. The researchers note that in situations where inclusion of key stakeholders have not been supported, public involvement in planning and implementation of plans may contribute to inequalities and promote a culture of patronage. Increasing the involvement of socially vulnerable groups in planning is important because these groups often face discrimination and inequalities of class and uncertainties that accompany these conditions. They note that involvement may have additional impact if socially vulnerable groups become more likely to be aware of government programmes and they benefit from it. Their research shows that when stakeholders play a more participative role in influencing development projects planning, then chances of success is increased. Horney, Spurlock, Grabich and Berke (2016) findings show that when ordinary residents are not involved in planning to participate, plans may become dominated by outside technical experts and result in communities opposing development plan since local knowledge and capacities are not taken in to consideration. For sustainability of projects to be assured, wide range of stakeholder inputs are needed. Horney, Spurlock, Grabich and Berke (2016) notes that "doing for" the community rather than "doing with" means that locally generated knowledge may not be recognised by planners and that key stakeholders may not be empowered at the end of it all to address their own problems or challenges, community members will be in position to identify their own problems and generate solutions rather than having everything done for them.

Fenton, Gustafsson, Ivner and Palm (2016) noted that to create sustainability and resilient societies, internal and external stakeholder participation is increasingly being emphasized and they should be involved in development strategies. Fenton, Gustafsson, Ivner and Palm (2016) noted that representation of stakeholders is always advocated for in national and international programmes. Stakeholder participation in planning processes has been hindered by lack of relevant knowledge on the part of stakeholders and that participation has been considered by many organizations less as a choice than a necessity. Public sector agencies, businesses, non-profit organizations and advocacy groups need a structured interaction so that the diverse needs of local societies are reflected in planning and implementation of programmes. They also note that there is risk of organizational goals not being met if stakeholder participation is not adopted since quality of decisions and generation of additional societal benefits come as a result of stakeholders being involved. In their research, Fenton, Gustafsson, Ivner and Palm (2016) noted the criticism that increased stakeholder participation will generate challenges and complexity increase and that participation is theoretically recommended but in practice it is unwelcomed as it's perceived to bring conflict of interests and power games. Participatory process is a goal in itself and goes further to say that assessment and decision-making process is enriched through involvement of stakeholders and in this case, participation is part of decision support process instead of a way to organize decision making

process itself. They note a common problem of goals of participation and methods to employ due to lack of reflection over using a specific participatory method, it's imperative to consider type of challenge and opportunity stakeholder participation involves. Benefits from approaches and methods that build on an inclusive definition of "local stakeholders" stems from development of shared goals and visions, as well as the introduction and implementation of sustainable individual and collective actions. Development of workable strategies or plans, stakeholder participation is required to help in identifying public concerns, development of mutual knowledge about complex systems and warrant sharing of experiences on the other hand weak participation may bring a sense of exclusion or may interfere with perceived legitimacy. In their findings, Fenton, Gustafsson, Ivner and Palm (2016) found out that if stakeholders were included early and without pre-conditions, they would be positive and result in outcomes that were larger in scope and this reduced the risk of scope creep during project implementation which were common in projects and programmes where stakeholder interests were not taken in to consideration. It was evident in their research findings that when stakeholders are involved, it provided them with chance to contribute with "situated knowledge" and information that may be unknown to civil servants or politicians. The inclusive approach that was utilized resulted in inclusion of different perspectives and the citizens' rights to information and participation. According to Fenton, Gustafsson, Ivner and Palm (2016) when stakeholders are involved earlier burdens are shared and reduced before implementation, it was seen as reducing complexity by reducing risks that may arise as a result of conflicts or challenges before budgeting and target formulation. When stakeholders are involved early also aids in identifying and engaging other actors whose participation may be required either in the present or future when goals are implemented and projects and programmes success becomes inevitable when several actors share their visions. Shared visions take time but stakeholder involvement methods include holding seminars, hearings or holding creative workshops about the future of programmes. Fenton, Gustafsson, Ivner and Palm (2016) When interaction with stakeholders increases, stakeholders' interactions also increases, this helps in moving away from traditional "command and control" approaches to development to approaches that is more holistic. Participation in projects helps in initiating both top-down process and bottom-up processes.

