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ABSTRACT
The general objective of the study was to establish the impact of non-governmental organisation partnerships on the donor project implementation. The specific objectives of the study were to establish partnerships benefits on donor project implementation by Irish charity Trocaire Kenya, to establish partnerships challenges on donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya, and to establish lessons learnt by partnerships on donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya.

The study design included descriptive as well as the inferential statistics. Population in the study constituted chief executive officers or equivalent persons of the Local Non-Governmental partners working with Irish charity Trocaire Kenya. The study employed census survey techniques. Each unit of the population was studied to increase accuracy and the reliability of the findings. Questionnaires were used in the collection of data through an online tool survey monkey. Data analysis was aided with Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software. Due to the design of the study, data analysis mainly comprised of Regression statistics observing Multiple R, R square, adjusted R square, and the study error. The analysis also included (ANOVA) analysis of variance to analyze the differences among group means in the sample. Data presentation was aided by tables and figures. Text was used in providing findings, trends, and contextual explanation.

Most organizations agreed (mode = 3) on the many areas of benefit that the partnership had strengthened their operational capacities with 2 strongly agreeing (mode = 4) specifically on financial management skills and technical abilities to deliver service support. The data cross-referenced with the median showed that there was a balance with most agreeing on benefits with only on financial strengthening having a majority strongly agreeing (median = strongly agree).

The VAR.P (Variance Population) function returns the variance in an entire population. The area with the highest variations being 0.817 on the organizations benefiting on issues board and governance. The least variant set of data being financial management skills with a variance of 0.355. Indications that various organizations had varying views regarding the benefit related to governance and the least variations being on aspects of financial support. With the overall main goal of the partnership pegged on financial support, the study collaborates the findings. Financial aspects seem to have a common
response across the organizations as compared to the other aspects on the aspect of the challenges explored that the partnership with Trocaire has experienced during donor project implementation. Majority of responses ranged from neither much, not much and not very much on a few instances (outliers) where the partners indicated experiencing much or very much challenges.

The mode and median fall under the "Not very much" category while the average across ranges between 1.37 (lack of skilled labour) and 2.37 (bureaucracy) an indication that the challenges were more on the external processes across organizations rather than the internal factors within the partners. On challenges, the highest variations were encountered on bureaucracy VAR.P (0.6) as a challenge with the least being in confused accountability and failure to deliver tying with VAR.P (0.35). The varying views on challenges being on aspects of bureaucracy, unlike financial accountability and failure to deliver.

The indications across the findings being that with the funding of projects, comes with the bureaucracy of processes within the partnership while there are concerted efforts to enhance accountability and compliance across the partners. Internally the partners in unison agree on having the internal capacity.

On the lessons learnt, the study revealed a covariance = 0.576177285, which is strongly positive on funding for last years and other years. The standard deviation of last financial years was 1.012018812, while for other years was 1.00532013, indicating increment in variations in funding across the organisation in the last financial year. The variance indicates the values are not very close to the mean, which implies that the funding across the various periods has not been consistent across various Trocaire partner organisations.

The positive correlation between funding and the capacity of the partners indicate enhanced skills built on the relationship between Trocaire and the local partners, the variations in the capacity linking the level of funding to the differences in capacity across the organisations. The capacity-building funding across organisations seems not prioritised hence need exploration to enhance the consistent capacity of the organisation independent from the funding levels and to create sustainability.
The most highlighted challenge is the slow pace of bureaucracy with 2.6% highlighting either both very much and much on the challenges experienced by the organisations. The study recommends that Trocaire should strive to simplify bureaucracy related to partner assessments, procurement, financial reporting, funds disbursement, and contracting. The bureaucracy fails mainly due to the financial disbursement and controls based on the different systems across the donor organisation and implementing partners coupled by the overall donor requirements of the various projects, which differ across various donors.

The study strongly recommends Trocaire to establish sustainable project implementing mechanism with various partners across the country. Partners are heavily dependent on funding from Trocaire to carry out their operations hence putting the organisations into the risk of uncertainty based on the funding environment related to Trocaire. Investment in building the capacity of partners fundraising skills would enhance diversity in their fundraising.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study
According to Knack (2013), a Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) is any non-profit, voluntary citizens' group which is organized on a local, national or international level. The non-governmental organisation is intermediary organisations engaged in funding or offering other forms of support to communities and other organisations that seek to promote development (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2017). In the past three decades, non-governmental organisations role and significance have increased in most developing countries. NGO's, through their external sources of financial support, has impacted more than 250 million people with their diverse agendas and interest groups (Mbom, 2012). NGO’s have given a new perspective to development by looking at development from the base with local agendas and priorities, creating space for improving communities’ socio-economic situation.

There are various types of Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs). The noun NGO is widely used; there are also many other over-lapping terms used such as nonprofit, voluntary, and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs). In most cases, the noun is used as a consequence of the different cultures and histories in which thinking about NGOs have emerged (Knack, 2013). In the United States, the term nonprofit organisation is frequently used because fiscal benefits are awarded to Organisations in a dominant market for the public good.

In the United Kingdom (UK), voluntary organisation or charity is commonly used, following a long tradition of volunteering and voluntary work (Ochieng, 2016). The acronym NGO therefore tends to be used in relation to work done international or developing country since the establishment of the United Nations in 1945, when the designation non-governmental organisation was awarded to certain international non-state organisations that were given consultative status in United nations activities (Chebosseh, Otieno, K’Obiero, Odondo, & Oliech, 2013).

Partnerships are increasingly seen as providing mutual leaning and complementarities opportunities, especially at health sector at both International, regional and local levels. According to studies by Senge, Dow, & Neath (2006), training of research students,
collaborating on research projects designs are examples of how partnerships have been useful to all involved. Further, studies conducted by Sangina, Chitsike, Njuki, Kaaria & Kanzikwera (2007) show that partnerships strengthen participation practices that in turn, enhance collaborative research objectives using structured evaluations and self-assessments.

Partnerships help raise awareness of organisations to work in various forums. According to studies by Dagenais, Queuille and Ridde (2013), partnerships have reported increased likelihood that research results in and nutrition program can easily be disseminated through scientific publication, conference proceedings or other avenues.

Further, Corbin, Mittelmark & Lie (2012) notes that partnerships continue to enhance knowledge transfer strategies particularly aimed local and national institutions hence enhancing long term impacts of health projects while strengthening the capacities of the local Non-Governmental Organisations. At both regional and international levels, partnerships have consequently led to the increased access to communities and governmental representatives.

In the past decade partnerships in the non-governmental sector have increasingly become a new practice in International development. Since the beginning, the nature of their relationships has been evolving from traditional corporate social responsibility, financial engagements giving way to more sophisticated, longer-term partnerships (Saldinger, 2015). In Africa, NGOs have been organisations whose primary role was to provide humanitarian aid and protection on the outskirts of violent conflicts since the 1980s. Non-Governmental Organisations, unlike governments, NGOs are considered by donors as efficient and a flexible funding channel with a high chance of local-level implementation and grassroots participation. In recent years, and particularly the past two decades, there has been a rapid growth in number and size of donor-funded NGOs, consequently bringing an increased focus on the impact of the donor funding in general. NGOs play a significant role in this, and it is apparent that their role in developing and rapidly changing (Ochieng, 2016).

The entities can be local, national or international. The study incorporates all three types of non-governmental organisations but legally categorized into types, namely trusts and Non-Governmental Organisations according to Kenya laws. Trusts defined by Arthur Underhill refer to equitable obligation binding a trustee to deal with trust property for
the benefit of beneficiaries. In Kenya, Trusts are registered under Trust act of laws of Kenya. On their part, Non-Governmental organisations are registered under the public benefits act of 2013. They may be either international or national. In the study, the national Non-Governmental Organisations, together with Trusts registered under the laws of Kenya, constitute the Local Non-Government Organisations (LNGOS). The study looks at the partnership impact of non-governmental organisations on donor project implementation. In particular, the study examines the impact of the partnership between an International Non-Governmental organisation-Trocaire with local non-governmental organisations on donor project implementation.

According to Sullivan (2018), partnership in the development sector has become so paramount to such an extent that most donors now only fund INGO programmes if they are partnering NGOs. The increased support of partnership is out of the need to promote local ownership but more importantly improve humanitarian coordination during conflict or natural disaster by ensuring greater predictability and accountability (Altahir, 2018). International donors opine that crises have become more sophisticated, bringing more people together rendering coordination, communication, and resource mobilisation more chaotic. Partnerships are seen as a critical method to address the challenge of confusion by focusing on partnerships not just among international actors, but also between international non-governmental organisations and local non-governmental organisations. Combining skills, expertise, skills, and resources partnerships deliver aid and strengthen the local organisation's leadership capacity (Altahir, 2018).

The importance of partnerships is encapsulated in Sudanese proverb that "One hand cannot clap" expressing the attainment of results is a result of pulling efforts together in non-governmental organisations. In the Non-Governmental Organisations sector partnership is defined interpreted as an award to reflect humanitarian, moral, political, ideological or spiritual solidarity between non-government development organisation's in the developed nations and developing nations joined together to pursue social change (Squire, 2012). In 2016, following the world humanitarian summit, there was concerted effort to call for a more balanced humanitarian system that value local and national humanitarian interventions supported and recognized by international humanitarian agencies, donors and international NGOs.
The localisation of aid through partnerships increases the impact and effectiveness of aid to the vulnerable communities. It was argued that International NGO's have to improve their operations with local Non-Governmental Organisations (LNGOS) to better respond and recognize their leadership as well as adjusting accordingly to their project implementation, advocacy, media, and fundraising work (Shifting Power, 2018). According to Brabant and Patel (2017), the world humanitarian summit led to a voluntary commitment of major governmental donors and international relief agencies to provide "more support and funding tools for local and national responders. In particular, Donor and international relief agencies committed to enhancing partnerships in three crucial areas, namely capacity building support, funding, elimination of barriers to localisation, and coordination at the national level.

Partnerships with Local Non-Governmental Organisations are increasingly being viewed as a crucial aspect in the delivery of humanitarian response in the vulnerable communities. It has come to the attention of donors and international relief agencies that Humanitarian action led by local humanitarian responders in crisis-affected countries, can be faster and more appropriate, saving more lives and alleviating the suffering of victims (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2017).

Local response is faster and easily accessible. The importance of partnerships in humanitarian response and development has been recognized by the United Nations agencies. The UN through sustainable development goal 16:7 calls for responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels (United Nations, 2015). There are many important reasons why partnership and localisation of aid is being advocated for in the humanitarian sector.

The local embedded humanitarian responders can respond to the many small-scale crises that are under the threshold of international intervention. A landslide in a remote rural area or a small-scale population displacement across a border will affect a large population but may well stay under the radar screen of the international humanitarian community. In such cases, local governments, the local Red Cross and Red Crescent branch or a local civil society organisation working on a development project may be the only organisations able to respond immediately to emergency needs (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2017).
Partnerships with grassroots Organisations ensure that the communities, especially in conflict areas, readily accept the local response. In the contemporary world, it has become challenging or impossible for expatriate or even national humanitarian workers associated with international organisations to access people in need. International organisations are increasingly resorting to local humanitarian responders to perform needs assessments, deliver aid and interact with local populations and local or national armed groups. In specific contexts, this can also improve the general acceptance for humanitarian aid from armed groups or local authorities (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2017). Third, the response by local actors is more cost-effective. Most of today's support to local humanitarian responders is undertaken through sub-grant arrangements from UN agencies or international NGOs, with funding passing from donors or other organisations to the international actor, and then on to the local humanitarian responder. Partnerships between international organisations and local humanitarian responders can add value to the response and help build national capacity. At the same time, a decreasing bureaucracy of transactions between the donor and local humanitarian responders can increase the efficiency of aid delivery by cutting transaction costs.

Partnerships allow local partners to link aid to development easily. Direct support to a local humanitarian responder can increase national capacity and responsibility when it recognizes and respects local leadership and decision-making. For example, when donors help a national government to build a social safety net that can absorb shocks in case of a natural disaster, development cooperation goals are aligned with humanitarian preparedness (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2017).

Finally, the use of local partnerships increases accountability of humanitarian aid both to beneficiaries and to the donors. More often, International humanitarian actors are often accountable to their donors more than their beneficiaries are, even if most of them have set mechanisms to take the voice of affected populations into account. The local humanitarian responders who are well rooted in society, affected populations are often more vigilant, asking for better quality goods and services, be they national NGOs and local government, which can increase accountability (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2017). For these reasons, the Irish Charity Trocaire has begun to pay attention to local and national organisations in humanitarian and aid sector.
while national actors in the delivery of development aid. Trocaire is leveraging on building solid partnerships with the local non-governmental organisations to gain access to difficult regions in need of humanitarian and development aid (Geoffroy & Geoffroy, 2017). Trócaire is an Irish International Non-Governmental organisation registered under charity Regulatory Authority No. 20009601. The Catholic Church in 1973 established the charity as a way for Irish people to donate to the development and emergency relief overseas. The mandate of the organisation is to raise awareness of injustice and poverty in the world. (Trocaire, 2018).

