



International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Needs Articulation and Grant Award Decisions For Humanitarian Assistance Projects in South Sudan

Ngong Ngong John¹, Dr. Isaac Abuya²

¹ University of Nairobi

² University of Nairobi

*Corresponding author email: ngongzeky@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Humanitarian grants provide the operational and financial foundation of humanitarian assistance. These grants offer vital financial and material resources to assist those impacted by emergencies, ultimately preserving lives, reducing suffering, and advancing respect and dignity for those facing adversity. This study examined needs articulation and its role in grant award decisions for humanitarian assistance projects in South Sudan. This study appraised Institutional Theory building on the hypothesis that these theories influence, to a significant extent, the grant award decision on a proposal. A descriptive research design was adopted by the study. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and humanitarian donors operating in South Sudan were targeted by the study, with a sample of 14 NGOs and one donor representative using a stratified random sampling technique by employing Krejcie & Morgan sampling formula. A 5-point Likert scale was used for data collection. Pilot testing was done to check the user-friendliness/appropriateness of the study questionnaire. Data cleaning was carefully done and the completed and returned questionnaires were examined for accuracy, reliability, and coded. Raw data was processed and analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences. The study finds that a grant proposal can hardly be funded if the needs of the affected people are not well articulated, the proposal doesn't align with donor priorities, the proposal doesn't showcase experience or the proposal doesn't demonstrate a realistic sustainability model. The study concludes that it's paramount to clearly articulate the needs of the affected population in a grant proposal, that alignment with donor priorities is a critical factor to consider when designing grant proposals, that experience is a critical element prioritized by donors when making competitive grant award decisions, that a project's sustainability model is a key determinant of a positive grant award decision, and that a project may still be funded even if it doesn't include a theory of change.

Key words: Humanitarian grants, needs articulation, donors

Introduction

Humanitarian grants provide the operational and financial foundation of humanitarian assistance globally. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2023) defines humanitarian assistance as aid intended to preserve and uphold human dignity both during and after emergencies while also saving lives and reducing suffering. These grants are highly significant as they offer vital financial resources to assist those impacted by emergencies or natural catastrophes. Humanitarian initiatives support those who have suffered trauma or loss, help to strengthen the resilience of those in need, and shield those who are susceptible from danger (OECD, 2023). Ultimately, humanitarian efforts help to preserve life, reduce human suffering, and restore respect and dignity for people facing adversity. Sectorial or multi-sectorial approaches are used to develop and offer this assistance, which includes but is not limited to giving those in need of access to food, water, shelter, education, safety, psychosocial support, and medical treatment.

Over the decades, Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) have shown crucial function and meaningful results in designing and delivering humanitarian assistance to the affected communities globally (Daniela, 2010). This is partly because NGOs are widely believed to be more efficient and closer to the affected people than the donors in providing aid to the poor and needy recipients, also known as project participants. On the other hand, donors (government, private sector, individuals) play a critical role in ensuring that funds (humanitarian grants) are available for the NGOs to reach the affected populations.

Funding humanitarian responses is marred with its unique challenges, including the capacity to design projects that impact donor humanitarian assistance funding decisions. As conflicts, natural disasters, and climate emergencies continue to rise, humanitarian needs continue to swell globally while funding shrinks (United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, 2022).

With insufficient funding and more humanitarian agencies at play, the competition for funding has risen in recent years explicitly bringing to light the capacity issues of the grant applicants to design projects that influence the grant award decisions by the donors. In 2022 alone, the donor resources were spread across major crises like the Ukraine conflict crisis, Syria crisis, Somalia hunger crisis, South Sudan conflict crisis, Ethiopian conflict among

other humanitarian responses. Globally, 274 million individuals needed humanitarian protection and humanitarian aid in general in 2022, compared to 235 million people the previous year, which was the largest number in so many years; these numbers represent a huge increase in humanitarian needs (OCHA, 2022). Moreover, these humanitarian crises suggest a strained donor capacity and fatigue to provide the necessary financial resources to satisfy the urgent humanitarian requirements. This further implies that the implementing agencies on the ground must now 'compete' for the few donor resources to maintain their life-saving operations in crisis zones like South Sudan, Somalia, and Afghanistan among others.

The South Sudan Humanitarian Fund (SSHF), the country's donor-pooled fund, allocated US\$68.8 million to 64 humanitarian partners operating in the country in 2022, through the standard and reserve allocation modalities (OCHA, 2022). The SSHF is a country-based pooled fund in which major donors contribute to one funding pool, with UNOCHA as the fund manager in the country.

By July 2022, the SSHF allocation for the year only amounted to US\$25 million (close to 64% reduced funding level relative to the previous year); this was intended to give a major boost to humanitarian assistance activities in tackling the effects of heightened violence and food shortages in ten counties of the four most severely affected states of South Sudan: Warrap, Jonglei, Unity, and Western Equatoria states (OCHA, 2022).

With the 64% reduction in SSHF funding in 2022 in comparison to the funding levels in the previous year, the number of partners eligible to receive this funding increased from 64 to 125, close to double the number eligible in 2021. This implies serious 'competition' for funding slots in the pooled fund; this is definitely not the 'usual' state of things in the country's humanitarian industry. Suddenly, there is a 64% reduction in resources (funds) and a close to 50% increase in the number of implementing partners, the potential fund recipients. This is a case of more eligible (potential) implementing partners, less funding in the pool; more needs, and stringent partner (fund recipient) selection criteria. As the competition for funds becomes steep, and as the number of eligible partners becomes twice as much, the chances that a grant proposal by an eligible applicant gets funded are diminishing. This further implies that project designs will be subjected to more stringent selection criteria during grant award decision-making process by the donors. With the low funding levels, there is a high risk of grant proposals being rejected for funding, which ultimately implies that the needs of the affected populations will not be met adequately which further triggers a crisis within crisis. The reduced donor appetite and little prioritization of funding allocations to South Sudan crisis is a recent phenomenon that humanitarian agencies in the country are facing in the last few years, given that South Sudan has been on the priority list of the major humanitarian donors since the country became independent in 2011.

Amidst the looping funding shortages globally and in the country particularly, an astounding 76 percent of South Sudan's population, or over 9.4 million people, were predicted to require humanitarian aid in 2023. In the country, at least 148,000 foreign returnees were still displaced and unable to return to their homes (OCHA, 2023). In 2023, there were 9.4 million individuals in need of humanitarian assistance, an increase from 8.9 million in 2022 due to the decline in people's coping strategies, living conditions, and physical and mental health. Compounding shocks brought on by ongoing conflict, extensive flooding, growing food insecurity, inflation, rising food costs, and limited access to essential services are the main causes of this escalation (OCHA, 2023).