Smith (2012) established that researchers and managers have realized that efficient management of resources can be more efficient when stakeholders or those with vested interest in the resources are involved in management and that when they participate, there is increase in compliance, in-cooperation of local knowledge of resources increases efficiency. Smith (2012) notes that when government entities and stakeholders manages projects together, there is some degree of power sharing between them because the resource users and other stakeholders are involved. Ideally those stakeholders involved in projects or programmes represent the interest of

all key stakeholders even when all key stakeholders don't participate. However, in many instances, stakeholders involved may have their own interests and fail to represent the interest of the community at large. Smith (2012) noted that within a community, multiple actors and interests, power struggles and political forces are likely to surface hence stakeholders with little influence may be overlooked in the process though for success of projects these stakeholders may be the once to be given more attention. In the findings Smith (2012) found out that stakeholder's participation was dependent on the level at which a given development affected the individuals and most of those who attended meeting were the affected in one way or the other. When individuals participate in meeting, reinforcement of community ties and social capital represented happens. Smith (2012) concludes that involvement leads to stakeholders feel their interests and desires are being considered. Individuals who feel their interests are taken in to account feel their interests are part of the goals of development.

Graff and Francis (2017) states that stakeholder comments must be taken seriously for efficacy if impacts on procedures are to be felt. Stakeholder participation impacts decision making. The study conducted by Graff and Francis (2017) on Stakeholder participation on regulatory processes, at times contradictory information exist on stakeholders and can impact on decisions made. It's therefore important to establish stakeholders that have more influence and that the organizations should be responsive to these stakeholders. In findings of Graff and Francis (2017) it was clear that when all key stakeholders are involved in an initiative, there comments and interests being taken in to consideration then plans are made taking in to consideration stakeholders interests resulting in a higher percentage chance of getting the intended outcome.

Chidammodzi and Muhandiki (2015) in their study on determining the status of stakeholder participation in the management of the Lake Malawi basin noted that to achieve sustainability, all stakeholders must fully be aware and understand their roles for them to participate effectively. Participation of stakeholders leads to better understanding of the problem and program acceptance, in cooperating local knowledge in decision making and thus increases chances of sustainability and promotes inclusion of marginalised groups. The researchers' findings showed that there was high rate of youths, women and traditional leaders' participation in the program due to high level of awareness. This feature needs to be harnessed for sustainability of management. However, despite the high level of awareness and stakeholder participation, there was weak cooperation among stakeholders and thus Chidammodzi and Muhandiki (2015) recommends a close sectoral cooperation at policy and local implementing level for efficacy and sustainability.

III. METHODOLOGY

This study employed descriptive survey research design and data collected using structured questionnaire from a sample

size of 118 out of a target population of 167 of PMCs, Contractors, Water Department staff and ward Administrators. A pilot testing was done on 10% of the sample size and a reliability coefficient of 0.77 and validity coefficient of 0.8 obtained. Analysis involved descriptive statistic of percentages, frequencies, mean and standard deviation while inferential statistics involved correlation and regression analysis.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The response rate was 89.83% of the total respondents. The study sought to establish how consultative stakeholders' involvement approach influence implementation of water projects in Kisumu East-sub county, Kenya.

Table 4.1: Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects

Statements	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Mean	SD
Involvement of stakeholders enhances capturing of beneficiary needs	37(35%)	47(44%)	12(11%)	9(9%)	1(1%)	4.04	0.95
Stakeholder contribution influences beneficiary satisfaction in water projects implementation	29(27%)	43(41%)	28(27%)	5(5%)	0(0%)	3.91	0.86
Inclusion of stakeholder interests promotes ownership of project	26(24%)	49(47%)	20(19%)	8(8%)	2(2%)	3.85	0.95
Environment of trust is created through attendance of site meetings increases	29(27%)	44(42%)	16(15%)	17(16%)	0(0%)	3.80	1.02
Stakeholder interests when taken care of reduces cost overruns in water project implementation.	27(25%)	59(56%)	12(11%)	6(6%)	2(2%)	3.97	0.88
Composite mean and composite standard deviation						3.91	0.93

The study sought to assess the extent to which respondents agreed that involvement enhances beneficiary satisfaction in water projects. Out of 106 respondents 37(35%) strongly agreed, 47(44%) agreed, 12(11) were neutral, 9(9%) disagreed, and 1(1%) strongly disagreed with a mean and standard deviation of 4.04 and 0.95 respectively as shown in table 4.8. The findings suggest that majority of respondents 79% agreed that involvement had an influence on implementation of water projects.

