

Influence of the Coordination Selection Mode on Project Performance in Public Administration: Case of the 2016-2018 Budget Program of the Ministry of Health of Benin

Emile Aifa

Center for Research in Entrepreneurship Growth and Innovation (CREGI), University Institute of Technology (IUT),
University of Parakou, Parakou, Benin
Email: emileaifa@yahoo.fr

How to cite this paper: Aifa, E. (2024). Influence of the Coordination Selection Mode on Project Performance in Public Administration: Case of the 2016-2018 Budget Program of the Ministry of Health of Benin. *Modern Economy*, 15, 901-916.
<https://doi.org/10.4236/me.2024.1510047>

Received: April 5, 2024

Accepted: August 15, 2024

Published: October 12, 2024

Copyright © 2024 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.
This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

The project management report of the Ministry of Health in Benin showed fairly low-performance rates during the 2016-2018 budget period. This unflattering situation led us to analyze the underlying fundamental factors. Specifically, we wanted to see if the nature of the coordination has an influence on these poor performance results. Thus, based on an econometric estimation, using a logit model, the results showed that project performance is first conditioned by “the time taken to make resources available from the national budget”, then by “the method of selecting the coordination” and finally by “the time taken to process procurement files and disburse funds”. To this end, in order to effectively ensure the performance of projects at the ministerial level, the Ministry must ensure not only the provision of resources, but also compliance with the procedures for recruiting Coordinators, as well as compliance with the procedures for awarding contracts and disbursing funds.

Keywords

Benin (Beninese State), Budget, Deadline, Performance, Project

1. Introduction

The Beninese State has opted for a health system based on broad and effective coverage of its national territory, through the improvement of governance and resource management. To this end, it has assigned to the Ministry of Health the linchpin of the implementation of the health policy, the objectives of universal access to better quality health services and strengthening partnerships. This

vision, clearly mentioned in the Government Action Program (PAG) 2016-2021 through its Pillar III “Improving the living conditions of populations” and Axis 6 “Strengthening basic social services and social protection”, is the foundation of all health action. In doing so, with a view to achieving health objectives, several projects and programs are assigned to the Ministry of Health. These are intended to be efficient in order to achieve the results expected of them. In this context, the Ministry of Health is trying to ensure compliance with the deadlines for the execution of project and program activities as well as the rational use of the resources at their disposal. However, the major observation that emerges from the 2016-2018 budget program is that most of the projects and programs of the Ministry of Health do not seem to have demonstrated performance so far despite all the measures taken by the government. Indeed, the analysis of the situation reveals that the results achieved are unsatisfactory. During the 2016-2018 budget period, the steering report showed fairly low performance rates ranging from 13.33% to 20%. This unflattering situation could undoubtedly be explained by relevant factors that should be clarified for the purposes of efficient and optimal management of projects in the said Ministry. In the process, trade union associations and certain stakeholders point the finger at the management of these projects and programs as responsible for this situation. Therefore, we were led to question the explanatory factors of the performance of said projects by asking ourselves whether the method of recruiting the coordinators of said projects does not have an influence on these results. It is particularly appropriate to see whether the nature of the coordination has an influence on the results of the programs. This is what justifies the title **“Influence of the method of selecting the coordination on the performance of projects in the Public Administration: Case of the 2016-2018 budget program of the Ministry of Health”**.

2. Overview of the Projects of the Ministry of Health of Benin

The Ministry of Health (MS) of Benin is the ministerial department of the Beninese government responsible for implementing government policy in the field of public health. Its mission is to improve the socio-sanitary conditions of families based on a system that integrates poor and destitute populations. As such, it initiates health activities, the implementation of which it plans, coordinates and monitors. To achieve this, it refers to the National Health Development Plan (PNDS), which it periodically adopts. For the period 2009-2018, the objective of the plan is to improve the health status of the Beninese population based on a system that integrates poor and destitute populations. As part of the implementation of this plan and for the period 2016-2018, several projects were implemented by the MS. For the years 2016 and 2017, these are:

Project 1: Reduction of maternal and infant mortality, prevention, disease control and improvement of the quality of care

Project 2: Valorization of human resources in the health sector

Project 3: Strengthening the partnership in the sector of promoting ethics and medical deontology

Project 4: Improving the health sector financing mechanism

Project 5: Strengthening health sector management

In 2018, there are three programs included in the budget, entitled:

Project 1: Health prevention and safety

Project 2: Supply and access to health care

Project 3: Steering and support

These different projects were carried out to varying degrees through actions relating to planned numbers of activities (NAP), with varied physical (TEP) and financial (TEF) execution rates as indicated in the following **Table 1**.