Trócaire began working in Kenya in 1994 where the Nairobi office was setup. Since then, the organisation has expanded programme activities into the informal slum areas of Nairobi and Nakuru, the arid lands of Turkana and East Pokot in Baringo County. The organisation has an operational presence in Embu, Kitui and Tharaka Nithi enhancing communities' food security and livelihoods. (Trocaire, 2018). The organisation works across four thematic areas in Kenya which Humanitarian response, food and resource rights, women empowerment, and justice and Human Rights. In humanitarian response, Trocaire has been at the forefront of responding to severe drought and famine experienced in Kenya in 2017. In 2018, it was estimated that 5.6 million people in Kenya were affected by drought and famine. Of this, 369,277 children in the arid and semi-arid counties of Kenya required urgent lifesaving treatment for acute malnutrition.

Trócaire's response has been focused on hard-hit areas particularly, Baringo, Turkana, as well as semi-arid areas of eastern Kenya. Through humanitarian response program, Trócaire has supported approximately 14,000 households are receiving food rations and water. Four thousand eight hundred of the most affected and vulnerable households in the northern region have benefited from cash transfers to support their households. Eight thousand children at risk of malnutrition have already been reached with high-energy nutritional food distributed through health facilities. In the Diocese of Meru Kenya, the organisation has undertaken the vaccination of 10,000 livestock to protect food security and livelihoods of pastoral communities (Trocaire, 2018).

Through the food and resource rights programme, the organisation provides knowledge, training and support for more sustainable livelihoods in some of the most dangerous climate change-affected arid regions of Kenya. In collaboration with partners, Trocaire helps built resilience and food security for families and communities at risk of drought.
and famine. The organisation also work with local communities to provide sustainable solutions on the use of scarce resources such as pasture and water, which have the potential to cause conflict (Trocaire, 2018). The organisation Integrated Gender and HIV (IGH) programme focusses on the empowerment of women and girls at risk of domestic violence, abuse, and female genital mutilation and HIV infection. The organisation support several clinics in city slum areas, which provide treatment and care to poor communities. The organisation also engages in human rights awareness in grassroots communities by promoting legislation and implementation of laws and policies in favour of gender equity behavio (Trocaire, 2018).

To promote justice and human rights in the context of current devolution, the organisation promotes more accountable and responsive governance by demanding protection of human rights and access to social services for marginalized groups especially youth, women and children. More importantly, the organisation support conflict resolution work for communities adversely affected by political and ethnic violence (Trocaire, 2018). In the past decade, Trocaire has been keen to create and leverage partnership in implementing projects in collaboration with their local communities. The local partners bring an in-depth understanding of their local context, language and culture, while Trocaire contributes experience, funding and staff. The organisation has a deliberate effort to listen and implement projects based on the needs of people. Through partnerships, the organisation can bring lasting change as well as empowering communities to overcome poverty through their efforts and abilities.

Globally during has collaborated with Intergovernmental organisations such The European Union and the United Nations. Trócaire's funding relationship with the EU dates to 1979 with funding for two projects in Latin America. Currently, the European Union is collaborating with Trocaire to deliver projects on development and democracy through the European instrument for democracy and human rights (EIDHR) and Development cooperation (DCI) (Trocaire, 2019).

The partnerships with the European Union are geared towards accelerating the implementation of agenda 2030 and sustainable development goals (SDGs). The partnership has seen the EU release humanitarian aid funds relief operations for victims of natural disasters and conflicts outside the European Union. Trocaire distributes Aid from the EU directly to people in need, without discrimination of their race, ethnic group,
religion, gender, age, nationality or political affiliation. Regionally the EU funding has enabled Trócaire to carry out development and humanitarian work in many countries across Latin America, Africa and Asia including Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, Liberia, Malawi, Myanmar, Rwanda, Somalia, Uganda and Zimbabwe (Trocaire, 2019).

In East Africa, there are over 26 million people facing malnutrition and the threat of famine across South Sudan, Somalia, Kenya and Ethiopia due to prolonged drought. Trócaire has been in partnership with local non-governmental organisations and is currently reaching hundreds of thousands of people across the East Africa region with emergency food, water, sanitation and healthcare. In Kenya, Trocaire has established relationships with forty-one local non-governmental organisations. Trocaire work is to ensure that the organisation's work addresses the underlying cause of poverty and marginalisation (Trocaire, 2018). Partnership with local non-governmental organisations is central to Trócaire's programme work in the developing world. Trócaire's project activities such as direct advocacy, campaigning and development, education work is carried out in collaboration with local or international partners.

Trócaire's mission is to realise dignity in the lives of the poor by providing essential services such as food, water, shelter, education and healthcare as well as promoting human rights. These services are essential in their own right and maybe critical in some situations, particularly in emergencies. Empowering individuals and communities have real and lasting in society. By empowering individuals and communities stand up for their fundamental rights change and development in the society is realise (Trocaire, 2006). Through collective action by individuals against unjust structures and unequal relationships, Trócaire, helps poor and vulnerable people make their own decisions and manage their development affairs (Trocaire, 2006).

The ultimate aim of the partnership approach is that the agencies that Trocaire support will continue to develop into a thriving, independent organisation that can articulate their demands for justice in their own countries, and, as appropriate, work alongside Northern CSOs in the fight for justice at the global level (Trocaire, 2012). Trócaire's programme approaches heavily influences the nature and range of partners. At the heart of the programme, the approach is the belief that the root causes of poverty must be addressed coherently and systematically at a variety of levels – sometimes ranging from local grassroots level right up to global level. In working programmatically, therefore,
Trócaire seeks to develop partnerships with organisations that can empower poor and vulnerable women and men and strive for change at various levels concerning a programme theme.

Partner organisations can vary widely in capacity and nature from small local community-based organisations (CBOs) to local NGOs (LNGOs) operating at local and national levels in the countries where we work. They include Church and non-Church agencies, missionaries - especially Irish missionaries, networks working on development issues at local, national, and international levels and, in a few cases, international NGOs working at the local level (Trocaire, 2012). By partnership with the local non-governmental organisation to bring change in the lives of people, Trocaire is guided by five overarching principles. These include Partnerships are based on Shared Vision and Values, partnerships support poverty alleviation and promote social justice and gender equality, relationships are based on trust, accountability and transparency, partners have clear roles, responsibilities and expectations, partnerships are based on mutual commitment and flexibility (Trocaire, 2012).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Globally, partnerships in the development sector have become so paramount to such an extent that most donors now only fund INGO programmes if they are in partnership NGOs. This is out of the need to promote local ownership but more importantly improve humanitarian coordination in conflict or natural disaster by ensuring greater predictability and accountability (Sullivan, 2018). International donors opine that crises have become more sophisticated, bringing more people together rendering coordination, communication, and resource mobilisation more chaotic. Partnerships are key in mitigating confusion in project delivery at the regional, national level and local levels. Effective aid delivery can be aided through partnerships that combine skills, expertise, and resources at the local level (Shifting Power, 2018).

The limits and challenges of partnership partnerships at Trocaire Kenya have not come to fore. While promoting partnerships, it is essential to reflect and evaluate the elements that make partnership in NGO successfully. More importantly, there is a need to understand the evolving nature of NGO partnership to bolster the benefits of such a relationship between International Organisations such as Trocaire and local implementing partners in Kenya. The understanding of partnerships dynamics must not only take the perspectives
of international relief agencies but also local Non-Governmental organisations on the ground to fully harness the potential of partnership in delivering humanitarian and development aid (Filho & Vargas, 2017).

According to the study by Aburi, Wimber, Makau (2010), the impact of partnerships on donor projects have been analysed from mainly International relief agencies perspectives. Further, Filho and Vargas (2017) notes, there exists numerous interactions between the state, private sector and society through actions based on networks, co-production, and collaborative governance. The existence of Non-governmental Organisations with varying characteristics (NGO) bring limitations to effective long-term partnerships (Aburi, Wimber, & Makau, 2010). Partnerships between the state and NGOs or among NGOs may distort the very nature of these organisations as representative of interests of society, as it may reduce their advocacy role, their financial independence, their accountability orientation and the perception by the attended public as not part of the state as well as the development process. There is now a need to understand the impact of the partnership on donor projects. The perspectives of local non-governmental on the impact of the partnership on donor project implementation are critical in fostering quality humanitarian and development aid to most vulnerable communities.

1.3 General Objective
The general objective of the study was to establish the impact of non-governmental organisations partnerships on donor project implementation: a case of Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya.

1.4 Specific Objectives
1.4.1 To establish the partnerships benefits on donor project implementation by Irish charity Trocaire Kenya.

1.4.2 To establish the partnerships challenges on donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya.

1.4.3 To establish the lessons learnt by partnerships on donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya

1.5 Significance of the Study
The study provides Trocaire board of directors, other international non-governmental organisations and donors with critical knowledge on understanding benefit limits and
challenges of partnership partnerships in the NGO sector in Kenya. While promoting partnerships, it is essential to reflect and evaluate the elements that make partnership in NGO successfully. More importantly, there is a need to understand the evolving nature of NGO partnership to bolster the benefits of such a relationship between International Organisations such as Trocaire and local implementing partners in Kenya.

1.5.1 Trocaire Board of Directors

Forty-one local non-governmental organisations have a partnership arrangement with Trocaire in Kenya. The organisations help in delivering humanitarian aid semi-arid marginalized parts of Kenya. The study findings enable Trocaire's board of directors to have a firsthand understanding of benefits, challenges, and partner breakthroughs from Local partner's perspectives. The feedback is useful in operational improvement to humanitarian and development aid delivery to the communities.

1.5.2 Other International Non-Governmental Organisations

Many international relief agencies are in partnership with local non-governmental organisations in Kenya in delivering humanitarian aid in most vulnerable and marginalized areas of the country. The study findings are useful to these organisations as they provide a firsthand understanding of benefits, challenges, and partner breakthroughs from Local partner's perspectives. The feedback will be useful in operational improvement to humanitarian and development aid delivery to the communities. It is becoming evident that small Local Non-Governmental Organisations can deliver faster responses in comparison to international agencies provided they are furnished with appropriate (Corbett, 2010).

1.5.3 Institutional and Individual humanitarian donors

Partnerships are essential in the delivery of donor project implementation. Donors are keen to know how their resources can change the lives of those most vulnerable. By understanding the benefits, challenges, and breakthrough from partner perspectives, the donors will make an informed decision on how to tackle grass root challenges of development through local partnerships.
1.6 Scope of the Study
The study covers Trocaire operations in Kenya for the past five years from the study. The study population were 41 respondents working in the different partner organisations in Nairobi. The study was conducted in Kenya from 4th July 2019 to 10th August 2019. The study was conducted in all Trocaire partners across Kenya. To get all the respondents across the country presented great financial, security, and logistical challenge. To overcome limitations occasioned by expansive distance, the study opted to collect data through digital platform Survey Monkey. Through Survey Monkey tool, real time responses were relayed through customized dashboard.

1.7 Definition of Terms
1.7.1 Partnerships
A partnership is defined as Collaboration between International non-governmental organisations with Local non-governmental organisations (NGOs and Trusts) (Stobart, 2010).

1.7.2 International Non-Governmental Organisation
International non-governmental Organisation refers to an entity registered under the Public Benefits Organisations act. The Public Benefits Organisations Act is the new legislative framework that provides for the formation, operation and growth of Civil Society Organisations. Recognizing that Public Benefit Organisations comprises a significant economic sector that employs almost half as many people as the public sector (The Republic of Kenya, 2013).

1.7.3 Non-governmental Organisations
Non-governmental Organisation refers to an entity registered under the Public Benefits Organisations act (The Republic of Kenya, 2013). In humanitarian circles, Non-governmental Organisations can also refer to groups of people not formed by the government to solve a specific problem in society. (Mazibuko, 2018).

1.7.4 Trust
Trust refers to an entity registered under the Kenya Trust act (NGOs registered as Trusts. (The Republic of Kenya, 2012). In legal terms, the trust permits the separation of legal ownership and beneficial interest: the trustees become the owners of the trust property as far as third parties are concerned. (Thomson Reuters, 2019).
1.8 Chapter Summary
The chapter introduced the background of the study. In particular, the chapter introduced non-governmental organisations as the new perspective to looking at development from the base with local agendas, and priorities creating space for improving community socio-economic situations. Through the study's problem statement, the chapter emphasized the need to understand partnerships dynamics by bringing on board the perspectives of Local non-governmental organisations previously unconsidered on board. To this end, the chapter introduced three main objectives of the study seeking to interrogate the benefits, challenges, and lessons learnt on partners and their impact on donor project implementation. The next chapter is the literature review of the study. The study covers an introduction to the literature review and literature analysis for three variables used in the study. The third chapter covers research methodology, the fourth chapter will deal with results and findings, while the fifth chapter covers research discussion, conclusion, and recommendation.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Chapter two of the study is organised into three sections. The first section focusses on understanding the benefits of NGO partnerships on donor project implementation in Kenya; the second section focuses on challenges of NGO partnerships to donor project implementation in Kenya; the third section focusses on understanding lessons learnt by NGO partnerships on donor project implementation in Kenya.

2.2 Partnerships Benefits on Donor Project Implementation.

2.2.1 NGOs Partnership

A partnership is defined as a relationship of mutual respect between independent organisations with common purpose, responsibilities, and expectations. In recent times, partnerships between local non-governmental organisations (LNGOS) and International Non-Governmental organisations have become prominent in implementing donor-funded projects (Stobart, 2010). In humanitarian partnerships, more than one institution agrees to combine their resources to provide essential goods or services to local communities. Partnerships have various benefits the produce when implementing donor projects in various regions of operations.