South Sudan became a self-governing state in 2011, having gained her independence from Sudan through a popular referendum. The young nation started off with promising economic prospects. However, the country's economy was heavily dependent on oil revenues, making up to 98% of the overall government revenue base (Attipoe et. al, 2014). South Sudan had no external debts in 2011 when it gained independence. More so, the government spent far less per person due to its relatively small population and abundant oil income, compared to many of its neighbors in the region. With these prospects, external observers believed that the nation indeed had a promising economic future. With the inherited untapped oil reserves supplementing the nation's well-established oil sector, the nation was in a good position to finance the significant expenditures needed for physical infrastructure, health care, and education coupled with its mining and huge agricultural potential. However, a few years into independence, this potential was lost. Cross border conflict with Sudan and internal political wrangling crippled South Sudan oil exports in particular and the economy at large. In 2015, South Sudan devalued its currency against the US Dollar and a year later, the nation had the highest rate of inflation in the world, just five years after gaining independence, as its currency lost more than 90% of its value (South Sudan Humanitarian Project, 2016).

Two years after its independence, the young nation was back to the frontline, this time against itself and within its national boundaries; an armed conflict broke out in the country's capital, Juba, between the government and opposition groups, and spread across other parts of the country fast. This triggered a humanitarian catastrophe in the form of widespread displacement, loss of lives and livelihoods, and a fragile economy. A peace agreement was signed to quell the conflict, but this didn't last long. In 2016, another conflict broke out, again between the government and opposition forces. This resulted in mass displacement, the creation of Protection of Civilians (POCs) camps, a spike in food insecurity levels, major safety challenges, access restrictions, and economic meltdown. The food security levels continued to worsen while humanitarian needs continued to deepen and became complex in nature.

As the humanitarian needs deepened in South Sudan, other sustained and emerging humanitarian crises and responses also grew in complexity and number in other countries including Somalia, Yemen, Afghanistan, Ukraine, and Democratic Republic of Congo in the recent times. According to OCHA (2024), Somalia endured a devastating protracted dry spell in 2023, which preceded severe floods in a matter of months. The severity and spread of the humanitarian requirements remain unabated. Acute food insecurity affects nearly one in five Somalis. The Integral Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) analysis, which was published on February 15, 2024, projected that until March 2024, at least 4 million people, or 21% of the population, was going to be in IPC Phase 3 or worse (Crisis or Emergency phase). Given that 23 out of 74 districts are deemed difficult or extremely difficult to access, the drawdown was expected to exacerbate the difficulty of humanitarian access and raise the cost of relief efforts during a period when a decrease in humanitarian funding was anticipated, as only 43% of the funding allocated for the 2023 Humanitarian Response Plan was received the previous year (OCHA, 2024). One significant obstacle is that, at US\$ 1.6 billion, the nation's financial needs for 2024 are 40% lower than those for

2023. An estimated 4.8 million people needed assistance from this allocation, which was 32% fewer than the number of people targeted in 2023 (OCHA, 2024). With the limited funding and increasing humanitarian needs in Somalia, it's apparent that competition for funding would rise and well-designed projects to meet specific donor requirements likely received positive funding decisions. Similar humanitarian challenges cut across other regions and countries, for instance, Yemen.

In 2024, after nine years of conflict escalation and more than a year since the agreement between the warring sides expired, Yemen found itself at a crossroads. The developments of the recent regional conflicts, such as the war in Gaza, have increased the humanitarian hazards involved and worsened the overall humanitarian outlook. Now and in the next few years, there will be a great demand for humanitarian aid across the country. In 2024, Yemen's complicated protection issues remained the main source of the nation's humanitarian needs (OCHA, 2024). OCHA (2023) reported that by the end of December 2023, just 38.3% of the US\$4.34 billion Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) had been financed, prompting 229 humanitarian agencies in the country to scale back or discontinue vital support programs for 17.3 million people. This situation bears similarities to both South Sudan and Somalia, with notable declines in funding, a huge number of aid agencies on the ground, and growing unmet humanitarian needs. This supports the theory that, in this fiercely competitive environment, donor funding will most likely only be attracted to well-designed programs. Afghanistan and other humanitarian disasters bear a similar dent.

Afghanistan is still battling the aftereffects of four decades of warfare, pervasive poverty, effects of climate change, and grim barriers to women's equality and involvement in public life. The Republic's underlying fragilities, such as inadequate chances for rural as well as urban residents to earn a living, have been made worse by the economic downturn that followed the change in leadership in August 2021, which also happened to coincide with the suspension of significant bilateral development cooperation (OCHA, 2024). Moreover, half of Afghanistan's population, or 23.7 million people needed humanitarian aid by 2024, out of which, only 17.3 million were targeted for humanitarian support. This means over 6.4 million individuals who needed aid couldn't be reached due to lack of funding. Humanitarian actors have been and will continue to be forced by these limited resources to prioritize the most vulnerable and those in dire need (OCHA, 2023). The strained Afghan economy, which is mostly dependent on remittances and humanitarian assistance, is facing difficulties made worse by women's marginalization from the workforce. From the project design perspective, given the high competition for the limited humanitarian funding in Afghanistan, project designs that best meet specific donor requirements will likely receive positive award decisions.

In the West and Central Africa, similar humanitarian trends are witnessed in conflict-affected countries like the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). The DRC's humanitarian outlook is still grave. More than 25.4 million people, or 25% of the population, needed humanitarian aid in 2024. The Eastern provinces, which have been particularly affected by conflict and insecurity, continue to have the greatest humanitarian needs. With almost 9.6 million people in the DRC on the move as of December 31, 2023—including 2.6 million returnees, 527,000 refugees, and 6.5 million displaced by conflict people—the country had one of the worst displacement crises in the world, second only to Sudan.

According to OCHA (2023), the 2023–2024 DRC Humanitarian Response Plan estimated that the nation required \$2.25 billion for national and international NGOs, as well as United Nations agencies, to provide aid to 10 million people. This aid was used to help those affected meet their basic needs while also preserving lives, easing suffering, and improving civilian protection.

Despite the huge humanitarian needs, only 33.5% of the humanitarian funding needs were met in the country in 2023, leaving a huge gap of unmet needs. Given the significant funding gaps with a huge presence of humanitarian agencies, the competition for funds rises dramatically and this calls for high capacity to design projects that best meet the donor requirements in order to enhance an agency's chances of positive grant award decisions from the donors.

The level of humanitarian funding is expected to significantly decrease in 2024 and 2025 following major cuts by the leading government donors in their humanitarian budgets for the year. As the humanitarian funding shrinks and humanitarian needs continue to rise globally, regionally and in South Sudan in particular, the competition for the little available funds is anticipated to rise. To exacerbate this further, particularly in the context of South Sudan, the number of humanitarian agencies eligible for the locally available funds has been rising over the last few years, despite the shrinking funding levels. This creates a limited space for acquiring funds to meet the increasing needs of the affected populations. The immediate consequence of which is that the needs of the affected populations will not be adequately met, lives will be lost, and the already vulnerable communities will plunge into deeper crises. The donors on one side will need to make critical, if not hard, decisions on the type of proposals to fund with the little available funding while the humanitarian grant applicants will need to be creative on what would make a winning grant in this hyper-competitive humanitarian environment.