The study sought to determine the extent to which respondents agreed that interest enhances sustainability in water projects implementation. Out of 106 respondents 29(27%) strongly agreed, 43(41%) agreed, 28(27%) were neutral, 5(5%) disagreed, and 0(0%) strongly disagreed with a mean and standard deviation of 3.91 and 0.86 respectively. The findings suggest that majority of respondents 68% agreed that contribution had an influence on implementation of water projects.

The study sought to investigate the extent to which respondents agreed that inclusion enhances beneficiary satisfaction in water projects. Out of 106 respondents 26(24%) strongly agreed, 49(47%) agreed, 20(19%) were neutral, 8(8%) disagreed, and 2(2%) strongly disagreed with a mean and standard deviation of 3.85 and 0.95 respectively. The

4.1 Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects

The second objective the study wanted to achieve was to assess the influence of participative stakeholder involvement approach on implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county.

4.1.1 Descriptive analysis of Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects

To achieve this, the respondents were asked to give their opinions on the level of agreement or disagreement with statements using Likert scale of 1-5 where 1- Strongly disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Neutral, 4-Agree and 5-Strongly agree. The results are presented in Table 4.1 below.

findings suggest that majority of respondents 71% agreed that inclusion had an influence on implementation of water projects. Inclusion of stakeholders in implementation of water projects brought a sense of ownership of project by stakeholders.

The study sought to establish the extent to which respondents agreed that attendance enhances beneficiary satisfaction in water projects. Out of 106 respondents 29(27%) strongly agreed, 44(42%) agreed, 16(15%) were neutral, 17(16%) disagreed, and 0(0%) strongly disagreed with a mean and standard deviation of 3.80 and 1.02 respectively. The findings suggest that majority of respondents 69% agreed that attendance had an influence on implementation of water projects.

The study sought to assess the extent to which respondents agreed that contribution enhances cost effectiveness in water projects implementation. Out of 106 respondents, 27(25%) strongly agreed, 59(56%) agreed, 12(11%) were neutral, 6(6%) disagreed, and 2(2%) strongly disagreed with a mean and standard deviation of 3.97 and 0.88 respectively as shown in table 4.8. The findings suggest that majority of respondents 81% agreed that contribution had an influence on implementation of water projects.

The composite mean was 3.91 and composite standard deviation was 0.93, this showed that Involvement, Contribution and Interests influenced Implementation of Water Projects since there means were higher than the composite mean while Inclusion and Trust did not influence Implementation of Water Projects since there means had smaller values than the composite mean.

4.1.2 Inferential Analysis of Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects

Inferential analysis of participative involvement approach and implementation of water projects was conducted in terms of correlation, regression, ANOVA and coefficients. The results were as outlined below.

4.1.2.1 Correlation of Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects

Pearson product correlation coefficient was used to establish the existence or non-existence of significance relationship as well as degree of association between Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects.

Table 4.2: Correlation of Participative Involvement Approach (PIA) and Implementation of Water Projects (IWP)

		Participative Involvement Approach	Implementation of Water Projects
Participative Involvement Approach	Pearson Correlation	1	.408**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	n	106	106
Implementation of Water Projects	Pearson Correlation	.408**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	n	106	106

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.2 presents the correlation statistics of Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects. The correlation table shows that Participative Involvement Approach was significantly related (p value < 0.05) against Implementation of Water Projects. The p value (p < 0.05) implies that there is a significant relationship between Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects leading to rejection of the null hypothesis H₀. Participative stakeholder involvement approach does not significantly influence implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county. The results are consistent with the findings of studies that have found significant relationships between Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects (Horney, Spurlock, Grabich and Berke (2016), Grabich and Berke (2016)).

4.1.2.2 Regression Analysis of Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects

In this study, simple linear regression was adopted to establish how Participative Involvement Approach Influences Implementation of Water Projects from opinions of the respondents. The reason for using the model was to establish

how each predictor significantly or insignificantly predicted Implementation of Water Projects, secondly to find out how Participative Involvement Approach best predicted Implementation of Water Projects and finally to confirm whether the model was a best fit for predicting Implementation of Water Projects. The regression model summary results are presented in table 4.3 below.