First, the donor landscape has been shrinking for the past ten years. In recent times, the rise of right-wing governments in Europe and the USA has led to deeper funding cuts. In this regard, LNGOS and INGOs are under increasing pressure to diversify their funding sources. Partnerships provide extra funding source independent of government funding (Damlamian, 2016). NGOs face the challenge of acquiring funds, especially in the corporate world due to lack of critical contacts. Partnerships build on personal relations of corporate executives and staff from NGO, between Local Non-Governmental organisations LNGOS, International Non-Governmental organisations help in eliminating this challenge (Yamamoto, 2014).

On the other hand, donors, especially in corporate sectors, are recognizing that by creating jobs as well as transferring technologies, their business can bring economic benefits to poor communities. In recent times, both LNGOS and INGOs are now considering these new ventures for tackling issues of poverty in Kenya (Yamamoto,
Both LNGOS and INGOs see partnerships as having valuable and complementary assets: the private sector is instrumental in creating employment and economic growth and therefore has a direct impact on the lives of the poor. On the other hand, LNGOS and INGOs have expertise in working to strengthen communities to ensure that the poorest benefit from this growth. Alleviating poverty requires both collaboration and coordination from both sectors (Damlanian, 2016).

The partnership between LNGOS and INGOs go beyond financial gain to the benefits communities and donors. On the one hand, the International non-profit organisation has considerable expertise in areas of financial management and long-term planning. The staff who work in INGOs have insights into different management styles and business skills; innovative, risk-taking perspective, the injection of leadership capacity; and the ability to focus on making things happen and getting results which are not at the same level with LNGOS (Heap, 2015).

The partnership between the two creates a sense of accountability, efficiency, innovation, and excellent service delivery to communities they serve. Partnerships facilitate incorporation of some efficiency standards inspired by corporate and international influence into their practices: LNGOs can capitalize on the skills and expertise of the individuals involved through board participation, project development or employee volunteerism. Besides, INGOs provides access to resources in research and development, experience and expertise in marketing support, distribution services, and outreach. LNGOS partnerships with INGOs provides them with a powerful instrument to develop a self-sustaining pattern of activities reducing financial risks for the donors. LNGOs cannot usually afford to work on building better financial management, information and technology, or strategic planning skills, which would help them to better, carry out their mission. Partnerships with INGOs boost these skills in their organisation. With capacity, LNGOS improve quality in project management that increases the value and prestige of the donors (Damlanian, 2016).

Partnerships between LNGOS and INGOs such as Trocaire present an opportunity for LNGOs advocates for their courses through INGO and donors. On the one hand, donor institutions invest heavily in publicizing their involvement in social causes. On another hand, the involvement with NGOs helps donors boost their social marketing on the part of
corporations that simultaneously enhance their brand image and accessibility (Damlanian, 2016).

Partnerships between LNGOs and INGOs such as Trocaire have been used in mitigating risks, especially security risks associated with project implementation in high-risk areas in Northern Kenya and Somalia. When INGOs implement directly implements the project, the cost of security billed to the donor is usually high as compared to when LNGOs are used. Similarly, the partnership has helped reduce the long-term costs and reputational liabilities of providing local communities with the public services that should rightly be the responsibility of governments (Warner, 2013). The partnership between LNGOs and Trocaire have been useful in merging the core competencies of the organisation in terms of distribution network, project management skills, procurement policies which are applied or adapted to enhance the geographic reach, time to benefit, quality and or sustainability of the activities of its strategic partner's community groups or international donor agencies.

2.2.2 Resources

Development and humanitarian issues facing local communities are complex and multifaceted. International and Local Non-Governmental organisations are most often confronted by these environmental, humanitarian, social, and development challenges that may be overlapping and sometimes mutually reinforcing. The solutions aimed at one part of the system are unlikely to be fully successful due to the counteracting impacts of other factors. Partnerships between INGOs and LNGOs are essential in effectively tackling these challenges at a local level (McQuaid, 2000).

Partnerships are important mechanisms to achieve complementarity and avoid wasteful duplication of efforts between INGOs and LNGOs. Partnership allows a pooling of resources so that larger projects, or more aspects of a project can be tackled than is possible for an individual agency. While the agency may lose total control of its own resources, it may gain influence over a larger set of resources. Such ‘leverage’ of resources is often also a performance measure of local economic development.

According to MacQuaid (2000), partnerships between INGOs and LNGOs increase the scale of available resources by bring it different types of resources, such as information and expertise not available in an organization such as the legislative power, land, finance, or knowledge, alternative perspectives on the issues and contacts from local community
Participants or the private sector. Partnerships in humanitarian sector partnership may enable the partners to gain the benefits of economies of scale terms of finance, marketing, administration or production.

2.2.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency

According to Webb (1991), depending upon the nature of the problem, partnership in humanitarian sector can greatly increase an individual organisation’s effectiveness and efficiency, especially through improved co-ordination between and within organisations. The author postulates that partnerships create synergies between various bodies reducing wasteful duplication hence greater outputs and increased savings might be realised.

Humanitarian partnerships help reduce the confusion faced by people in identifying the appropriate agency by acting as an umbrella for people to approach. Also, many initiatives use community activists and groups to become more responsive to user needs and so, for example, increase participation rates in training initiatives, as prospective trainees have greater confidence and trust in such groups and will respond to them rather than to an ‘outside’ agency. Hence this should increase the efficiency of the humanitarian interventions rather than being only a redistributive policy (Webb, 1991).

According to Kohler et al (1993), humanitarian partnerships also play an important role in breaking down the stereotypical views of partners towards one another, building trust and making joint working easier and more efficient, as well as improving understanding and knowledge of each other’s’ organisation opening the possibility of better co-ordination and creation of synergy and new ways of joint working. Partnerships may also improve effectiveness, especially in the long term, through creating stability, building local confidence and minimising risk for partners and potential investors, and may be an important mechanism for building local capacity for action and control by the local community and other actors (Kotler, 1993).

2.2.4 Capacity Strengthening

NGOs focusing on field implementation, capacity strengthening and responding to urgent basic needs, taking a longer view with a focus on research and training. Both are now under pressure from major international donors and their own leadership to collaborate. This is due in part to an increasing number of case studies that show that the two partners can complement one another’s expertise, and that this type of complementary expertise
can increase the efficacy, impact, transparency, and sustainability of donor investments in development. While some partnerships forged because of this shift in donor priorities and guidance result in positive outcomes, many do not (Bukenya & Hickey, 2014).

Most of the successful ones only work for the short period of time when the two parties are co-implementing a joint project that has external funding (Aniekwe, Hayman, & Mdee 2012). This is because the motivation and culture of an NGO is very different. Most organization collaborated with a large NGO, and they are less developed financial or programmatic relationships with one. As a result, many of these partnerships are focused on specific projects with little forethought about how the relationship will be managed or the partners’ longer-term goals (Olivier, Hunt, & Riddle, 2016). Thus, there is little incentive to continue the collaboration once the project funding and/or contract ends, which limits the transformative impact of these development investments.

Although NGOs have grown overall, growth has been much smaller in recent years, and funding has been scaled back in some countries in the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis. The role of the private sector is also growing proportionately larger. Institutional donors have also raised their standards. Securing grants has become a highly competitive process requiring a significant investment of resources and deep knowledge of technical subject matter, along with the ability to demonstrate a track record of results (Oliver, Hunt, & Riddle, 2016). Programs are required to be evidence-based, using rigorous methods to ensure that donor investments and taxpayer dollars will not be wasted. In an era of instant information and real-time communication, individual donors are also demanding more information about the programs they fund beyond heart-warming human-interest stories. It is no longer enough for NGOs to say that they are doing good work. They need to prove it and need a credible third party to back this up. These pressures have pointed NGOs toward the need to undertake more rigorous evaluations and applied research with institutions that have strong technical credibility (Oliver, Hunt, & Riddle, 2016).

NGOs must also understand their own unique culture and administrative models. Some tend to be relatively centralized, while others are extremely decentralized. A more centralized institution can be somewhat easier to navigate since a central institutional focal point can provide a link to many different stakeholders. A less centralized institution can be more challenging since it may require building many different relationships, often
within each school or college, and sometimes even at the center or institute level. This can be a time-consuming process, first just to understand the basic structure, then to figure out who is interested in exploring opportunities. Some universities are extremely siloed, and it can be difficult to get to know the institution aside from individual contacts with faculty in each school. In some cases, especially the more centralized institutions, an institutional memorandum of understanding (MOU) can help to move the partnership process forward. However, in a decentralized environment, this may not actually help much since it is at the level of individual contacts that one can make things happen (Banks, Hulme, & Edwards, 2014).

Building full partnerships takes time and the leadership of an institutional focal point on both sides who can serve as a bridge between partners. Any NGO that is serious about developing collaboration should have a designated focal person for the activities and have that function made part of the person’s level of effort for their job. When the partnerships are limited, it might be possible for this person to combine these activities with other activities within the institution. As the number of formal partnerships grows, have an experienced staff member in a full-time position tasked with this coordination (Hunt, Leege, Agogino, & Woodson, 2016).

2.3 Partnerships Challenges on Donor Project Implementation.

2.3.1 General Challenges with Partnership on Donor Project Implementation
Despite many advantages of partnerships on donor project implementation, such partnerships are not without challenges. According to Claire (2016), partnerships are not for everyone. It is difficult for an organisation to find organisations that are compatible in the first place as well as implementing a donor plan between two entities with different philosophies of working (Shinn, 2016). The mission of the organisation is the foundation of any partnership. Enhancing the outcome of donor project delivery should not outweigh the mission and vision of organisations. If partnerships bring mission drift with it, it could weaken the organisation blurring of vision and mission in the pursuit of funding. Equally, partnerships need to share specific core values. According to Menzies, the unifying values must be a coherent foundation on which strategy, delivery, priorities can be built (Menzies, 2010).
Partnerships in Non-governmental organisations face significant leadership and integrity challenges. NGO leaders misappropriate donor funding meant to benefit communities. These leaders prefer to live entirely off foreign money while pretending to serve communities (Kapoor, 2015). Partnerships need strong leadership that will be accountable, transparent, effective, and efficient in delivering donor-funded projects to communities. Partnerships are increasingly failing to deliver for both the communities and the donors. Conversely, partnerships must strive to produce tangible results. Partnerships need to build credibility through service to humanity. On the other hand, partnership credibility is built with tangible achievements on the ground (Menzies, 2010).

Partnerships require time, energy, and connection to make and influence change. Sometimes partnerships lack enough funding to run operations that deliver results. Moreover, when donor funding is possible partnerships lack a skilled workforce to facilitate the implementation of donor projects. Small LNGOS may also lack the required connection to influence change (Menzies, 2010). According to the study by Els and Carstensen (2015), funding of LNGOs is sporadic and inconsistent. In 2013, for instance, direct funding to LNGOs was a paltry 0.2 per cent. The amounts channelled through INGOs and UN agencies are thought to be much higher. Major donors tend to rely on intermediary organisations (INGOs or UN agencies) to administer small-scale grants (CAFORD, 2014).

Small Organisations have challenges in accessing national funding due to lack of good donor connections, numerous technical challenges and shot deadlines to submit calls to International Non-Governmental Organisations. (CAFORD, 2014). Citing South Sudan case, Corbett (2011) note that without a change in how aid agencies attempt to balance their bureaucratic need for centralized control greatly hinders donor project implementation.

The lack of partnership sustainability by a non-governmental organisation on donor project implementation remains a significant challenge in the humanitarian world. According to Ramalingana (2015), local organisations feel their sustainability as organisations are been weakened by partnerships between International Organisations in implementing donor projects. Good quality staff prefer to work for INGOs at the expense of LNGOs. The competition for personnel, funds, and public space between International Organisations and Local Non-Governmental Organisations limit the effective
implementation of donor projects. Investment in the sustainable capacity building of local actors by current humanitarian practices is responsible for the development of dependency culture on international non-governmental organisations. The local actors are eventually sidelined and not treated as partners but as sub-contractors. The efficiency and effectiveness of first-responders in the immediate wake of disasters, reconstruction or recovery efforts is highly constrained in these cases. Further, Local non-governmental organisations are excluded in Key policy deliberations and planning critical avenues where decisions that affect local non-governmental organisations, as well as communities, are taken (Ramalingana, 2015).

Cultural barriers remain a considerable obstacle in partnerships. Cultural barriers do, at times, hinder effective donor project implementation. There is but mostly refer to the inability of international responses to work effectively in any language other than English. The segmentation of aid into different cluster system contributes to the inability of international organisations to attract and integrate local actors hence limiting donor project implementation (Currion & Hedlund, 2011). Partnerships can interfere with the legitimacy of donor project implementation.

A study conducted by Obrecht, (2014), INGOs are increasingly concerned that they will be rendered irrelevant if they allow full localisation of the humanitarian response to LNGOs. In the perspectives of the non-governmental organisations, legitimacy comes from service INGOs. Being a convener or a broker wanes the credibility of international organisations. In other words, if you aim to do yourself out of a job at the country level, then that is fine, but how do you have any legitimacy at the global level?" International relief agencies, therefore confronted by the need to choose to defend their right to provide humanitarian assistance or take the actions necessary to capacity build LNGOs.

2.3.2 Goals
The absence of clear objectives is regularly referred to as a noteworthy reason for the disintegration of humanitarian partnerships. Numerous partnerships have concurred expansive points, however their nitty gritty objectives might be indistinct or the partners in in humanitarian sector may have contrasting understandings of what the objectives mean. This can quickly prompt misconception and conceivable clash between the INGOs and LNGOs. This could be highlighted if a few partnerships had undeclared, or 'covered
up’, plans and were purposely looking to pick up bit of leeway over different partnerships or trying to accomplish their very own hierarchical objectives, without supporting or responding the endeavors of their present partners. In humanitarian industry, it might be hard to distinguish the proper nature and level at which the network or private division, or other, take an interest (McQuaid, 2000).