This study is cognizant that donor funding will always be limited as there are not enough resources to meet all the needs; nonetheless, agencies that design humanitarian projects will need to demonstrate the capacity to design projects that positively influence humanitarian donor grant award decisions. The study is premised on the fact that no substantial literature exists on project design and donor award decisions for humanitarian assistance in South Sudan. Therefore, the paper endeavored to clearly ascertain and document what project design parameters make a winning grant proposal in a competitive humanitarian context of South Sudan. Specifically looking at project design and grant award decisions for humanitarian assistance projects in Juba, South Sudan.

Literature review

Needs assessment and grant award decisions for humanitarian projects.

Addressing the needs of the affected populations is at the heart of good humanitarian donorship and humanitarian action in general. However, to address the needs of the affected people, a coherent needs assessment is key. While a needs assessment may clearly identify the severity, triggers, and breadth of the challenges facing the affected population, the grim reality is that the donors almost always have limited funds to meet all the needs of the affected population. This makes needs assessment a rather tough task which not only requires fairness but great analytical skills. This section looks at the historical, contemporary, and developing issues on needs assessment and grant award decisions by donors.

Stufflebeam et al. (1985) are among the earliest known authors on the subject of needs assessment. They contend in their work, *Conducting Educational Needs Assessment*, that needs assessments provide a logical method for setting priorities and assigning resources. Key findings from the study include the following: current performance; means to maintain or achieve the desired outcomes; and costs, viability, and other pertinent information are related to the recommended actions. Needs assessments are critical for strategic decisions. The study emphasizes that to create a grant proposal and secure funding, a needs assessment is necessary. This is true in the contemporary humanitarian practice where some, if not most, donors require a needs assessment of not more than six months from the time of data collection, as a measure of currency and relevance of the assessed needs for grant award decisions. However, this new requirement by some donors is a gap in the work of Stufflebeam et al. (1985) as this study doesn't stipulate how long needs assessments remain useful for donor decision making, especially when making decisions on grant awards in relation to the needs on the ground.

Gunther Fink and Silvia Redaelli (2011) have also contributed to the discussion of needs assessment and grant award decisions. They delved deeper into the subject in their paper, *Determinants of International Emergency Aid—Humanitarian Need Only?* Fink and Redaelli (2011) examined the factors influencing international emergency help using an original data set encompassing 270 natural catastrophes. The study concludes that while humanitarian requirements seem to be a significant factor in determining emergency relief payments, political and strategic considerations are as important in determining how emergency aid is allocated. Donor states exhibit notable biases toward politically less aligned countries and their former colonies, and they generally favor smaller, geographically closer, and oil-exporting nations.

The United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/182, which stipulates that emergency assistance shall "... be provided in accordance with the principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality, and independence," clearly defines the goals and standards for humanitarian aid from an ethical and legal standpoint (United Nations, 1991). Humanitarian assistance is intended to relieve human distress during emergencies, regardless of ethnic background, nationality, or other political affiliations, legal or ethical perspective. Notwithstanding these relatively explicit directives, worries over the distribution of emergency relief have grown in recent years, and criticism of foreign aid policy has increased from the media and commercial charity groups (Fink and Redaelli, 2011).

The study used a sample of 270 disasters that happened between 1992 and 2004 to give the first cross-country examination of emergency assistance determinants. The study examined how the world reacts to humanitarian crises brought on by natural catastrophes and assessed the extent to which humanitarian principles conceptually underpin international aid flows. According to the study, a number of bilateral and strategic considerations seem to have a big impact on the decisions made by donors regarding emergency help. Generally, donor states tend to send help more frequently to nations that sell oil and disproportionately more to nations that are closer physically and politically, as well as to their former colonies.

The research also reveals that there are significant differences amongst donors in the variables influencing both the decision to participate (selection) and the actual quantity of help awarded (allocation). Oil exporting nations are more likely to receive aid from the United States of America, the Britain, and Norway, while Japan and other private donors are not as likely to do so. The five largest donors—the United States, the United Kingdom, Norway, Germany, and Japan—all appear inclined to support nations with less political polarization in their recent UN voting records and to offer more substantial assistance if they choose to step in following a disaster.

These findings imply that emergency relief is utilized by donors to solidify ties with states whose foreign policy outlook often differs (Fink and Redaelli, 2011). While Neumayer (2003) indicates that civil and political rights have a significant role in determining aid allocation, Alesina and Dollar (2000) establish sturdy evidence of strategic preconceptions favoring former colonies and political partners, which is consistent with the study's findings. According to Neumayer's (2003) analysis of development banks' and UN agencies' aid initiatives, the majority of regional development banks only consider the recipient's economic needs, whereas UN agencies also include human development factors.

An overview of how humanitarian donors make decisions is given by Rose Worden and Patrick Saez's study from 2021, "How Do Humanitarian Donors Make Decisions, and What Is the Scope for Change?" The study focuses on the importance of needs assessments in grant award decisions made by humanitarian donors. This work aimed to dissect the decision-making process used by the major humanitarian donor organizations when awarding grants. The study also looked at the factors that support and hinder donors' efforts to alter the way they decide which projects to sponsor. The study's intended audience consisted of humanitarian donors, who in 2020 accounted for 80% of all humanitarian spending.

Fourteen contributors answered an online survey to provide data for this study. In follow-up interviews lasting around two hours, representatives from nine donor organizations took part, which accounted for 62% of humanitarian funding in 2020. The questions were intended to elicit information about internal limitations on humanitarian funding, planning, and decision-making, as well as the effects of the larger political and economic environment in which donors operate. Data analysis was not provided for each donor individually, and the study collected information in a secret manner because of ethical concerns. The research notes that it is not able to present a complete picture of donor practices because data was gathered on a subset of donors; however, it makes an effort to highlight similarities and variations among the practices of those consulted.

According to the report, humanitarian techniques employed by donors are typically focused on preserving human dignity both during and after calamities, as well as on saving lives and reducing suffering. According to the report, the majority of donors worked together to promote the Good

Humanitarian Donorship Initiative's values and best practices for humanitarian funding. Donors differed in their ability to consistently assess, monitor, and prioritize crises response efforts, but they were all committed to focusing on the most urgent needs.

The quality of HRP's and other papers, such as Refugee Response Plans (RRPs) and Humanitarian Needs Overviews (HNOs), has been inconsistent, according to donors, which has hampered their usefulness for deeper planning or comparing the urgency and severity of needs across crises. The study discovers that donors were driven to depend more on instruments developed outside of the UN-led system to close this gap, such as the Assessment Capacities Project's ACAPS severity index, which serves as an "objective algorithm" for deciding on needs-based financing priorities. Ninety percent of the humanitarian cash allocated by some donors was reportedly directed toward situations with high ACAPS severity index scores. Additionally, the survey discovered that about 40% of contributors kept 20–40% of their funds in reserve. Donors viewed early planning figures primarily as approximations and maintained flexibility to adjust for evolving needs. Most significantly, smaller contributors relied on larger donors to provide information for needs evaluations that determined which funding priorities, while some donors collaborated more closely with a small number of peers.