Table 4.3: Regression Analysis between Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects in Kisumu East Sub-County

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.408 ^a	.166	.158	.63846

Predictors: (constant), Involvement, contribution, Attendance, Inclusion and Interest

The table 4.3 presents a model summary of relationship between Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects. To find out the amount of variation in Implementation of Water Projects which explains its relationship with Participative Involvement Approach. R-Square (coefficient of determination) is commonly used statistic to evaluate model fit. It explains the amount of variation in Implementation of Water Projects and relationship with Participative Involvement Approach. The above model summary table indicates that there is a positive multiple correlation (R=0.408) between Implementation of Water Projects and Participative Involvement Approach and those predicted by the regression model. In addition, the coefficient of determination R² = 16.6% indicates that the amount of variance in Implementation of Water Projects is explained by Participative Involvement Approach. The results of the model are consistent with findings of studies that have found significant relationship between Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects (Fenton, Gustafsson, Ivner and Palm, 2016).

4.1.2.3 ANOVA^a Results of the Regression between Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects in Kisumu East Sub-County

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a collection of statistical models and their associated procedures used to analyse the differences among means in a sample. It is a statistical tool used to develop and confirm and explanation of an observed data.

Table 4.4: ANOVA^a Results of the Regression between Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects in Kisumu East Sub-County

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8.446	1	8.446	20.721	.000 ^b
	Residual	42.393	104	.408		
	Total	50.840	105			

Predictors: Involvement, contribution, Attendance, Inclusion and Interest
Dependent Variable: Implementation of Water Projects in Kisumu East Sub-county

ANOVA results on Table 4.4 on regression of Participative Stakeholder Involvement Approach on Implementation of Water Projects. The study sought to find out whether the regression model was best fit for predicting Implementation of Water Projects through use of F-statistics from the ANOVA output. As per results in table 4.11 F=2.721 is significant at p-value<0.05 implying the regression model result is significantly better prediction of Implementation of Water Projects. From the perspective of overall research participants, Participative Involvement Approach had positive influence on Implementation of Water Projects. The results are consistent with the findings of studies that have found significant relationships between Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects (Horney, Spurlock, Grabich and Berke, 2016).

4.1.2.4 Regression Coefficients of the relationship between Predictive Variables and Implementation of Water Projects

The study attempted to establish the extent to which Participative Stakeholder Involvement Approach Influence Implementation of Water Projects in Kisumu East Sub-county. Simple linear regression model was used to test whether Participative Involvement Approach affected Implementation of Water Projects.

Table 4.5: Regression Coefficients of the relationship between Predictive Variables and Implementation of Water Projects

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.257	.474		2.655	.009
	Participative Involvement Approach	.546	.120	.408	4.552	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Implementation of Water Projects						

$$y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_2$$

Where

y=the average score of Implementation of Water Projects, and

X₂= the average score for research participants' Participative Involvement Approach

The reason for using the model was to establish how each predictor significantly or insignificantly predicted Implementation of Water Projects, to find out which of the approaches best predicted Implementation of Water Projects.

4.1.2.5 Testing for Hypothesis 2

The second null hypothesis was H₀₂: Participative stakeholder involvement approach does not significantly influence implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county. The null hypothesis was tested at α=0.05 level of significance. From the correlation results shown in table 4.9, the null hypothesis was rejected since p-value (0.000) <0.05 and it

was concluded that at least one of the explanatory variables is significantly related to the Implementation of Water Projects. The results are consistent with the findings of studies that have found significant relationship between Participative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects (Horney, Spurlock, Grabich and Berke (2016), Grabich and Berke (2016)).