2.3.3 Resources Costs

Humanitarian partnerships have associated assets costs. For example, as far as staff time in dialogs and settling on understandings, and in deferrals to choices because of meeting all partners. According to McQuaid (1997), it might be hard to close a wasteful or ineffective partnership, or even one whose target has been accomplished. There can likewise be issues of responsibility as no single partner feels completely responsible for the activities of the partnership because of the split among obligation and control (McQuaid, 1997).

2.3.4 Unequal Power

In many humanitarian partnerships there is inconsistent power. As Syrett (1997) contends, conceptualisations of partnerships frequently neglect to perceive the inconsistent power relations between social partnerships (Syrett, 1997). On his part, Cadbury (1993) contends that the terms counsel and open partnerships are regularly utilized conversely, however that organization is an increasingly included type of interest with a wide scope of implications, and suggests power being shared similarly among all partners (Cadbury, 1993). Bennett and McCoshan (1993) contend that the organization might be inconsistent as it might be more significant for one partner than the other(s) or one partner can force or order the others (for instance through giving or retaining fund). This be that as it may, may cause impressive strains as one body looks to adjust another’s need (for instance to modify training arrangement to reflect monetary needs), especially where a non-chose partner tries to constrain an equitably chose policy or plan of action (Bennett & McCoshan, 1993).

2.3.5 Organisational Difficulties

Authoritative challenges hindering fruitful coordination of projects and approaches pose great challenges to partnerships. Jennings and Krane (1994) found that different boundaries obstructed project coordination. These obstructions were: authoritative (these
incorporate contrasting missions, proficient directions, structures and procedures of offices); legitimate/specialized (rules or guidelines set somewhere near more recognizable expert, and the innovative limit and routine with regards to the association); and political both outside world of politics yet in addition inside administration governmental issues (Jennings & Krane, 1994).

2.3.6 Insufficient Funding

NGOs are expressing difficulty in finding sufficient, appropriate and continuous funding for their work. They find accessing donors as challenging as dealing with their funding conditions (Batti, 2014). They perceive there to be certain cartels of individuals and NGOs that control access to donor funds. They have limited resource mobilization skills and are often not looking for funds that are available locally, preferring to wait for international donors to approach them. There is a high dependency of donors and a tendency to shift interventions to match donor priorities. There is a lack of financial, project and organizational sustainability (Islam, 2014).

2.3.7 Poor Governance

Poor governance was recognized within the sector, within the NGO Council and within individual NGOs. Knowledge of good governance varied widely, with some regions indicating very little understanding of why NGOs are required to have Boards or what their roles and functions should be. Many other participants explained that it is difficult to achieve good governance with founders who wished to own their NGOs for their own purposes. Participants with better understanding of good governance appreciated that this is fundamental to NGO accountability and transparency. Many NGOs mismanage their resources, quite often with the involvement and encouragement of their Boards that eat their NGOs resources. Finding Board members can be difficult if you are not willing to pay them or provide allowances (Banks, & Hulme, 2012).

NGOs in many countries do not have effective governance structures and where a board exists, they are rarely effective in providing strategic leadership in ensuring resources are mobilised. NGOs boards are supposed to provide guidance and oversight to the operations of the NGO. However, many boards are not aware of their role in resource mobilization. The presence and extent of involvement of management and governance structures in NGOs influenced their ability to mobilize resources. Many times, NGOs did not have governance instruments such as constitutions, policies and guidelines and this tended to scare off potential donors (Batti, 2014).
2.3.8 Development Approaches

Many NGOs are still focusing upon what some refer to the ‘hardware’ approach to development, i.e. the building of infrastructure and the provision of services; rather than what some refer to as the ‘software’ approach of empowering people and local institutions to manage their own affairs. Other NGOs seem unaware of changes in the role of government, the changing Aid paradigm, and the effectiveness of a “right’s based” rather than “welfare” approach. While it is becoming harder to fund and sustain service delivery interventions, most local NGOs persist with them. Community poverty and illiteracy rates remain significant (United Nations, 2015). NGOs are acutely aware of the increasing and enormous needs of poor people and feel at a loss as to how they can respond to all these needs. There is a lack of sustainability and ownership of development interventions by communities. Some communities have been spoilt by dependency creating interventions and are not inclined to do things for themselves. It is difficult to keep our programmes relevant to changing situations and the culture of handouts is hard to counter. There is no accepted code of ethics and conflicting approaches (Batti, 2014).

2.3.9 NGO Board and NGO Council

According to NGO board is poorly informed of the difference between these two institutions, NGO Coordination Board and the National Council of NGOs; and unaware of their roles and responsibilities in relation to them. Most participants expressed the opinion that the NGO Code of Conduct is outdated and needed updating soon. This group of participants also complained that the NGO Council is poorly governed and doesn’t provide any services to the NGOs (Abdulkadir, 2014). They were aware that the NGO Board does not respect the Council and that there is mistrust between the Government and NGOs. Participants understand the NGO sector has a very poor public profile which they see as mainly due to the leadership wrangles, politics and infighting at the Council and among NGOs. While most participants appreciated the positive role of the NGO Board in creating an enabling environment for NGOs, a few participants felt there was a lack of political good will towards NGOs in some parts of government. Some branches of government are thought to deliberately frustrate NGOs. A few participants felt that government bureaucracy holds back the NGO sector and its members (Bebbington, 2013).
2.4 Lessons Learnt by Partnerships on Donor Project Implementation

2.4.1 Partnerships lessons

According to Robinson, Festen, McConnell, Palm, and White (2017), mergers and partnerships can bring strength to organisations by advancing their mission, but that does not mean there are not challenges and pitfalls along the way. The authors note that building successful partnerships can be time- and resource-intensive, and not every possible partnership should move forward. First, it takes time and efforts to build partnerships. Partnerships should be hurried. Proper assessment of strength and weaknesses are essential before forming partnerships. During the process, organisations learn about themselves and carefully plan for their future partnerships (Robinson et al., 2017). Secondly, the central concern for any partnership is how well it advances the organisational mission. Enhancing the outcome of donor project delivery should not outweigh the mission and vision of organisations. If partnerships bring mission drift with it, it could weaken the organisation. Third, finances are a tricky part of a partnership. It is essential to assess the financial health of organisations before joining hands. There should not be an assumption that merely because one organisation partner with another acquires other organisation financial benefits will follow. The analysis of revenue and liabilities need careful consideration (Ray, 2012).

Fourth, relationships are critical to any partnerships. Existing relationships provide a foundation to begin explorations of partnerships, and maintaining those relationships is an essential part of the ongoing process. An effort needs to put into building and to maintain trust between the organisations. Fifth, it is essential to engage in organisational assessments comprising of organisational leadership, board members, and staff embrace the idea of a partnership with a different organisation. Failure to have a united front at the organisational level before creating a partnership may lead to miss steps that would be detrimental to the cultures of the organisation involved (Lister, 2018).

Sixth, blending cultures is tricky, because often the distinct culture of an organisation attracts or repel people to work for it. A clash of cultures can, therefore, elicit adverse reactions. In some cases, it is essential to hire expertise in organisational to guide the blending of various cultures (Reid, 2016). Seventh, involving donors in conversations regarding merger and partnerships is critical. The donors are vital stakeholders and need to be informed on how a partnership can facilitate their project implementation on the
ground. Two boards of organisations intending to partner should be fully involved and have significant input into what the composing of partnership board would look like will look like and who will move to the new board (Reid, 2016).

For partnerships to succeed staff, need to be involved. Staff contributions should be leveraged on in making a decision on how partnerships will affect their organisational culture, vision, and mission. (Robinson et al., 2017). Partnerships can enhance the quality of need assessment by International non-governmental organisations, therefore, improving the quality of donor project implementation. According to the study by Corbett (2010), innovative approaches to assessment utilize the readily available information available from communities' action to complement or triangulate more general or standardized needs assessment findings. In the same vein, Simon, Adini (2015) notes that by examining the humanitarian response, that survivors’ shifting needs over time could be tracked by merely analysing changing focus of LNGOs and micro-grant communities' groups. The shifting priorities of the autonomous response and provided a reasonable picture of changing needs and opportunities without any assessment ever having to be carried out.

Ramalingam and Cerruti, (2013), noted that whereas partnerships take time to build, some models of local partnership employed by INGOs are strong in delivering responses that are more relevant and appropriate, effectiveness through accountability and bridging the divide between development and humanitarian response. Partnership capacity building has numerous advantages on donor project implementation. According to Featherstone (2014), a widely held assumption among international actors that capacity building is central to working effectively with local actors whereas the evidence suggests that for partnerships to succeed, the capacity building gap should be identified by a local organisation. According to Corbett, (2015), capacity building can in the initial aftermath of a disaster be demand-led and focused on "capacities" that are relatively easy to acquire and have immediate relevance in the emergencies. Skills such as first aid training and management, facilitating local-to-local capacity building such as identification.

According to Bishop (2014), there is a close link between humanitarian preparations and capacity building. Good capacity building should be premised on lessons learnt for supporting locally-led crisis response since they are rich in fostering disaster risk reduction and reinforcing community resilience when a humanitarian need arises.
According to OECD, (2011) recognizes that partnership between development actors should be inclusive based on shared principles, common goals, and distinct commitments from all stakeholders, especially from the local actors toward development effectiveness. Therefore, as a concept, the partnership between organisations means cooperation for a specific purpose to achieve common objectives. In theory, the partnership between NGOs should be based on equality, trust and reciprocity in ways that promote the autonomy and organisational capacity of their local NGOs partners (Elbers, 2012). However, in practice, often partnerships may take a conventional sub-contractual approach highlighting an unequal marriage between aid donors and recipients.

This is discerned from the above that accountability constitutes an important element of partnership as described through the aspects of trust, respect, equality, mutuality, transparency. The literature on effective partnerships asserts that INGOs, in theory, should be accountable to their local partners as a duty or right, while they can also demand the same from local NGOs and other partners (William& Taylor, 2013). Accountability means that rights imply duties and duties demand answerability or responsibility. Accountability is the act of being responsible to stakeholders, including local beneficiaries such as the poor and their organisations. According to ActionAid’s Action on partnership signifies a way of building and strengthening a diverse, broad movement of organisations working together based on common values. Therefore, the rights-based approach determines their decisions to take care of how they deploy their power and influence as individuals and as an organisation regarding their local NGO partners.

2.4.2 Strategic Alliance

One of the prominent reasons is that partnership between NGOs varies widely: NGO partnership can be founded on a range of principles, from solidarity, mutuality and institutional values or objectives to narrower funding-based donor-recipient relationships. Today in the development sector, everybody wants to partner with everyone else on everything, rather than a strategic alliance that should involve the sharing of resources and responsibilities to achieve common goals.

However, given that the ideational motivation for forming a partnership between or among the NGOs is to combine different attributes and strengths of different
organisations, perhaps it is unrealistic to expect those different organisations involved in this process will always have the same view of how the relationship should be structured (Olawoore, 2017). In addition, partnerships between INGOs and local NGOs from developing countries are often underpinned by power relationship that is tilted in favour of the former because of their position as funders.

A partnership could be employed as a political slogan to mask other motives, such as the demand to promote the effectiveness and efficiency of development aid. As local NGOs are often framed as incompetent, corrupt and cannot be trusted to deliver the desired development. Conventional partnerships there remains a yawning chasm between the stated goals and its practices and outcomes. As such, the ambitious aims of partnership often appear disappointingly empty. The apparent inability of the local NGOs to generate sufficient funding for their work and the competition for scarce resources from funding agencies is also a thorny issue in realising the promises of the partnership (Elbers, 2012). Nevertheless, some scholars believe that partnership between NGOs adds value to the development sector by empowering the recipient of development aid. For example, recent studies suggest that local organisations in developing countries are now exploring their constituencies to raise funds, thus limiting their dependence on external funding (Olawoore, 2017). In addition, many rights-based NGOs are selective on which INGO donors they have a financial relationship with, which can increase their influence and power in their engagement with their foreign partners and promote an effective partnership between them. It is possible that rights-based NGOs in the partnership are experiencing effective engagement among them because they focus less on financial resources in their relationships (Crack, 2013).

2.4.3 Legitimacy

LNGOs partnerships allow greater legitimacy for policy as they may involve participants from the local community directly rather than through INGOs. In cases where policy implementation decisions are being made by employed officials of an International Non-Governmental organisations, then the legitimacy of the policies as seen at the local level can be enhanced through community participation. However, partnerships may sometimes be used by INGOs to bring in their supporters to influence local policies, for example by bringing in the business community or, on the other hand, community activists. The creation and sharing of risks and rewards and incentives towards creating
and participating in partnerships apply in varying degrees to different actors. As McQuaid (1993) notes, strong incentives for local authorities to enter into partnership are provided by the possibility of bringing external resources into the area such as funding, property, expertise, links to national support schemes, avoidance of duplication, replication of good-practice in other joint initiatives, and hence more effective and efficient policy development and implementation. Partnership may also result in strategy compromise with each partner concentrating upon its own perception of important issues, perhaps leaving gaps of unmet needs.