Theoretical Review

Institutional Theory

John Meyer and Brian Rowan developed institutional theory in the late 1970s to investigate how organizations interact with, are influenced by, and were formed by their local, regional, national, and international contexts. The theory considers the ways in which tools and frameworks—such as work plans, rules, norms, and conventions—become acknowledged as the only acceptable frameworks for social behavior (Gordon, 2022). According to the idea, institutions, also known as organizations, have normative, regulative, and cognitive traits that work together to give people's social conduct inside the organization structure, stability, and meaning (Muller et al., 2019).

This theory elaborates how each institution/organization embodies a unique set of knowledge, experiences, and physical assets, operating systems such as finance and accounting systems, policies, cultures, values, professional networks, and operational capabilities. These unique 'qualities' make an organization stand out in executing tasks.

Inasmuch as the theory is primarily geared toward social behavior, it is also true in professional settings in which stakeholders such as donors or government institutions make decisions on channeling of critical resources like humanitarian funds based on how they perceive the institutional capacity of the applicant agency. This in a way implies a form of 'soft bias' in favor of organizations that are perceived by the donors to exhibit credible institutional capabilities including good track record of performance, possession of critical expertise, availability of adequate means of mobility to the project sites and good accounting and social safeguarding policies.

In grant acquisition processes, the question is whether organizations that present stronger and unique institutional capabilities tend to stand a higher chance of being trusted by the donors and communities they serve to ultimately meet the project goal. This may boost their chances of being selected in a competitive grant acquisition process. This affirms part of the institutional theory's tenet that an institution's technical capabilities, approaches, and operational capacity greatly influence the organization's position to bargain for more resources while commanding trust and operational excellence in competitive environments.

Although institutionalism has been successful in taking center stage as the most popular theory for researching macro-organizational phenomena, it should be noted that the theory's original intent has been greatly expanded upon to explain how organizational structures and processes gain continuity and meaning beyond their functional objectives (Suddaby, 2010). Furthermore, the idea has inherent flaws regarding strong outside influences. Regardless of an institution's competence and capability, factors like political instability, unfavorable natural diseases, and conflict or insecurity can significantly impair its functioning. This limits the idea of institutionalism by rendering an institution's capacity and capability "temporary."

Materials and Methods

Research Design

Descriptive research design was used to conduct this study. This is because the study focused on the use of statistical measures of tendencies to describe how different factors relate or correlate to one another (Churchill, 1991). According to Kothari (2004), descriptive research accurately describes individuals, events, or circumstances. A description of the variables connected to a demographic subject is part of descriptive research. This type of approach makes it possible to correctly attribute the observed characteristics of the study subject (the who, what, and how of an issue). To identify relationships and create a model that describes how well project design is connected to grant award decisions by the donors, regression and correlation analyses were conducted. The organization of the research activity is also called the research set up or research design. According to Kisilu and Tromp (2006), this forms the cornerstone of all the various facets of any research endeavor. According to Orodho (2011), a research design is a blueprint that contains all the requirements and elements required to collect and evaluate data impartially and in line with the goals of the study. Research design offers a structure for carrying out research.

Target Population

The institutional humanitarian donors and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) operating in South Sudan were the main target population of this study. The study focused on interviewing donors and INGO staff members with at least two years or more experience in project

design, project management, and grant award processes. This included but not limited to program officers, sector specialists, and grant managers who work for an INGO or a donor agency. The study focused on the decisions and strategies made by INGOs when writing proposals for humanitarian assistance projects. On the donor side, the study documented decision making process by the donors when they fund grant proposals for humanitarian assistance. The study's target population also included other relevant authorities/individuals with background in project design and grant award decisions as a way of triangulating views while capturing different perspectives on the study subject.

According to the South Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Commission (Government office that registers non-governmental organizations and donors operating in the country) and the South Sudan NGO Forum, there are 118 international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), 1,800 National NGOs, and several donor agencies operating in South Sudan (South Sudan NGO forum, 2024). Despite the high number of INGOs (118) making up the South Sudan NGO forum, not all of them are regular or big recipients (by grant size) of funds from the country's pooled fund, the South Sudan Humanitarian Fund (SSHF). The study targeted 15 INGOs who are the top recipients (by grant size) of funding from SSHF. The 15 INGOs composed an adjusted primary target population for this study, alongside the institutional donors represented by UN OCHA in the country. South Sudan uses a country-based pooled funding mechanism in which several donors put their resources together into one pool called South Sudan Humanitarian Fund (SSHF), managed by UN OCHA. Thus, OCHA staff were targeted and interviewed by the study as the overall representative of the donor community in the country.

Sampling Procedures sample size

In this study, the respondents were selected using a stratified random sampling technique. According to Cooper and Schindler (2006), stratified random sampling is a technique used to reduce chance variance between a sample and the population it represents. The approach produces population parameter estimations with higher precision. Program officers, sector specialists, and advisers in the INGOs and donor teams were the three main strata from which every affiliate of the population has an equal chance of being selected. For a sampling formula, the study adopted Krejcie & Morgan (1970) sampling table to determine the study's sample size. According to Krejcie & Morgan (1970), if the target population is 15-19 units, the target sample will be 14 units. Therefore, the sample size of this study was 14 INGOs and one donor, UN OCHA, as the representative of an umbrella of donors as per the country's pooled funding mechanism. The respondents were targeted for interviews and their responses gathered and analyzed.

Table 2. Sampling Criteria

Program sector	Sample percentage	Sampled number	Type of Organization
FSL	33%	5	INGO
Protection	25%	4	INGO
Nutrition	20%	3	INGO
Health	15%	2	INGO
Multiple	7%	1	Donor
	100%	15	

Source: Author, 2024

Analysis and Display of Data

A thorough data cleaning was carefully done following a successful data collection exercise. During this procedure, the completed and returned questionnaires were examined for accuracy, reliability, and assigned unique codes. The cleaned data was processed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS v.30) as a tool for data processing; preliminary entries were made in an Excel Spreadsheet (Office 2013). Data accuracy, consistency with additional details, uniform entry, completeness, and organization to facilitate coding and tabulation was guaranteed during the data cleaning processes. Following the data entry stage, the entire dataset was recorded and saved, in case of need for future reference or if needed to run another analysis. During the data cleaning and coding stage, no outliers were identified.

The procedure of giving the vast pool of information gathered a sense of organization, order, and meaning is known as data analysis. This entails reviewing the information gathered and drawing conclusions and deductions (Kombo & Tromp, 2010). Quantitative analysis, according to Maxfield and Babbie (2014), is the process of representing and manipulating data numerically in order to describe and explain the processes that they reflect. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were utilized to analyze the data. Based on the respondents' qualitative responses, quantitative analysis was performed using numerical measures of tendencies (mean, averages, percentages, and standard deviation) to assess the study's objectives.