V. CONCLUSION

The study finding indicate that there is a positive multiple correlation coefficient (R=0.408) between Implementation of Water Projects and Participative Involvement Approach and those predicted by the regression model. In addition, the coefficient of determination (R²=16.6%) suggests that the amount of variation in Implementation of Water Projects is explained by Participative Involvement Approach based on the perspective of all the 106 research participants. From the correlation results, the null hypothesis H₀₂: Participative stakeholder involvement approach does not significantly influence implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county was rejected since p value = 0.000<0.05 and so it was concluded that at least one of the explanatory variables is significantly related to the Implementation of Water projects. The study revealed that involvement, contribution, attendance, inclusion and interest affected implementation of water projects to a great extent. Overall, interest had the greatest effect while contribution had the least effect. The study recommends that a holistic approach to project implementation should be embraced where all key stakeholders are identified and brought on board to discuss project affairs and to participate in the decision-making process. This contributes to timely implementation and sustainability of water projects.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akhmouch, A. and Clavreul, D. (2016). Stakeholder Engagement for Inclusive Water Governance: "Practicing What We Preach" with the OECD Water Governance Initiative. 8(204).
- [2] Birongo, J.M. and Quyen, N.L. (2005). An Analysis of Water Governance in Kibera, Kenya. Retrieved 25th April 2019 from: <http://rudar.ruc.dk/bitstream/1800/863/1/Project%20Report%20-%20Group%202249.pdf>
- [3] Chidammodzi, C. L., & Muhandiki, V. S. (2015). Determination of the status of stakeholder participation in the management of the Lake Malawi basin through application of Integrated Lake Basin Management. *Lakes & Reservoirs: Research & Management*, 20(3), 166–181.
- [4] Cook, J. &. (2016). Environment for Development: The Costs of Coping with Poor Water Supply in Rural Kenya. Retrieved from Environment for Development. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-costs-of-coping-with-poor-water-supply-in-rural-Cook-Kimuyu/68f51edccfa1bb9936ea0c6dd2bf2217329a9d4d>
- [5] Giupponi, C., Jakemann, A.J., Karssenber, D. and Hare, M.P. (2006). Sustainable management of Water resources: An integrated approach, Massachusetts: Edward Elgar Publishing limited
- [6] Kusek, J.Z. and Rist, R.C. (2004) Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System. World Bank, Washington DC. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1596/0-8213-5823-5>
- [7] Mahianyu, J. & Njeru, A. (2016). Factors Influencing Project Implementation in the Department of Public Health in Kiambu

- County. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*.(68), 1291-1301.
- [8] Marxsen, C. (2015). Open Stakeholder Consultations at the European Level-Voice of the Citizens? *European Law Journal*, 21(2), 257–280. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eulj.12084>
- [9] Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R. & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts. *Academy of Management Review*. 22, No 4, pp 853 – 886.
- [10] Mugenda, O. M. & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative Approaches. Nairobi: African Centre for Technology Studies.
- [11] Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2012). Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches. Nairobi: Acts Press.
- [12] Nyabera T. M. (2015). *Influence of Stakeholder Participation on Implementation of Projects in Kenya: A Case of Compassion International Assisted Projects in Mwingi Sub-County*. University of Nairobi.
- [13] Olden, P. C. (2003). Hospital and Community Health: Going from Stakeholder Management to Stakeholder Collaboration. *Journal of Health & Human Services Administration*, 26(1), 35–57.
- [14] Owuor, M. O., & Moronge, M. (2017). Influence of Stakeholder Participation on Completion of Water Supply and Sanitation Projects in Informal Settlements in Nairobi City County, Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business and climate change*,3(4), 42 – 59.
- [15] Rowlinson, S., & Yan Ki Fiona Cheung. (2008). Stakeholder management through empowerment: modelling project success. *Construction Management & Economics*, 26(6), 611–623.
- [16] Safford, T., Carlson, M., & Hart, Z. (2009). Stakeholder Collaboration and Organizational Innovation in the Planning of the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study. *Coastal Management*, 37(6), 514–528.
- [17] Shrestha, M. K. (2018). Network Structure, Strength of Relationships, and Communities' Success in Project Implementation. *Public Administration Review*, 78(2), 284–294.
- [18] Slaymaker, T. & Newborne P. (2004). Implementation of Water Supply & Sanitation Programmes under PRSPs. Synthesis of research findings from sub-Saharan Africa <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/2404.pdf> retrieved on 10th April 2019
- [19] Sloan, P. (2009). Redefining Stakeholder Engagement: From Control to Collaboration. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, (36), 25–40. <https://doi.org/10.9774/GLEAF.4700.2009.wi.00005>
- [20] Smith, S. (2012). Toward Inclusive Co-Management: Factors Influencing Stakeholder Participation. *Coastal Management*, 40(3), 327–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08920753.2012.677642>
- [21] UNEP (2019). Sustainable Development Goals and water. <https://www.unenvironment.org/explore-topics/water/what-we-do/supporting-sustainable-development-goals-and-water> retrieved on 5th May 2019
- [22] Uraiwong, P., & Watanabe T. (2017). Stakeholder Analysis of Water Resources Projects in Thailand. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267724507_STAKEHOLDER_ANALYSIS_OF_WATER_RESOURCES_PROJECTS_IN_THAILAND on 30th March 2019