2.4.4 Enforced Cooperation

The partnerships in humanitarian sector may not necessarily be voluntary. Some partnerships are forced. In implementation of donor projects at national level, co-operation can be forced onto the community-based group dependent upon finance from INGOs as well as Intergovernmental Organisations such as the European Union. Such financial control may be by making resources available through grants or through other controls such as the UK capital expenditure restrictions on local LNGOs or budget controls on other funded bodies.

2.4.5 Game Theory

Partnerships provide vital lessons on applicability of game theory in humanitarian leadership and management. According to Luce and Raiffa (1957), and Axelrod (1984), the basic story of the Prisoner's Dilemma is basically that two accomplices arrested after a crime are then interrogated separately. These two players have two choices: to co-operate with each other or to defect. If one confesses (defects) and the other does not, then (s) he will get free (through a high positive payoff, although note that these payoffs are endogenous to the model) but the other prisoner will get a heavy sentence (zero payoff). If both confess then they both get a medium sentence (low payoff), and if neither confesses then both get low sentences (medium payoff). The latter is the best solution for both prisoners together (they maximize their combined welfare). However, for each individual, it is in their interest to confess as: (s) he receives the worst outcome (a heavy sentence) if (s) he does not confess but his accomplice does; while (s) he gets the maximum payoff (goes free) if his accomplice does not confess. Hence, if neither prisoner has moral qualms or fears revenge from the other prisoner, then each would choose to confess, resulting in a sub-optimal outcome for their combined welfare.
However, if the process is repeated, say they are likely to be caught again, then co-operation becomes much more easy as there will be a strong incentive for both not to confess as in the future case they will know how the other reacted and base their behaviour (to confess or not) on what happened last time. So, the strategy for success for each depends entirely upon the strategy of their accomplice. If there is a strong central control mechanism, for example the accomplices are part of a gang which will punish anyone who confesses, then co-operative behavior between the accomplices will occur. Provided the game is repeated several times, that players can recognise and remember the results of previous encounters, that future payoffs are not greatly discounted, then co-operation will be mutually beneficial. Even if there is a short-term cost to co-operation it will still occur if future retaliation for current defections is great enough. This forms the basis of a theory of co-operation based upon reciprocity (Luce & Raiffa, 1957).

According to Axelrod (1984), the most successful strategy in humanitarian partnership was also the simplest: start with co-operation in the first move and then do what the other player did in the previous round (tit-for-tat). Hence the winning strategy was for a player to always co-operate with a co-operative adversary, but if the adversary did not co-operate, then in the next move the player would cease to co-operate, but once the adversary returned to co-operation, the player should also return to it. Axelrod argued that the evolution of co-operation depended upon individuals having a sufficiently large chance of meeting again, so they have a stake in their future interaction (this can be applied to individuals within organisations as well as to the organisations themselves). The co-operation can be based upon reciprocity, but once established this can survive many different strategies used by the individuals and can protect itself from less co-operative strategies (Axelrod, 1984).

2.5 Chapter Summary
The chapter has looked at the literature and emerging issues on partnerships with the aim of understanding the benefits of partnerships on donor project implementation in Kenya; challenges of partnerships to on donor project implementation in Kenya as well as highlighting lessons learnt on partnerships to on donor project implementation. The next chapter deals with the research methodology of the study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter on research methodology is structured into the following categories research design, population and sampling design, sampling technique, sample size, data collection methods, research procedures, data analysis methods, and chapter summary.

3.2 Research Design
The research design suitable for the study comprises the element of both descriptive and inferential research designs. The study opted for the two designs because whereas the spread and the centre of data was captured by descriptive research design, the findings based on descriptive research design were not adequate to form generalized conclusions (Taylor, 2019). The study, therefore, used inferential statistics from the sample while generalizing it to the study population. The diagnostic approach was also critical in determining the frequency with dependent variables interact with the independent variables of the study. The research comprised study objectives formulation; designing of the methods of data collection; selection of the sample; collection of the data; processing and analysing the data; and reporting the findings.

3.3 Population and Sample Design
3.3.1 Population
According to Banerjee & Chaudhury (2010), the entire group about which some information is required to be ascertained constitute the population. The authors noted that in selecting a population for study, the research question or purpose of the study should suggest a suitable definition of the population to be studied. In this study, the Chief Executive Officers or equivalent persons of local Non-Governmental partners working with Irish charity Trocaire Kenya constituted study population. The total number of Chief Executive Officers of LNGOs in partnership with Trocaire were 41.
Table 3.1: Population Distribution Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Coordinators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Directors</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father in Charge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Trocaire (2018)

3.3.2 Sampling Design and Sample Size

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

According to Sarndal, Swensson, and Wretman (2013), the list of items in the population constitutes the sampling frame. Sampling frame and the population differ in that the population in general and the frame is specific. In the study, the sampling frame is a list or database from which a sample can be used. The entire population was studied. In the study, the sampling frame is also the population of the study. The sampling frame of the study constituted six Administrators, one Advocacy Officer, one General Secretary, two Bishops, one Chief Executive Officer, two chancellors, five Project Coordinators, sixteen Executive Directors, one Parish Father, one Head of Finance, three Project Managers and one superior. The list used in the sampling frame was provided by the partnership department of Trocaire Kenya.
3.3.2 Sampling Technique
The entire population was studied. Some factors informed the need to carry out a census survey as opposed to sampling survey. First, the study seeks to eliminate errors associated with sampling (Hoyle, 2018). The population of the study is small. Only 41 respondents were interviewed. The sampling of the significantly small population like in this case might result in a low level of the confidence interval. Sampling is effective when there is a significantly large population (Taylor, 2019). Larger sample sizes result in smaller confidence intervals - the smaller the confidence interval, the more accurate the results. The study has three different subgroups under study. The subgroups include LNGOs registered as Non-Governmental Organisations, LNGOs registered as Trust, and LNGOs that are registered as trusts but run by the faith-based organisation. It would be inappropriate to use the group finding without considering the subgroups.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size
According to Rahi (2017), defines a sample size as a representation of the population and exerts the same characteristics as the target population. According to Jackson (2009), further asserts that a large-sized sample leads to increased precision in estimates of various properties of the population. Every unit of the population will be studied. The total population was 41. Likewise, the total sample is 41. According to Hoyle (2018), sometimes a sample is small because of constraints such as a small population or insufficient resources. In this case, most senior staff in most organisation form partnerships. A partnership is at the apex of any organisation strategy. Interviewing other subordinate staff on the issue might not necessarily of strategic value as compared to the heads of the organisation who have the eye bird of the entire organisation. In this sense, the study population constituted six Administrators, one Advocacy Officer, one General Secretary, two Bishops, one Chief Executive Officer, two chancellors, five Project Coordinators, sixteen Executive Directors, one Parish Father, one Head of Finance, three Project Managers and one superior.

3.4 Data Collection Methods
The primary data was used in the study. Primary data was considered over secondary data because it gives original research quality and does not carry bias or opinions of third parties. Questionnaires were used to collect the data. This study preferred the questionnaires because they shield the study from the bias of the interviewer answers;
respondents have adequate time to give well thought out answers; respondents, who are not easily approachable, can also be reached conveniently and more importantly, large samples provide reliable and dependable data (Kathori, 2014). The questionnaire used was divided into five sections. The first section dealt with demography, the second section probed the impact of partnership non-financial benefits to donor project implementation, the third section covered the impact of partnership financial benefits to donor project implementation, the fourth section probed on the partnership’s lessons learnt on the donor project implementation. The fifth section constituted feedback questions to the researcher. The questionnaire consisted of both close ended and open-ended questions touching on all variables that were being investigated. The closed ended questions had five-point Likert scale from which the respondent would select preferred response.

3.5 Research Procedures

The study followed five significant steps followed in any typical applied and quantitative business research process: formulation of the problem statement, a survey of the literature, study objective formulation; designing the methods of data collection; testing data collection tools, sample selection; collecting the data; processing the data; analysing the data; and reporting the data findings.

The data collection tool was web based. The tool was programmed with capabilities to deliver real time analysis of data upon completion of each response in the digital questionnaire. Pretesting of the survey was done before the it was forwarded to the respondents. The pretesting was done with help of 10 respondents not part of the survey and mainly from the Finance and Administration Unit of Trocaire Kenya. The first-time test was to determine the time taken to complete a single questionnaire by the respondents. From the test, it was determined that it took an average of 25 minutes for respondents to complete questionnaire regardless of whether the respondents were on a computer, tablet, or smartphone while filling the survey. The study also checked skip logic mistakes to ensure that skip instructions do not send respondents to the wrong page in the end compromising data quality.

To test the reliability of the responses, the study used the test-retest correlation measures on the 10 respondents at one time, and using it again on the same respondents on interval of two weeks to determine test-retest correlation between the two sets of scores. The
Pearson r test value for data was +0.92 hence indicating good research reliability. Since the research reliability results obtained were of good quality, the researcher was satisfied that the extent to which the scores from measures represented the variables intended hence valid. The embedded commands in the data collection tool were programmed to send reminders to the respondents twice a day to their emails and mobile phones hence a high response rate of 95% was obtained on time.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods

The study examined quantitative data analysis methods whereby raw numbers were turned into meaningful data through the application of the reliable statistical methodology. The calculation of quantitative data included the analysis of measures of central tendency, measures of dispersion; measures of Asymmetry (Skewness); measures of relationship; simple regression analysis; multiple correlation and regression; partial correlation; and association in Case of Attributes (Kathori, 2014). The measures of central tendencies that is the mean, median and the mode used to inform the study point about which items tend to cluster. Such measures considered as the most representative figure for the entire mass of data. The measures of dispersion analysed included the range, mean deviation, and the standard deviation. Due to the design of the study, data analysis mainly comprised of Regression statistics observing Multiple R, R square, adjusted R square, and the study error. The analysis also included (ANOVA) analysis of variance to analyze the differences among group means in the sample. The study used Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) as the main analysis tool. The data presentation techniques used comprised of tables and figures.

3.7 Chapter Summary

The chapter on research methodology has looked at the research design of the study. The study design includes descriptive as well as the inferential statistics. Population in the study constituted chief executive officers or equivalent persons of local non-governmental partners working with Irish charity Trocaire Kenya constitute study population. The study employed census survey techniques. Each unit of the population was studied to increase accuracy and the reliability of the findings. The data collection was done using questionnaires. The questionnaires were submitted to the participants through an online tool survey monkey. Data analysis was aided with Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The next chapter will deal with the results and findings of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
The chapter is divided into five sections. The first section deals with general information of the study, including response rate and demography of the study. The second section deals with results and finding relating to the first objective on establishing partnerships benefits on donor project implementation by Irish charity Trocaire Kenya. The third section deals with the second objective on establishing partnerships challenges on donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya. The fourth section deals with the third objective of establishing lessons learnt by partnerships on donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya. The fifth section is the summary of the entire chapter five

4.2 General Information
The study did not incorporate sampling. The entire population was studied. The study obtained 38 responses out of a population of forty-one respondents. The findings provide very vital insights across all the three objectives that would be useful in providing Trocaire board of directors, other international non-governmental organisations and donors with critical knowledge on understanding benefit limits and challenges of partnership partnerships in the NGO sector in Kenya.

4.2.1 Type of the Organisation
The demography of the study was as follows: Of the total respondents, 52.6% constituted non-governmental organisations. 47.4% were Trust or Church based institutions. The composition of demography shows that Trocaire has an extensive grass root network; hence, donor projects have a more significant impact at the community level. Further, the church-based organisation in Kenya have a reputation of serving the most marginalised communities, especially in arid and semi-arid areas where pastoralism is the primary source of livelihoods. It is inferred that Trocaire operations cover at least half of marginalised communities contributing to poverty reduction in these areas.
Table 4.1: Type of the organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>Count of What best describes your organisation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental Organisation</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST (Church Organisation)</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Budgetary Distribution

The budgetary distribution, according to respondents, as shown in table below. The implication of the budgetary distribution on donor project implementation has been discussed in the sections that follow.

Figure 4.1 Budget Distribution Table

On the classification of the operations, the study findings were as per table 4 below. The implication of operation classification on donor project implementation has been discussed in the sections that follow.

4.2.3 Classification of Operations per Years

Across various parameters, the study assessed various statistical significance measures which include, regression, the correlation across various variables and measures of dispersion
Table 4.2: Classification of Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Organisation Classification (%)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 Years</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisation</td>
<td>15.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRUST (Church Organisation)</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 Years</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisation</td>
<td>26.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRUST (Church Organisation)</td>
<td>18.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 Years</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisation</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRUST (Church Organisation)</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15 Years</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisation</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRUST (Church Organisation)</td>
<td>18.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Partnerships Benefits on Donor Project Implementation by Irish charity Trocaire Kenya

4.3.1 Strengthened Board of Governance

From the assessment, the impact of the partnership between the organisations and Trocaire is as follows; in summary, of the total sample, 39.5% of the organized agreed that their institutions' board of governance was strengthened by Trocaire partnership. 26.3% strongly agreed that their board of governance is strengthened by partnerships with Trocaire. Only 7.9% were of the contrary view while 26.3% neither agreed nor disagreed on whether the board of governance of their respective Organisations had been strengthened by a partnership with Trocaire. There is a strong correlation between a strong board of governance and donor project implementation, as institutions with strong board tend to be more innovative and accountable in-service delivery. It can, therefore, be deduced that the partnership between Trocaire and LNGOs has led better donor project implementation because of the strengthened board of governance.