Results and Discussion

Response Rate

The sample of this work was 15 units of the targeted population. A total of 15 questionnaires were administered through face-to-face interviews and pick-and-drop approach; all the questionnaires were filled and completed at a 100% response rate. A study response rate of up to 60% is considered fair and a 70% response rate or higher is considered exceptional, according to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003).

Needs articulation and grant award decisions

The study examined the relationship between needs articulation and grant award decisions for humanitarian projects. A five-point Likert scale was used to administer a set of questions to the study respondents. The thoughts and technical opinions of the study participants are recorded in table 9 below with the statistical measures (mean, standard deviation, and variance) for each variable. Table 9 below presents the findings under the needs articulation independent variable, with an in-depth interpretation of the findings provided below.

Table 9: Needs articulation and grant award decision

		Needs articulation and positive grant award decision	Proposal funding and needs articulation	Needs articulation and amount of funding requested	Needs assessment and project implementation period
N	Valid	15	15	15	15
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.40	2.20	2.73	3.33
Std. Error of Mean		.163	.279	.182	.187
Std. Deviation		.632	1.082	.704	.724
Variance		.400	1.171	.495	.524
Sum		66	33	41	50

Source: Author, 2025

Needs articulation and positive grant award decision

This variable sought to ascertain whether needs articulation is a key determinant of a positive grant award decision. The thoughts and technical opinions of the respondents were tallied and analysed as shown in table 10 below. The study finds that clear articulation of the needs of the affected people is a key determinant of a positive grant award decision by donors. Majority of the respondents (46.7%) agreed while 46.7% others strongly agreed that needs articulation is a key determinant of a positive grant award decision. This makes a combined 93.4% of the total count of the respondents (Mean, 4.4; number =14, standard deviation = 0.632) who either 'agree' or 'strongly agree' to the statement. The study's finding goes contrary to the work of Rahman et al (2021) who suggest that contextual factors, such as institutional support, infrastructure, and project management, can also play a role in grant funding decisions, beyond the needs articulation. Rahman et al (2021) findings may not directly address the role of needs articulation, but they strongly indicate that needs articulation is likely not the sole or even a key determinant of a positive grant award decision. The evidence points to a more complex set of factors that influence grant funding success, including peer review process, applicant characteristics, proposal quality, and contextual factors. Nonetheless, further discussions with some of the respondents indicate that in most donor Terms of References or calls for proposals, the premise of clear articulation of needs is a critical item in the partner selection criteria. Humanitarian donors like ECHO are need-based donors of which majority of their funding decisions are based on how much a proposal states the needs on the ground, the underlying vulnerabilities of the affected populations, and triggers of the vulnerability being addressed.

Table 10: Needs articulation and positive grant award decision

Response	Count	Percent
Strongly disagree	0	0.00
Disagree	0	0.00
Neutral	1	6.60
Agree	7	46.70
Strongly agree	7	46.70
Total	15	100.00

Source: Author, 2025

Proposal funding and needs articulation

This variable sought to determine whether a proposal can be funded even if needs are not well articulated. The thoughts and opinions of the respondents were tallied as shown in table 11 below. The study finds that majority of respondents (46.7%) disagreed with the statement, 26.7% strongly disagreed, while 20% agreed to the statement. The mean score for this variable was 2.2 with a standard deviation of 1.082 with the overall finding that a proposal can hardly be funded if needs are not well articulated. This makes it imperative to clearly articulated needs for a positive grant award decision.

The study finding collates with the findings of Mirando (2018) who emphasizes the importance of well-written, thoroughly prepared grant proposals in achieving funding success, rather than solely the needs articulation. Mirando (2018) argues that while a well-articulated needs statement is important for a grant proposal, it is not the sole or even a key determinant of a positive grant award decision.

Table 11: Proposal funding and needs articulation

Response	Count	Per cent
Strongly disagree	4	26.70
Disagree	7	46.70
Neutral	1	6.60
Agree	3	20.00
Strongly agree	0	0.00
Total	15	100.00

Source: Author, 2025

Needs articulation and amount of funding requested

This variable determined whether needs articulation justifies the amount of funding a grant applicant can request for a project during the proposal design process. The views of the respondents were collected and tallied as seen in table 12 below. Majority of the respondents disagreed with the statement (40%) or remained neutral (46.7%), making the overall finding for this variable nullify the statement that needs articulation justifies the amount of funding requested. This means that however much the needs are well articulated, this doesn't justify the amount of funding the donor is willing to award for a grant.

Further discussions with the respondents observed that not all needs can be met as donor budgets come with budget ceilings, indicating resource constraints in relation to the magnitude of needs to be met. Moreso, needs will always outweigh the amount of financial resources available with any donor at a time; thus, not all needs can be met fully however much a proposal may articulate the needs. With the majority of respondents either disagreeing (40%) or remaining neutral (46.7%), the mean score for this variable was 2.73 with a standard deviation of 0.704. Thus, due to resource constraints, not all the needs can be met; this means that needs articulation may justify why certain vulnerabilities groups are targeted, not how much funding should be channelled to the targeted populations. This finding supports the views of Ahmad et al. (2023) who find that sometimes donors consider the need to distribute available funds equitably among different types of applicants despite the initial amount of funding requested by each applicant. Therefore, needs articulation alone doesn't justify the amount of funding requested from a donor as some donors consider the principle of equitable distribution of available funds.

Table 12: Needs articulation and amount of funding requested

Response	Count	Percent
Strongly disagree	0	0.00
Disagree	6	40.00
Neutral	7	46.70
Agree	2	13.30
Strongly agree	0	0.00
Total	15	100.00

Source: Author, 2025

Needs assessment and project implementation period

The variable determined whether needs assessment justifies the length of project period. The feedback from the respondents was collected and tallied as seen in table 13 below. The study finds that 60% of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement; 26.6% agreed with the statement, making a mean score of 3.33 with a standard deviation of 0.724 for the variable. Therefore, the study finds no correlation between needs assessment and length of project period. Further discussions with the respondents revealed that project periods depend on the nature of humanitarian response at hand; emergency or life-saving humanitarian responses are usually implemented in shorter time frames (6-12 months) while development or transitional development responses usually take about 2 years or more of project periods. Moreover, most donor terms of references for proposals pre-stipulate the project implementation periods and the applications are therefore tied to these timeframes regardless of the findings of their needs assessment reports. Contrary to this view, Kalman (2016) argues that a project period is largely dependent on the nature of the root cause identified during needs assessment. Kalman stresses that a needs assessment is critical in determining whether the underlying cause of the problem is a knowledge or skill deficiency, which further provides the justification to consider a training intervention (long-term intervention) or an awareness raising activity (short-term engagement) as a potential solution. This argument gives weight to the need to design the project intervention period depending on the nature of the problem at hand.