Figure 4.2 Findings on Strengthening the Board of Governance
4.3.2 Management and Leadership Styles

In terms of strengthening management and leadership skills, 31.6% strongly acknowledged that their leadership skills and management skills had been improved by the partnerships between Trocaire and their respective Organisations. 42.1% agreed, 21.1% neither agreed nor disagreed. While 5.3% noted that their leadership and management skills had not improved by the partnership between Trocaire and their respective organisation. Good leadership is vital in guiding organisations to achieve their respective mission and vision. The partnership between Trocaire and LNGOs as the study findings show has had a significant impact on the leadership of these organisations hence improving donor project implementation. By equipping top leadership of the Local Non-Governmental organisations with skills in strategy formulation, fundraising, financial management, the partnership between Trocaire has gone a long way in ensuring the sustainability of these organisations as well as high-quality donor project implementation at the community level.

![Management and Leadership Skills](image)

**Figure 4.3 Findings on Management and Leadership Skills**

4.3.3 Financial Management Skills

Sound financial management skills essential, especially in managing donor resources and ensuring that financial resources are used in the manner intended by the donors. Overwhelming responses show that organisations financial management skills had improved because of their partnership with Trocaire. 94.8% of the respondents acknowledged that their financial skills strengthened after the partnership with Trocaire. Whereas 5% neither agreed nor disagreed, whether the partnership improved financial management skills of their respective organisation. The improved management skills because of the partnership with Trocaire has helped LNGOs to reduce acts of fraud.
previously perpetuated due to weak financial systems in place. More financial resources are now being used as intended by the donor and the beneficiary communities.

Figure 4.4 Findings on Financial Management Skills

4.3.4 Technical Abilities to Deliver Service

Similarly, 84.2% of the respondents noted that technical abilities of their organisation to deliver donor project implementation had improved because of partnership with Trocaire while 15.8% were not sure whether in fact the partnership of Trocaire with their Organisations had improved technical abilities to deliver donor projects. As the findings show, Trocaire has invested heavily in training key staff in finance, project administration, procurement, advocacy, and senior leadership in various specialized skills rendering the organisations more capable and dependable on donor project implementation.

Figure 4.5 Findings on Technical Abilities to Deliver Service
4.3.5 Advocacy and Campaign Capabilities

In terms of strengthening advocacy and campaigning abilities, 71% agreed that their visibility and campaign capabilities had improved because of the partnership with Trocaire. Only 7.9% were of the contrary opinion, while 21.1% were not sure of the impact of the partnership between Trocaire and their respective organisations had on strengthening advocacy and campaign capabilities. The increased visibility of organisations has led them even to acquire more funding partners, receive government recognition, and enjoy greater community acceptance in the communities they serve.

![Advocacy and Campaign Abilities](image)

**Figure 4.6 Findings on Advocacy and Campaign Abilities**

4.3.6 Participatory Approaches

Overwhelming responses show that most organisations benefited from participatory approaches introduced by their partnership with Trocaire. Over 92.1% of respondents acknowledged that indeed, partnership with Trocaire had led them to develop relevant community participatory approached during donor project implementation. The increased community participation in project management shows that projects are now being implemented more from community perspective rather than from donor or organisation perspectives.
4.3.7 Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluations are vital in any donor project implementation. Monitoring and evaluation not only promote transparency to the donor but also the communities where projects are implemented. According to the findings, 79% of all the respondents acknowledged that the partnership with Trocaire had improved their monitoring and evaluation skills, hence improving community and donor accountability. By proving project intervention with relevant data, the organisations have been able to build solid reputation with donors as well as being more accountable to the communities where donor projects are being implemented.

4.3.7 Long-term Planning and Financial Viability

Long term planning and especially financial forecasting is a key ingredient in running any organisations it helps to minimize financial risks, legal risks, and more importantly, reputational risks. Of the total respondents, 73.7% acknowledged that their partnership
with Trocaire had improved the long-term planning, especially in the financial forecasting and planning process.

Figure 4.9 Findings on Long-Term Planning and Financial Viability

4.3.8 Presence at National/International Levels

Presence at both international and national levels is vital, especially in Non-governmental sector. Presence at national and international level allows these organisations to influence policy and legislation on matters such as health, education, housing, food security and livelihoods. Of the total respondents, 68.5% opine that the partnership between their respective organisations and Trocaire had improved their presence at national and international levels hence increasing their effectiveness in influencing policy at both levels in their work.

Figure 4.10 Findings on Presence at National and International Level
4.3.9 Introduction to Other Networks

Local and international networks, working groups, and coalition play a pivotal role in promoting humanitarian learning in various areas of work. This is also an essential avenue for fundraising but also lobbying the government to influence specific policies and legislation concerning community development. Of the total respondents, 86.8% acknowledged that the partnership between their organisations and Trocaire had improved their networking capabilities in public space.
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Figure 4.11 Introduction to Other Networks

4.3.10 Accessing Funds

Funding is very critical for the survival of Local Non-Governmental organisations. The organisations need reliable funds to implement community projects in line with their vision and mission. According to the findings, 84.2% of the respondents acknowledge that partnership with Trocaire has opened a new funding stream from other International Non-Governmental organisations and donors. LNOGs always grapple with financial sustainability, as their funding is not always consistent and stable. As the finding shows, Trocaire has a consistent funding approach to these organisations hence contributing to their sustainability and stability. With assured funding, the organisations have begun to set medium and long-term goals during donor project implementation. Furthermore, with additional funding streams, the organisations have been able to diversify projects in areas such as health and nutrition, education, food security and livelihoods.
Figure 4.12 Findings on Accessing Funds

Across the various areas explored, the majority (48.6%) agree on the impact of the partnerships, followed by a significant proportion of 30.9% who strongly agree on the impact. Financial management strengthening is an area where the majority (55.3%) strongly agree is a benefit of the partnership followed by the technical abilities to deliver service. Advocacy and campaigns, accessing other funds are areas with minimal scores on the impact. An area where there is disagreement on impact is strengthening the board and governance (7.9%) in addition to campaigns and advocacy.

4.4 Partnerships Challenges on Donor Project Implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya.

4.4.1 Impact of Partnership Challenges on Donor Project Implementation

The study findings revealed unexpected results, especially with regards to partnership challenges on donor project implementation. The study looked at whether conflicting vision of partnership, conflicting mission of partnership, partnership rules, power asymmetry in partnerships, slow bureaucracy confused accountability, failure of partnerships to deliver both for the communities and donors, lack of partnership sustainability strategy, lack of skilled workforce to facilitate implementation of donor projects impede on donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya. In a surprise result, of total responses, in all the indicators, over 80% of respondents noted that these challenges don not impede implementation of on donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya.
Table 4.3: Partnership Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges that your partnership with Trocaire has experienced</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Neither Much or Not Much</th>
<th>Not Much</th>
<th>Not Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Vision in partnership</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting mission in partnership</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules that govern partnership</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Asymmetry in partnership</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow Pace of Bureaucracy</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused Accountability</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure of partnership to deliver for both the communities and the donors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of partnership sustainability strategy by Trocaire</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of skilled workforce to facilitate the implementation of donor projects</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most highlighted challenge is the slow pace of bureaucracy with 2.6% highlighting either both very much and much on the challenges experienced by the organisations.

4.5 Lessons Learnt by Partnerships on Donor Project Implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya

4.5.1 Findings from Regression Statistics

Regression coefficient in the case provides a statistical measure of the average functional relationship between two or more variables to measure the degree of dependence of one variable on the other(s). Regarding the funding, the organisations have received from Trocaire in the last financial year as compared to the funding received from other years.
Table 4.4: Regression Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.601281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.361539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.343298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.831393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R, being the Correlation Coefficient to measure the strength of a linear relationship between two variables. Figures tending to (positive) +1 means a strong positive relationship (0.601281 for the funding stream). For the funding stream, the value is 0.36154 (rounded off to 5 decimal places) with a standard error of 0.83139 for the total 37 observations.

4.5.2 Findings from ANOVA Statistics

Table 4.5: Anova statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.69941</td>
<td>13.69941</td>
<td>19.81935</td>
<td>0.000083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.19248</td>
<td>0.691214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37.89189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Significance of value gives the validity of the results of how reliable (statistically significant) the results are. For the two variables, the Significance F is 0.000083 less than 0.05 (5%), indicating the model is correct. This section provides specific information about the components of the analysis for the variables.

Table 4.6: Regression and Analysis Output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.395706</td>
<td>0.374084</td>
<td>-0.36373</td>
<td>1.155137</td>
<td>-0.36373</td>
<td>1.155137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.623466</td>
<td>0.140045</td>
<td>0.339159</td>
<td>0.907773</td>
<td>0.339159</td>
<td>0.907773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the relationship between the years of partnership with Trocaire and funding; Covariance = 0.576177285 which is strongly positive on funding for last years and other years. Standard deviation, last financial years = 1.012018812, other years 1.00532013
indicating increment in variations in funding across the organisation in the last financial year.

4.5.3 Correlation between the Years of Partnership with and Funding

The study findings of the relationship between the years of partnership with Trocaire and funding shows Covariance = 0.576177285 which is strongly positive on funding for last years and other years. Standard deviation, last financial years = 1.012018812, other years 1.00532013 indicating increment in variations in funding across the organization in the last financial year.

Table 4.7: Relationship between the Years of Partnership with Trocaire and Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Years of Support</th>
<th>Last Financial year</th>
<th>Other years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Financial year</td>
<td>0.342545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other years</td>
<td>0.331457</td>
<td>0.581628</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression summary on the number of year’s vis-à-vis the funding in the last financial year shows that Data for the last one year being more consistent and valid based on the significant F values. A contribution of this was based on the overall assessment of the funding streams of the project with the scoring based on a range rather than actual figures. However, all the periods covered (last financial year and other years) point to a positive relationship between the number of years and the funding package to the individual organisations. The more the years of partnership, the more the funding package.

Table 4.8: Relationship between the Number of Years and Last Financial Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th>Last Financial Year</th>
<th>Other financial years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.290644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.126025</td>
<td>0.084474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.101054</td>
<td>0.058316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.938109</td>
<td>0.96015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance F</td>
<td>0.03108</td>
<td>0.080961427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.4 Variance of Funding Across Partners

The variance indicates the values are not very close to the mean. Which implies that the funding across the various periods has not been consistent across the organisations.

Table 4.9: Standard Deviation (on various fronts especially on funding)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last financial Year</td>
<td>1.012019</td>
<td>1.024182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other years</td>
<td>1.00532</td>
<td>1.010669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On regression and ANOVA Analysis as shown in figure 4.10 and 4.11 respectively across the strengths and the number of years of engagement, there is no clearly defined correlation between variables, which compares the length of partnership with the strengthening of the various components of the organizations. A more in-depth assessment with deeper assessment into the various factors would derive the correlations. However, there are correlations that are more positive across the various strength areas with the number of years of partnership with no specific pattern.

Table 4.10: Regression Statistics

Regression Statistics

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.559478163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.313015814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.010742773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.984104685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.03169249</td>
<td>1.002881135</td>
<td>1.03554</td>
<td>0.44659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.21155075</td>
<td>0.96846203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35.24324324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variances across the data sets on the relationship with Trocaire is significant and ranges from 0.3 on donor conditions to the ease of payment to 1.25 on changes in expenditure. This indicates that for conditions set out by donors on funding consistently managed the same way across the organisations while for the changes in expenditure plans are majorly varying across organisations.
Table 4.12: Variances across Data Sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy Payments</td>
<td>0.777778</td>
<td>0.881917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure change</td>
<td>1.252252</td>
<td>1.119041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to general/core costs</td>
<td>0.62012</td>
<td>0.787477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>0.345345</td>
<td>0.587661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.5 Impact of Partnership on the Capacity of Organisation to Deliver on Donor Project Implementation

The findings on the number of years and the capacity of the organizations on various fronts from the table 4.13 show positive correlations between the numbers of years of engagement with the strengths on various fronts is positive in all aspects but not strongly positive.

Table 4.13: Number of years and the capacity of the organisations on various fronts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Significance F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board / governance</td>
<td>0.0629</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.0245</td>
<td>1.0015</td>
<td>0.7114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and leadership skills</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.0317</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.9775</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management skills</td>
<td>0.2427</td>
<td>0.0589</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.9735</td>
<td>0.1478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical abilities to deliver service</td>
<td>0.0133</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>-0.0284</td>
<td>1.0034</td>
<td>0.9376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy &amp; campaigning abilities</td>
<td>0.0915</td>
<td>0.0084</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.9993</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory approaches</td>
<td>0.0763</td>
<td>0.0058</td>
<td>-0.0226</td>
<td>1.0005</td>
<td>0.6535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation skills</td>
<td>0.0763</td>
<td>0.0058</td>
<td>-0.0226</td>
<td>1.0005</td>
<td>0.6535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation skills</td>
<td>0.1603</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
<td>-0.0021</td>
<td>0.9905</td>
<td>0.3432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation skills</td>
<td>0.3092</td>
<td>0.0956</td>
<td>0.0698</td>
<td>0.9543</td>
<td>0.0626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence at national / international levels</td>
<td>0.0745</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>-0.0229</td>
<td>1.0007</td>
<td>0.6612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductions to other Networks</td>
<td>0.2866</td>
<td>0.0821</td>
<td>0.0559</td>
<td>0.9614</td>
<td>0.0855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing funds</td>
<td>0.2948</td>
<td>0.0869</td>
<td>0.0608</td>
<td>0.9589</td>
<td>0.0765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Chapter Summary
The fourth chapter was about the results and findings of the study. The first section has dealt with general information of the study, including response rate and demography of the study. The second section has dealt with results and finding relating to the first objective on establishing partnerships benefits on donor project implementation by Irish charity Trocaire Kenya. The third section has dealt with the second objective on establishing partnerships challenges on donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya. The fourth section has dealt with the third objective of establishing lessons learnt by partnerships on donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya. The findings from the study provide vital insights across all the three objectives that would be useful in providing Trocaire board of directors, other International Non-Governmental Organisations and donors with critical knowledge on understanding benefit limits and challenges of partnership partnerships in the NGO sector in Kenya. The next chapter covers discussions, conclusion, and recommendations for the study.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
The chapter concerns the discussion, conclusion, and recommendation of the study. The chapter is organized in several sections. The first section deals with the summary purpose of the Study. It also comprises of study methodology and summary of major findings. The second section deals with the discussion. It involves a comparison of the significant findings of the study of each objective with relevant findings in the literature review section. The third section deals with conclusions of the study based on each research objective of the study. The section provides a summary of the major conclusion for each research question or specific objective in a narrative format. The fourth section deals with recommendations of the study based on each objective of the study. In this section, primary recommendation will be provided for every research objective.