Table 13: Needs assessment and project implementation period

Response	Count	Percent
Strongly disagree	0	0.00
Disagree	1	6.70
Neutral	9	60.00
Agree	4	26.60
Strongly agree	1	6.70
Total	15	100.00

Source: Author, 2025

Pearson Correlation Analysis

To ascertain the type and degree of relationships between the hypothesized project design (independent) variables and grant award decision for humanitarian assistance projects in Juba, South Sudan (dependent variable), the study performed Pearson correlation analysis. The Pearson correlations between the project design variable and the positive funding decisions for humanitarian assistance projects are shown in Table 34 below.

Table 34 : Pearson correlation matrix

	Needs articulation	Positive funding decision
Needs articulation	1	
Positive funding decision	.494	1

Source : Author, 2025

Based on the results from the analysis, there is a positive relationship between the grant award decisions for humanitarian assistance and the assessed project design elements (study variables). The results showed that there was the strongest correlation ($r = 0.494$) between needs articulation and positive funding decision by humanitarian donors.

Determining how best the model fits

Table 35: Model summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.853	.728	.711	1.448

Source, author, 2025

Table 36: ANOVA

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.545	5	0.909	11.45	.008801
	Residual	22.502	9	0.3766		
	Total	27.047	14			

The model summary table is shown in table 35 above. Regression model fit to data can be assessed using the R, R², adjusted R², and standard error of the estimate provided in this table. The results indicate that positive funding decision for humanitarian aid and needs articulation are positively correlated. The correlation coefficient (R Square) is equivalent to 0.728, according to the study. The significant degree of prediction is indicated by the coefficient of determination, which is 0.711.

In particular, the 0.711 coefficient of determination shows that variations in needs articulation can explain 71.0% of the variance in the positive funding decision for humanitarian assistance projects. Given that the R² value exceeds 70%, the donor grant award decisions forecasting model is fit for prediction.

4.9.3 Statistical Significance

Source, author, 2025

The combined significance of the F ratio in the ANOVA as shown in the table above shows how well the regression model fits the data. The F-test results indicate that $F = 11.45 > 2.61$, $p\text{-value} = 0.008801 < 0.05$, indicating the presence of a jointly significant linear association between positive grant funding decisions and needs articulation.

Estimated Model Coefficients

A regression analysis was conducted to determine the degree to which Needs articulation affected the donor grant award decisions for humanitarian assistance projects in South Sudan. The analysis was based on the assumptions that the variable would be generally spread to prevent misrepresentation of suggestions and consequence tests; this was achieved because no extreme outliers were found; and that the independent and dependent variables would have a direct relationship to ensure accuracy of estimation; this was achieved by using standardized coefficients in the interpretation process.

Table 37: Estimated Model Coefficients

Model	Standardized Coefficients β	Std. Error	t-value	Pr ($ >t $)
(Intercept)	15.721	3.700	.924	.000
Needs articulation	12.472	3.664	3.021	.000

Source: Author, 2025

The following was the general multiple linear regression model:

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \epsilon$$

$$\text{Positive grant award decision} = \alpha + \beta_1 (\text{Needs articulation}) + \epsilon.$$

$$\text{Therefore, the likelihood of positive donor grant award decision} = 15.721 + 12.472 X_1$$

The study finds that there was a positive correlation between the dependent variable and the independent variables. The determinant of the positive donor grant award decision was observed in the needs articulation variable (coefficient = 12.472, $t = 3.021$). The study used standardized coefficients because at 95% confidence level, there was no need to use unstandardized coefficients.

Elasticity of the Model Limit

The coefficient of the needs articulation variable, $\beta_1 = 12.472$ shows that the likelihood of a positive donor grant award decision can be predicted by a factor of 12.472 given that other project design elements are held constant. Thus, needs articulation and positive donor grant award decision are strongly (positively) correlated.

Conclusion

The study finds that clear articulation of the needs of the affected people is a key determinant of a positive grant award decision by donors (co-efficient = 12.472) and that a proposal can hardly be funded if needs are not well articulated. More so, the study finds no correlation between needs assessment and length of project period. Thus, however much the needs are well articulated, needs articulation doesn't necessarily justify the amount of funding the donor will be willing to award for a grant. This is because the needs almost always outweigh the amount of resources available at a time.

The study concludes that it's paramount to clearly articulate the needs of the affected population in a grant proposal for a positive award decision. This conclusion is made with the understanding that a clear needs articulation will likely get a proposal funded but it doesn't guarantee that the donor will avail all the amount of funding requested. This is because not all needs can be met at a time as donor resources are usually limited while needs largely remain vast.

Recommendation

The study concludes that it's paramount to clearly articulate the needs of the affected population in a grant proposal to enhance the possibility of getting a positive award decision. This conclusion is drawn with the understanding that a clear needs articulation will likely get a proposal funded as it gets to the dept and breadth of the real problem being addressed; however, a succinct articulation of needs doesn't guarantee that the donor will avail all the amount of funding requested. This is because not all needs can be met at a time as donor resources are usually limited while needs largely remain vast.

Based on the conclusion drawn from this study, this work strongly proposes that a thorough needs assessment should be carried out timely to inform the design of a grant proposal. More so, a grant proposal design should be based on the needs or gaps identified during a recent needs assessment (not older than six months from the time of data collection) in a particular location. Overall, the study recommends that project designs should be need-based in practice and theory. Besides, some donors may be biased towards need-based designs and would therefore favor project designs that strongly articulate the needs of the affected people. This work proposes that, where possible, the proposal development unit should carry out a needs assessment in line with the donor request for proposal or the application terms of reference. Once the needs are well documented, the project proposal should be based on the identified needs as a justification for the funds being requested.

References

- Abby Stoddard (n.d.), Raising the Bar, Humanitarian Firms: Commercial Business Engagement in Emergency Response
- Abidin, N. Z. and Pasquire, C. (2007). Revolutionize value management: a mode towards sustainability. *International Journal of Project Management*, 25(3), 275-282. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2006.10.005>
- Adams, C. A. (2002). Internal organisational factors influencing corporate social and ethical reporting. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 15(2), 223-250. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570210418905>
- Ahmad, A., Jamaludin, M., Sapry, H., & Jameel, A. (2023). Designing strategies framework for effective funding formula implementation at Malaysian public universities. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (Mjssh)*, 8(6), e002359. <https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v8i6.2359>
- Alesina, Alberto, and David Dollar (2000). *Who gives foreign aid to whom and why?* *Journal of Economic Growth* 5(1).
- Anthony Langat (2022). 'Cooperation rather than aid': How Japan plans to spend \$30B in Africa. Devex. Retrieved from <https://www.devex.com/news/cooperation-rather-than-aid-how-japan-plans-to-spend-30b-in-africa-104215>
- Anuradhi Joshi et al. (2020). *Online Assessment: Concept and Applications*, *Journal of Research in Medical Education & Ethics Vol. 10, No. 2, July 2020*.
- Apsari, I. A. K. and Rasmini, N. K. (2019). The pecking order theory testing on company life cycle. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 6(5), 101-107. <https://doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v6n5.704>
- Beldad, A., de Jong, M. and Steehouder, M. (2010), "How shall I trust the faceless and the intangible? A literature review on the antecedents of online trust", *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 26 No. 5, pp. 857-869, doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2010.03.013.
- Bjorn Harald Nordtveit (2010). *Development as a complex process of change: Conception and analysis of projects, programs and policies. International Journal of Educational Development, Volume 30, Issue 1*
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational research. An introduction* (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