5.2 Summary
The general objective of the study was to establish the impact of non-governmental organisation partnerships on the donor project implementation. The specific objectives of the study were: to establish the partnerships benefits on donor project implementation by Irish charity Trocaire Kenya; to establish the partnerships challenges on donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya; and to establish the lessons learnt by partnerships on donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya.

The research design for the study constituted both descriptive and diagnostic research designs. In this study, the chief executive officers or equivalent persons of local non-governmental partners working with Irish charity Trocaire Kenya constitute study population. The total number of Chief Executive officers of LNGOs in partnership with Trocaire was forty-one. The study did not incorporate sampling. The entire population was studied. The need informed the need to carry out a census survey as opposed to a sampling survey of the study seeks to eliminate errors associated with sampling.

First, the study sought to eliminate errors associated with sampling. Forty-one respondents were interviewed during primary data collection. Primary data was considered over secondary because it gives original research quality and does not carry
bias or opinions of third parties. Digital questionnaires were used to collect the data. The study followed five significant steps used in any typical applied and quantitative business research process: formulation of the problem statement, a survey of the literature, objective study formulation; designing the methods of data collection; Selection of the sample; data collection, processing analysis and reporting the findings. Due to the design of the study, data analysis mainly comprised of Regression statistics observing Multiple R, R square, adjusted R square, and the study error. The analysis also included (ANOVA) analysis of variance to analyze the differences among group means in the sample.

The findings show that across the various benefits, that the organizations have benefitted, organizations mainly agreed (mode = 3) on the many areas of benefit that the partnership had strengthened with 2 strongly agreeing (mode = 4) specifically on financial management skills and technical abilities to deliver service support. The findings cross-referenced with the median shows that there was a balance with most agreeing on benefits with only on financial strengthening having a majority strongly agreeing (median = strongly agree).

On the aspect of the challenges, most responses ranged from neither much, not much and not very much. In a few instances, especially on slow bureaucracy, power asymmetry and sustainability, partners indicated experiencing much or very much challenges. The mode and median fall under the "Not very much" category while the average across ranges between 1.37 (lack of skilled labour) and 2.37 (bureaucracy). This indicates that the challenges were more on the external processes across organizations rather than the internal factors within the partners. On challenges, the highest variations were encountered on bureaucracy VAR.P (0.6) as a challenge with the least being in confused accountability and failure to deliver tying with VAR.P (0.35). The varying views on challenges being on aspects of bureaucracy, unlike financial accountability and failure to deliver.

In terms of lessons learnt, the findings show that correlations are more positive across the various strength areas with the number of years of partnership with no specific pattern. The variances across the data sets on the relationship with Trocaire is significant and ranges from 0.3 on donor conditions to the ease of payment to 1.25 on changes in expenditure. This indicates that for conditions set out by donors on funding was managed
the same way across the organisations while for the changes in expenditure plans are majorly varying across organisations.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Partnerships Benefits on Donor Project Implementation by Irish charity Trocaire Kenya.

As the study findings revealed that the partnership between LNGOS and INGOs go beyond financial gain to the benefits communities and donors. The study shows that Local non-governmental organisations accrue substantial benefits from their partnerships with an International organisation such as Trocaire, which in turn enhances donor project implementation. Further, the study validates Power (2018) view in the problem statement that partnerships bringing more people together rendering coordination, communication, and resource mobilisation more organized at local, national level and International level.

The findings from the study provides similar conclusions on the partnership benefits between International organisations and LNGOs on the donor project implementation. The findings show that across the various areas explored, a majority (48.6%) agree on the impact of the partnerships followed by a significant proportion of 30.9% who strongly agree on the impact. Financial management strengthening is an area where the majority (55.3%) strongly agree is a benefit of the partnership followed by the technical abilities to deliver service. Advocacy and campaigns, accessing other funds are areas with minimal scores on the impact. An area where there is disagreement on impact is strengthening the board and governance (7.9%) in addition to campaigns and advocacy.

According to qualitative studies conducted by Bukenya and Hickey (2014), partnerships have strengthened LNGOS capacity to respond to urgent basic needs as well as improving on their research and training. Partnerships have enhanced collaboration among leadership between International organisations and LNGOs. The collaboration between these entities have continued to complement each other hence increasing the efficacy, impact, transparency, and sustainability of donor investments in development.

The study findings revealed that partnership between Trocaire and local non-governmental organisations had increased sense of accountability, efficiency, innovation, and excellent service delivery to communities they serve. Partnerships between Trocaire and local organisations have facilitated incorporation of some efficiency standards
inspired by corporate and international influence into their practices. Further, the results show that local non-governmental organisations are capitalizing on the skills and expertise in building better financial management, information and technology, or strategic planning skills, which would help them to better, carry out their mission.

The study revealed that 84.2% of the respondents noted that technical abilities of their organisation to deliver donor project implementation in efficient and effective manner had improved because of the partnership with Trocaire. Overwhelming responses show that most organisations benefited from participatory approaches introduced by their partnership with Trocaire. Over 92.1% of respondents acknowledged that indeed, partnership with Trocaire had led them to develop relevant community participatory approached during donor project implementation hence increased accountability in the use of donor funds.

According to Webb (1991), depending upon the nature of the problem, partnership can greatly increase an individual organisation’s effectiveness and efficiency, especially through improved co-ordination between and within organisations. The author postulates that partnerships creates synergies between various bodies reducing wasteful duplication hence greater outputs and increased savings might be realised.

The study findings reveals that indeed increased coordination between Trocaire and NGOs had strengthened board of governance, management and leadership skills, technical ability to deliver quality program to recipient communities, strengthened advocacy and campaign abilities, community participatory approaches, monitoring and evaluation, financial planning and forecasting, and increased presence at national and international levels especially on donor fundraising and involvement in the platforms that help generate development policy of local communities with over 70% satisfaction rate from all the respondents.

5.3.2 Partnerships Challenges on Donor Project Implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya.

The study findings revealed unexpected results on partnership challenges facing donor project implementation. The study looked at whether conflicting vision of partnership, conflicting mission of partnership, partnership rules, power asymmetry in partnerships, slow bureaucracy confused accountability, failure of partnerships to deliver both for the communities and donors, lack of partnership sustainability strategy, lack of skilled
workforce to facilitate implementation of donor projects impede donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya as alluded to by Menzies (2010).

In a surprise result, of total responses, in all the indicators, over 80% of respondents noted that these challenges don not impede implementation of on donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya. On the aspect of the challenges, most responses ranged from neither much, not much and not very much. In a few instances, especially on slow bureaucracy, power asymmetry and sustainability, partners indicated experiencing much or very much challenges.

The failure of respondents to pass any blame or complain to funding partners such as Trocaire should not be taken lightly. It could be an indication of how partnerships in humanitarian sector may not necessarily be voluntary be enforced. According to MacQuaid (2000), the implementation of donor projects at national level, co-operation can be forced onto the community-based group dependent upon finance from INGOs as well as Intergovernmental Organisations such as the European Union. Such financial control may be by making resources available through grants or through other controls such as the UK capital expenditure restrictions on local LNGOs or budget controls on other funded bodies. The usurpation of power by International Non-Governmental Organisations from LNGOs can therefore hinder speaking ill of the funding partner.

The mode and median fall under the "Not very much" category while the average across ranges between 1.37 (lack of skilled labour) and 2.37 (bureaucracy). This indicates that the challenges were more on the external processes across organizations rather than the internal factors within the partners. On challenges, the highest variations were encountered on bureaucracy VAR.P (0.6) as a challenge with the least being in confused accountability and failure to deliver tying with VAR.P (0.35). The varying views on challenges being on aspects of bureaucracy, unlike financial accountability and failure to deliver.

The indications across the findings being that with the funding of projects, comes with the bureaucracy of processes within the partnership while there are concerted efforts to enhance accountability and compliance across the partners. Internally the partners in unison agree on having the internal capacity. Of the total responses, in all the indicators, over 80% of respondents noted that these challenges don not impede implementation of on donor project implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya. The most highlighted
challenge was the slow pace of bureaucracy with 2.6% highlighting either both very much and much on the challenges experienced by the organisations. According to the study, the most highlighted challenge is the slow pace of bureaucracy with 2.6% highlighting either both very much and much on the challenges experienced by the organisations.

The findings are contrary to what had been expected as per the literature review. From the results, compatibility is not of the problem in the partnership between Trocaire and local non-governmental organisation as contrary to Claire (2016) view that it is difficult for an organisation to find organisations that are compatible in the first place as well as implementing a donor plan between two entities with different philosophies of working. The studies show that the outcome of donor project delivery does not outweigh the mission and vision of organisations partnership between Trocaire and local partnerships in donor project implementation.

The questions of accountability have not come to fore as expected. As Kappor (2015) noted in the literature review, NGO leaders misappropriate donor funding meant to benefit communities. The responses show that accountability is not a problem between Trocaire and local partnerships. The contrary outcome on the issue of accountability may need to be interrogated further. Triangulation of the information across various target group, including with the funding organisations recommended identifying any cases of funds misappropriation. Accountability would also be explored holistically beyond funds management in future studies.

Further, according to the studies by Bebbington (2013) it was postulated that the government of Kenya through NGO Coordination Board and the National Council of NGO interferes with donor project implementations through unnecessary bureaucracy. The findings of this study offer contrary opinion. Government interference was not mentioned as an obstacle in donor project implementation by Local Non-Govermental Organisation implementing projects together with Trocaire Kenya. The results would however be different if Trocaire programs were political in nature.

5.3.3 Partnerships Lessons Learnt on Donor Project Implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya.

The study validated Ramalingana (2015) view that a lack of partnership sustainability by a non-governmental organisation on donor project implementation remains a significant challenge in the humanitarian world. By looking at funding offered by Trocaire to local
organisations in the last financial year, the study shows that all the periods covered (last financial year and other years) point to a positive relationship between the number of years and the funding package to the individual organisations. The more the years of partnership, the more the funding package. However, analysis of Standard Deviation on funding shows the variance indicates the values are not very close to the mean. The variance implies that the funding across the various periods has not been consistent across the organisations hence local organisations are justified to feel that their sustainability as organisations have been weakened by sporadic funding.

The study results have not however proved Ramalingana (2015) assertions that Local Non-Governmental organisations have been weakened by staff poaching by International Non-Governmental Organisations. To the contrary, the study shows that Trocaire has not undermined the growth of local partners. However, due to inconsistent funding, the study results point to the fact that in some cases the local actors are eventually sidelined and not treated as partners but as sub-contractors and called upon only when the need arises and not as part of long-term strategic plans of Trocaire.

Regression coefficient in the study provided a statistical measure of the average functional relationship between two or more variables to measure the degree of dependence of one variable on the other(s). Regarding the funding, the organisations have received from Trocaire in the last Financial year as compared to the funding received from other years. Multiple R, being the Correlation Coefficient to measure the strength of a linear relationship between two variables. Figures tending to (positive) +1 means a strong positive relationship (0.601281 for the funding stream). For the funding stream, the value is 0.36154 (rounded off to 5 decimal places) with a standard error of 0.83139 for the total 37 observations.

The Significance of value gave the validity of the results of how reliable (statistically significant) the results are. For the 2 variables, the Significance F is 0.000083 less than 0.05 (5%), indicating the model used in conducting research was correct. Covariance was 0.576177285 which is strongly positive on funding for last years and other years. Standard deviation, last financial years = 1.012018812, other years 1.00532013 indicating increment in variations in funding across the organisation in the last financial year.
The variance indicates the values are not very close to the mean. Which implies that the funding across the various periods has not been consistent across the organisations. There is no clearly defined correlation between variables, which compares the length of partnership with the strengthening of the various components of the organisations. A more in-depth assessment with deeper assessment into the various factors would derive the correlations. However, some correlations are more positive across the various strength areas with the number of years of partnership with no specific pattern. On regression across the strengths and the number of years of engagement;

The variances across the data sets on the relationship with Trocaire was significant ranging from 0.3 on donor conditions to the ease of payment to 1.25 on changes in expenditure. This indicates that for conditions set out by donors on funding was managed the same way across the organisations while for the changes in expenditure plans are majorly varying across organisations. The findings show positive correlations between the numbers of years of engagement with the strengths on various fronts is positive in all aspects.