- Brown, L. D. and Moore, M. H. (2001). Accountability, strategy, and international non-governmental organizations. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.269362>
- Carthey, J. (2019). User group consultation: design quality and project success. *Herd Health Environments Research & design Journal*, 13(2), 143-169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1937586719873143>
- Carvalho, M. M. d. and Rabechini, R. (2017). Can project sustainability management impact project success? an empirical study applying a contingent approach. *International Journal of Project Management*, 35(6), 1120-1132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.02.018>
- Chung-Hoon, T., Hite, J., & Hite, S. (2005). Searching for enduring donor relationships: evidence for factors and strategies in a donor/organization integration model for fund raising. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 6(1), 34-53. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ijea.2140232>
- Churchill, G. A. (1991). *Marketing Research: Methodological Foundations*. Thriftbook, London
- Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. (2014). *Business research methods*. McGraw-hill.
- Correa, J., Hoff, R. v. d., & Rajão, R. (2019). Amazon fund 10 years later: lessons from the world's largest redd+ program. *Forests*, 10(3), 272. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f10030272>
- Crane, B. B., & Dusenberry, J. (2004). *Power and politics in international funding for reproductive health: the US Global Gag Rule*. *Reproductive health matters*, 12(24), 128-137. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0968-8080\(04\)24140-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0968-8080(04)24140-4)
- Cronbach, L. J. (1971). Test Validation In Educational Measurement, R. Thorndike (Ed.).
- Cyndi MacKenzie (2023), *what is a grant?* Grant Professionals Association.
- Daniel E. Esser, Kara Keating Bench (2011), *Does Global Health Funding Respond to Recipients' Needs? Comparing Public and Private Donors' Allocations in 2005–2007*, *World Development*, Volume 39, Issue 8, 2011
- Daniel L. Stufflebeam et al. (1985). *Conducting Educational Needs Assessment*, Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing, Boston.
- Dugger, C. W. (2009). *As donors focus on AIDS, child illnesses languish*. *New York Times*
- Edward Freeman (2010): *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*, Cambridge University Press
- Fink, G., & Redaelli, S. (2011). *Determinants of International Emergency Aid—Humanitarian Need Only?* *World Development*, 39(5), 741-757. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2010.09.004>
- Fouka, G., & Mantzorou, M. (2011). *What are the major ethical issues in conducting research? Is there a conflict between the research ethics and the nature of nursing?* *Health science journal*, 5(1), 3.
- Funnell, S. C., & Rogers, P. J. (2011). *Purposeful program theory: Effective use of theories of change and logic models* (Vol. 31). John Wiley & Sons.
- Gerber, E.M. and Hui, J. (2013), "Crowdfunding: motivations and deterrents for participation", *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, Vol. 20 No. 6, pp. 1-32, doi: 10.1145/2530540.
- Golafshani, N. B. (2003). *Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research*, University of Toronto.
- Guo, S., Lu, P., & Song, Y. (2013). The effects of trust and contractual mechanism on working relationships—an empirical study in engineering construction projects. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 03(06), 539-548. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ajibm.2013.36062>
- Higgins, D. M. (2010). Investment styles and performance in the Australian unlisted wholesale property fund market. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1648641>
- Iwunna, O., Kennedy, J., & Harmer, A. (2023). Flexibly funding who? an analysis of its donors' voluntary contributions. *BMJ Global Health*, 8(4), e011232. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2022-011232>
- Jääskä, E., Aaltonen, K., & Kujala, J. (2021). Game-based learning in project sustainability management education. *sustainability*, 13(15), 8204. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13158204>
- Jason Gordon (2022). Institutional Theory – Explained. The Business Professor. Available at: https://thebusinessprofessor.com/en_US/management-leadership-organizational-behavior/institutional-theory-explained
- John Mayne (2008). *Contribution analysis: An approach to exploring cause and effect*. *The Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative* (www.cgiar-ilac.org)
- Kalman, H. (2016). Integrating evaluation and needs assessment: a case study of an ergonomics program. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 29(1), 51-69. <https://doi.org/10.1002/piq.21214>
- Kamau, B. (2024). Monitoring planning and implementation of donor funded agricultural projects in kenya. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Project Management*, 9(1), 29-49. <https://doi.org/10.47941/jepm.1677>

- Kavita Gupta (2007). *A Practical Guide to Needs Assessment*. Pfeiffer, San Francisco
- Khieng, S. (2013). Funding mobilization strategies of nongovernmental organizations in Cambodia. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 25(6), 1441-1464. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-013-9400-7>
- Kisilu, D. K., & Tromp, D. L. (2006). *Proposal and Thesis Writing*. Pauline, Nairobi
- Kombo D.K. and Tromp D.L. (2006). *Proposal and thesis writing, an introduction*. Paulines, Nairobi
- Kothari, C.R. (2004) *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. 2nd Edition, New Age International Publishers, New Delhi.
- Kuhn, L. (2008). *Complexity and educational research: A critical reflection*. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 40(1), 177-189.
- Leisher, C., Bugan, R., & Ngo, S. (2024). Improving theories of change in conservation projects. *Conservation Science and Practice*, 6(11). <https://doi.org/10.1111/csp2.13248>
- Liao, C. and Lian, J. (2022). Gender inequality in applying research project and funding. *Journal of Information Science*, 50(2), 546-554. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515221097861>
- Luk Van Wassenhove (2022). *Making Humanitarian Operations More Sustainable*, Knowledge INSEAD. <https://knowledge.insead.edu/operations/making-humanitarian-operations-more-sustainable>
- MacKellar, L. (2005). *Priorities in global assistance for health, AIDS, and population*, OECD Development Centre Working Paper No. 244. Paris: OECD.
- Martin, A. and Stein, S. (2020). Female surgical trainees and departmental awards. *Jama Surgery*. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamasurg.2020.3532>
- Maxfield, M. G., & Babbie, E. R. (2014). *Research methods for criminal justice and criminology*. Cengage Learning, McGraw-Hill.
- Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H. and Schoorman, F.D. (1995), "An integrative model of organizational trust", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 709-734, doi: 10.5465/amr.1995.9508080335
- Megan Keup (2023) *What Is Stakeholder Theory?* Available on Project Manager, <https://www.projectmanager.com/blog/what-is-stakeholder-theory>
- Miguel A. Tamonan (2022). USAID business forecast: Q1 2023 | Devex. Available on <https://www.devex.com/news/usaid-business-forecast-q1-2023-104545>
- Mirando, M. A. and Turzillo, A. M. (2018). Funding opportunities at the national institute of food and agriculture: program priorities and tips for successful grant writing. *Clinical Theriogenology*, 10(4), 469-475. <https://doi.org/10.58292/ct.v10.9905>
- Mugenda, O.M. and Mugenda, A.G. (2003) *Research Methods, Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. ACT, Nairobi.
- Mugenda, Q.M. and Mugenda, A.G. (2009) *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. ACTS, Nairobi.
- Neumayer, E. (2003). The Determinants of Aid Allocation by Regional Multilateral Development Banks and United Nations Agencies. *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(1), 101-122. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3096078>
- Ngechu, M. (2004). *Understanding the Research Process and Methods*. An Introduction to Research Methods.
- Nikaj S, Roychowdhury D, Lund PK, Matthews M, Pearson K. (2018). *Examining trends in the diversity of the U.S. National Institutes of Health participating and funded workforce*. *FASEB J*. <https://doi.org/10.1096/fj.201800639>
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2023). *Defining humanitarian assistance*. Global Humanitarian Assistance.
- Orodho, A. (2011). *Essentials of Educational and Social Sciences Research Methods*. Mazola Publishers, Nairobi.
- Pablo Arocena (2008). *Cost and quality gains from diversification and vertical integration in the electricity industry: A DEA approach*, *Energy Economics*, Volume 30, Issue 1, 2008
- Paina, L., Tetui, M., Ekirapa-Kiracho, E., Barman, D., Ahmed, T., Mahmood, S. S., ... & Bennett, S. (2017). Using theories of change to inform implementation of health systems research and innovation: experiences of future health systems consortium partners in Bangladesh, India and Uganda. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 15(S2). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-017-0272-y>
- Parks, T. (2008). The rise and fall of donor funding for advocacy ngos: understanding the impact. *Development in Practice*, 18(2), 213-222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520801899036>
- Paul Brest (2008). *Forms of Philanthropic Support: The Centrality of Alignment*. The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, 2008 Annual Report
- Périn, I., & Attaran, A. (2003). Trading ideology for dialogue: an opportunity to fix international aid for health? *Lancet* (London, England), 361(9364), 1216-1219. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(03\)12956](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(03)12956)

- Perlman, Daniel, and Ananya Roy (2009), *The Practice of International Health: A Case-Based Orientation*, New York; online edition, Oxford Academia, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195310276.001.0001> , accessed 6 June 2024.
- Philip Tamminga (2011). *Sustainability in Humanitarian Action*, Dara Impact Matters
- Prasad, J. M., Shipley, M. T., Rogers, T. B., & Puche, A. C. (2020). National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant awards: Does past performance predict future success? *Palgrave Communications*, 6(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-020-0432-5>
- Pratt, B. and Hyder, A. (2014). Reinterpreting responsiveness for health systems research in low and middle-income countries. *Bioethics*, 29(6), 379-388. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bioe.12138>
- Radford, M. L., Connaway, L. S., Mikitish, S., Alpert, M., Shah, C., & Cooke, N. A. (2017). *Shared values, new vision: Collaboration and communities of practice in virtual reference and SQA*. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 68(2), 438-449. <https://asistdl.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/asi.23668>
- Rahman, H. U., Raza, M., Afsar, P., & Khan, H. U. (2021). Empirical investigation of influencing factors regarding offshore outsourcing decision of application maintenance. *IEEE Access*, 9, 58589-58608. <https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2021.3073315>
- Ralf Müller, Nathalie Drouin, and Shankar Sankaran (2019). *Organizational Project Management: Theory and Implementation*, Elgar Introductions to Management and Organization Theory series, Monograph Books, Seiten.
- Ravishankar, N., Gubbins, P., Cooley, R. J., Leach-Kemon, K., Michaud, C. M., Jamison, D. T., & Murray, C. J. (2009). Financing of global health: tracking development assistance for health from 1990 to 2007. *Lancet (London, England)*, 373(9681), 2113-2124. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(09\)60881-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60881-3)
- Reinholz, D. and Andrews, T. (2020). Change theory and theory of change: what's the difference anyway? *International Journal of STEM Education*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-0202-3>
- Ridho, W. and Violita, E. (2020). Do muslim donors consider accountability, trust, and reputation? <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.1-11-2019.2294023>
- S.R. Benatar et al. (2009). Making progress in global health: The need for new paradigms, *International Affairs*.
- Shiffman, J. (2006). Donor funding priorities for communicable disease control in the developing world. *Health policy and planning*, 21(6), 411-420.
- Smekalin, I. (2022). From a to b by a proven route: theory of change as a tool for impact planning and evaluation. *Positive Changes*, 2(3), 46-55. <https://doi.org/10.55140/2782-5817-2022-2-3-46-55>
- South Sudan NGO Forum (2024), Membership NGOs 2024
- Stringer, P. (2017). Issue of sustainability in global humanitarian programs. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*, 2(17), 3-8.
- Suddaby, R. (Ed.). (2010). Editor's comments: Construct clarity in theories of management and organization. *Academy of management review*, 35(3), 346-357.
- The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2012), *Towards Better Humanitarian Donorship: 12 Lessons from DAC Peer Reviews*
- Thomas P. Moran, John M. Carroll (1996): *Overview of Design Rationale*. Routledge, New Jersey
- United Nations Democracy Fund (n.d.), How proposals are assessed and the selection process. Available at <https://www.un.org/democracyfund/content/how-proposals-are-assessed-and-selection-process>
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (2022), *Global Humanitarian Overview 2022*. Retrieved from <https://reliefweb.int/topics/global-humanitarian-overview-2022> 19 Feb 2022
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (2021); *South Sudan Humanitarian Fund 2021 at a Glance*.
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (2022); *South Sudan Humanitarian Fund (CHF) Standard Allocation Strategy July 2022*
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (2022); *South Sudan Humanitarian Needs Overview 2022 (February 2022)*
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (2023), *Afghanistan Humanitarian Needs and Response Plan 2024 (December 2023)*
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (2023), *Yemen: Humanitarian Response Snapshot (December 2023)*
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (2023); *South Sudan Humanitarian Needs Overview 2023*
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (2024), *Somalia 2024 Humanitarian Needs and Response Plan (January 2024)*
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (2024), *Yemen Humanitarian Needs Overview (January 2024)*

United Nations Office of the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (2022), Global Humanitarian Overview 2022, April Update (Snapshot as of 13 May 2022)

Wang, T., Thornhill, S., & Zhao, B. (2018). Pay-for-performance, employee participation, and SME performance. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 56(3), 412-434.

Watkins Allen, M., Coopman, S. J., Hart, J. L., & Walker, K. L. (2007). Workplace surveillance and managing privacy boundaries. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 21(2), 172-200.

Yu, M., Zhu, F., Yang, X., Wang, L., & Sun, X. (2018). Integrating sustainability into construction engineering projects: perspective of sustainable project planning. *Sustainability*, 10(3), 784. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10030784>