In all aspects, whereas there were acknowledged challenges with regards to capacity needs, system needs, quality personnel, and quality project implementation, the biggest lessons learnt from the study is that sustainable funding of Local Non-Governmental Organisations in missing in Kenya. Sustainable funding is missing therefore organisations are forced to implement short term projects depending on Donor’s preferences which might not have significant developmental and socio-economic transformation of the communities they operate in.

The study findings show that the partnership between Trocaire and LNGOS have led to increased networks, presence at national and international level directly contributing to increased funding, community awareness, and community acceptance of the works of local Non-Governmental Organisations within Kenya. The findings of the study validate Elbers (2012) postulations that partnerships work as a back stop or an insurance policy of the inability of the local LNGOs to generate sufficient funding for their respective development work due to increased audience to donors at national and International level as a consequence of partnership with International Non-Governmental organisations like Trocaire.
Finally, another key lesson learnt from the study is that Trocaire’s non-religious, non-political model has greatly increased the legitimacy of the organization in the eyes of government, communities, and implementing LNGOs. Further, Trocaire partnerships have naturally grown from strength to strength hence eliminating while maintaining quality donor project implementation at community level.

According to Axelrod (1984), the most successful strategy in humanitarian partnership is also the simplest: start with co-operation in the first move and then do what the other player did in the previous round (tit-for-tat). The study findings on the lessons learnt points to Axelrod postulations that the evolution of co-operation depended upon individuals having a sufficiently large chance of meeting again, so they have a stake in their future interaction (this can be applied to individuals within organisations as well as to the organisations themselves). The co-operation can be based upon reciprocity, but once established this can survive many different strategies used by the individuals and can protect itself from less co-operative strategies. This perhaps explain why Trocaire has maintained long-term partnerships with same LNGOs for periods ranging from four to fifteen years.

5.4 Conclusion

5.4.1 Partnerships Benefits on Donor Project Implementation by Irish charity Trocaire Kenya.

The study concludes by noting that the partnership between Trocaire and local non-governmental has brought many benefits to Local Non-Governmental Organisations, improved the quality of donor project implementation to local communities in Kenya. In particular, the partnership between Trocaire and LNGOs have led to strengthened board of governance, management and leadership skills, technical ability to deliver quality program to recipient communities, strengthened advocacy and campaign abilities, community participatory approaches, monitoring and evaluation, financial planning and forecasting, and increased presence at national and international levels especially on donor fundraising and involvement in the platforms that help generate development policy of local communities.
5.4.2 Partnerships Challenges on Donor Project Implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya.
The study highlighted partnerships challenges impacting on donor project implementation to a small extent were: conflicting vision of partnership, conflicting mission of partnership, partnership rules, power asymmetry in partnerships, slow bureaucracy confused accountability, failure of partnerships to deliver both for the communities and donors, lack of partnership sustainability strategy, lack of skilled workforce to facilitate implementation of donor projects impediment to donor project implementation in Kenya. Consistent and sustainable funding was identified the greatest challenge facing partnerships between Local Non-Governmental organisations and Trocaire. Slow bureaucracy in funds disbursement and partnership assessments were also highlighted as a challenge to partnership between Trocaire and LNGOS.

5.4.3 Lessons Learnt by Partnerships on Donor Project Implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya
The study concludes that the level of funding to a local organisation directly affect their sustainability. The study concludes that Trocaire funding model to local organisations has not been sustainable and consistency hence impacting expected outcome on the donor project implementation. The more the years of partnership, the more the funding package. However, analysis of standard deviation on funding shows the variance indicates the values are not very close to the mean. The variance implies that the funding across the various periods has not been consistent across the organisations. Hence, local organisations are justified to feel that sporadic funding has weakened their sustainability as organisations and further increased rather than reduce dependency on donor funding.

5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Recommendation for Improvements

5.5.1.1 Partnerships Benefits on Donor Project Implementation by Irish charity Trocaire Kenya.
Trocaire should maintain its consistence and high-quality partnership management that has established and demonstrated over the past 10 years. Good partnership management will build on gains made in partnership management to further lead to strengthened board of governance, management and leadership skills, technical ability to deliver quality
program to recipient communities, strengthened advocacy and campaign abilities, community participatory approaches, monitoring and evaluation, financial planning and forecasting, and increased presence at national and international levels especially on donor fundraising and involvement in the platforms that help generate development policy of local communities.

5.5.1.2 Partnerships Challenges on Donor Project Implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya.

Trocaire and LNGOs should formulate consistent and sustainable funding model for long term donor project implementation and community development. Slow bureaucracy in funds disbursement and partnership assessments were highlighted as major challenges to partnership between Trocaire and LNGOS. Trocaire should strive to simplify bureaucracy related to partner assessments, procurement, financial reporting, funds disbursement, and contracting. The bureaucracy is failing mainly on the financial disbursement and controls based on the different systems across the donor organisation and implementing partners coupled with the overall donor requirements of the various projects, which differ across various donors.

5.5.1.3 Lessons Learnt by Partnerships on Donor Project Implementation by Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya

The study shows that levels of funding to the local organisation is the beckon to their existence. The study concludes that Trocaire funding model to local organisations has not been sustainable and consistency hence impacting the expected outcome on the donor project implementation in long term. The more the years of partnership, the more the funding package. However, analysis of Standard Deviation on funding shows the variance indicates the values are not very close to the mean. The variance implies that the funding across the various periods has not been consistent across the organisations; hence, local organisations are justified to feel that sporadic funding has weakened their sustainability as organisations. In these regards, Trocaire should improve consistency on funding local partners by engaging in long-term projects with these actors. Further, to enhance consistency in funding, Trocaire should consider reducing the number of partners to a level that would allow fair, sustainable resources for effective donor project implementation. Trocaire should invest in building the capacity of partners with
fundraising skills that would enhance diversity and spread the risk of their funding stream.

5.5.2 Recommendations for further studies

The questions of accountability did not come to fore as expected. It is no secret that some NGO leaders misappropriates donor funding meant to benefit communities. Ironically, the responses from the study show that accountability is not a problem between Trocaire and its local partners. The unexpected outcome on the issue of accountability may need to be interrogated further. To gauge the accountability of partnerships between Trocaire and local partners, it would be prudent for future researchers to seek opinions of beneficiaries at the community level and incorporate it in their findings concerning donor project implementation.

The comparisons of funding streams for Trocaire partners and other organisations would establish the linkages towards various systems' strength within the organisations bolstering strategic positioning and sustainability of the local organisations. The localisation agenda within the development world has gained traction across the board in the achievement of the SDGs. With the discussion on funding to be channelled through to local partners to implement projects in the community. This would be an area of further research to explore the readiness of local partners to step up and deliver high-quality programmes. The strategic plans for the various organisations and their link to the capacity of the organisations not explored. Further studies would inform the linkage to the capacity of the organisations based on their strategic plans.
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Dear Participant,

I invite you to participate in a research study entitled: “Impact of Non-governmental organisations partnership on donor funded project the case of Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya”. I am currently enrolled in the Master of Business Administration and am in the process of writing my master’s Thesis. The purpose of the research is to establish the benefits, challenges, and lessons learnt in partnerships between International non-governmental organisation and local non-governmental organisations in Kenya. The findings will be useful in making improvements to the existing Trocaire partnerships and bring more value to the communities we serve.

Your participation in this research project is voluntary. You may decline altogether or leave blank any questions you do not wish to answer. There are no known risks to participation beyond those encountered in everyday life. Your responses will remain confidential and anonymous. Data from this research will be kept confidential.

If you agree to participate in this project, please answer the questions on the questionnaire as best you can. It should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. If you have any questions about this project, feel free to contact me on my email: githuaw@gmail.com

Thank you for your assistance in this important endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

Wilfred Githua
Appendix II: Questionnaire

The questionnaire has been prepared for the purpose of data collection in partial fulfillment of the award of Master of Business Administration in Strategic Management. It has two sections. Section 1 requires information concerning general information’s. Section 2 concerns the variables to find out NGO partnerships benefits on donor project implementation, Section 3, concerns the variables to find out NGO Partnerships challenges on donor project implementation, and Section 4 concerns about Partnerships lessons learnt on Donor Project Implementation. Section 5 consist of feedback section.

| I am conducting research on Trocaire partnerships in partial fulfillment of the award of Master of Business Administration in Strategic Management. I would love to hear from you about the benefits, challenges, and lessons for improved working relations between our organisations and donors. This will help us make improvements to our existing partnerships and bring more value to the communities we serve. The survey should only take 25 minutes, and your responses are completely anonymous. |
| | |
| SECTION 1: DEMOGRAPHY |
| 1 | Which County is your organisation is based? |
| 2 | Please choose one of the following that best describes your organisation? |
| (1) Trust | (2) NGO | (3) INGO |
| 3 | Approximately what was the total budget in KES of your organisation in your last Financial year? |
| (1) Less than 5 Million | (2) 6M-10 M | (3) 11M-20 M | (4) Above 20 Million |
| 4 | Approximately how much in KES has your organisation received from Trocaire in the last Financial year? |
| (1) Less than 5 Million | (2) 6M-10 M | (3) 11M-20 M | (4) Above 20 Million |
| 5 | For how many years have you received support from [TROCAIRE]?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) 1-4 Years</th>
<th>(2) 5-9 Years</th>
<th>(3) 10-14 Years</th>
<th>(4) Above 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to know how the partnership between your organisation and Trocaire have impacted donor project implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Financial Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of these statements about how non-financial benefits received from Trocaire have impacted on your organisation donor project implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strengthening our Board / governance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strengthening our management and leadership skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strengthening our financial management skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strengthening our technical abilities to deliver service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strengthening our advocacy &amp; campaigning abilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strengthening our participatory approaches</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strengthening our monitoring and evaluation skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Strengthening our long-term planning / financial viability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Strengthening our presence at national / international levels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Introductions to other organisations / people / networks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Accessing other sources of funds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In your perspective what has been the most significant partnership non-financial benefit on donor project implementation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Financial Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of these statements about how financial benefits received from Trocaire have impacted on your organisation donor project implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stron</td>
<td>Stron</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gly disagr</td>
<td>gly Agree</td>
<td>See</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The payments are made in appropriate phases so we can easily manage our cash flow.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Trocaire allows us to make any changes that we need to about how we spend funds.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Trocaire makes an appropriate contribution to general/core costs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Trocaire clearly explains any conditions imposed by the original donors who provide the funds.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>In your perspective what has been the most significant partnership financial benefit on donor project implementation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 3**

I would like to know the challenges that your partnership with Trocaire has experienced during donor project implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On scale of 1-5, please indicate the extent challenges have on your partnership with Trocaire and donor project implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conflicting Vision in partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conflicting mission in partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rules that govern partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Power Asymmetry in partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Slow Pace of Bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Confused Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Failure of partnership to deliver for both the communities and the donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lack of partnership sustainability strategy by Trocaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lack of skilled workforce to facilitate implementation of donor projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Government Interference on donor project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>In your perspective what has been the most significant partnership challenge on donor project implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>What would you recommend as the solution to the mentioned challenge above?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 4**

I would like to know lessons learnt/Areas of improvement in your partnership with Trocaire on donor project implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On a scale of  1-5 please indicate the least or Most important lesson learnt/ Area of Improvement</th>
<th>Least Important</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Provide Support on time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Be more flexible about the support they provide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Discuss their strategy and plans with us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Develop a joint strategy with us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Take more time to listen to us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Be more respectful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be more approachable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Be more fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quality needs partnership assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Equity in sharing financial resources to achieve common goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>In your perspective, what has been the most significant lesson learnt on the impact of partnership on donor project implementation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Has your partnership with Trocaire been successful?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 5 : FEED BACK QUESTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Least likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How likely do you think that Trocaire will make changes as a result of your answers in this survey?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do you have any comments/suggestions to make regarding your relationship with Trocaire?</td>
<td>1- Not at all useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How useful have you found this survey process?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III: USIU Permission to Conduct Research

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

17TH JUNE 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

REF: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH: WILFRED GITHEA NGOIRI
STUDENT ID NO. 656230

The bearer of this letter is a student of United States International University (USIU)-Africa pursuing a master’s Degree in Business Administration.

As part of the program, the student is required to undertake a dissertation on the “Impact of Non-Governmental Organizational Partnerships on Donor Project Implementation: A Case of Irish Charity Trocaire Kenya” requires him to collect data.

Please note that information provided will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will only be used for academic purposes.

Kindly assist the student get the appropriate data and should you have any queries contact the undersigned.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Prof. Akinyi Wanjiru
Dean School of Graduate Studies, Research and Extension
Tel: 730 116 482
Email: awanjiru@usi.ac.ke
Appendix IV: Respondent Consent Letter

To whom it may concern,

August 26, 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Consent to Conduct Research on Trocaire Partners

The purpose of this letter is to inform you that you have been given consent to conduct the research titled IMPACT OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS PARTNERSHIPS ON DONOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION: A CASE OF IRISH CHARITY TROCAIRE KENYA

This also serves as assurance that Trocaire complies with requirements of integrity, privacy of our partners, Safeguarding of participants and will ensure that these requirements are followed in the conduct of this research.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James Fredrick Wanjara
Finance and Administration Manager
Trocaire
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