Table 1. Physical and financial execution rates of the 2016, 2017 and 2018 budget programs.

Project	2016			2017			2018		
	NAP	TEP	TFE	NAP	TEP	TFE	NAP	TEP	TEP
Project 1	945	46.16	74.76	780	66.52	71.84	1200	76	74.5
Project 2	55	6.44	98.77	66	63.26	29.90	390	78.54	80.71
Project 3	84	29.39	52.69	25	63.11	68.02	450	80.75	90.43
Project 4	2781	60.22	75.63	1651	86.89	89.12	-	-	-
Project 5	389	47.60	25.41	625	57.74	56.05	-	-	-
Average	850,8	37,962	65,452	629,4	67,504	62,986	680	78,43	81,88

Source: MS: Evaluation reports: 2016, 2017 and 2018.

The observation of **Table 1** above shows that during the period 2016-2018, no activity was fully executed either financially or physically. In 2016, in particular, the physical execution rates were relatively low, with an average below 40%. But against all expectations, the financial execution rate was very high for all projects, except for project 5 (**TFE (2016) = 25.41%**). These results, at the limit, are very insufficient and show a lack of effectiveness and efficiency in the management of these projects.

In 2017, there was some progress in the physical execution of activities, with an average rate of 67.50%. There was thus an improvement in the management of these projects. This (improvement) would certainly be a consequence of the capitalization of experiences acquired during the previous period. The financial execution rates were also moderate without distancing themselves excessively from the physical execution rates, as was observed in 2016.

The year 2018, with its average physical execution rate of 78.43% against an average financial execution rate of 81.88%, revealed the strengthening of management. One could conclude that there is a process of continuous improvement. However, this result remains mixed in view of the behavior of the performance indicators whose rates are recorded in the following **Table 2**.

Table 2. Performance indicators.

Label	2016	2017	2018
Rate of indicators having reached their target	20%	20%	13.33%
Rate of indicators not having reached their target	53.33%	53.33%	73.34%
Rates of indicators not calculated	26.67%	26.66%	13.33%

Source: MS: Performance report: 2016, 2017 and 2018.

The observation of this table (**Table 2**) indicates that with an average rate of 17.33%, very few indicators have reached their target (**20% at most**). We are thus witnessing poor performance of these programs for the period 2016-2018.

This unflattering situation observed at the level of the projects registered for the period 2016-2018 can be explained, according to the performance reports for the years 2016, 2017 and 2018, by numerous reasons, mainly:

- lack of vehicles for field activities;
- the late provision of resources from the national budget for the sector's achievements;
- non-payment of accounts on time, resulting in a significant delay in the contractual deadline for contracts;
- the recurring problem of delays in the development of the public procurement plan;
- the cumbersome nature of public procurement procedures;
- the quantitative and qualitative insufficiency of human resources in the sector;
- from poor planning of activities.

All these difficulties would hinder the effectiveness and efficiency of the projects and programs of the Ministry of Health. However, under the heading of “quantitative and qualitative insufficiency of human resources” is illustrated, according to some dissenting voices, the weak management of certain coordinators whose recruitment nature would be biased. Indeed, behind the scenes of the trade union organizations, several would consider that attention should also be paid to the management of the coordinators of these projects, many of whom, according to them, were poorly recruited, that is to say, by simply appointment, without taking into account the criteria of competence which should govern good governance.

It is, therefore, necessary to analyze the determinants of the performance of these projects. This will highlight the main factors that generally hinder the performance of projects in this vital sector of Public Administration. This study could thus serve not only as support for the strategy of good governance, but also as a basis for decision-making in the context of the management of future projects and programs of the Public Administration. Explicitly, the results of this work are intended to be a tool to help decision-making in the context of improving the performance of State projects and programs. To this end, the resulting analysis will make it possible to prioritize the problems in order to determine the crucial ones and provide solutions. To achieve this, it would be important to first review some works that have dealt with the explanatory factors of project and program performance. This is in order to draw inspiration from them for the rest of our work.

3. Literature Review

Seeking to measure an economic phenomenon logically implies having previously defined its nature. Therefore, understanding the term “project performance” requires, first of all, the definition of each of the concepts that compose it and the understanding of which proves important for the rest of the analyses. Far from

dwelling on the multiple theoretical foundations to which these concepts refer, we will simply try to establish the link with our theme.

The term project admits several definitions which vary according to the context, the goal, the purpose, etc. To this end, several authors have been interested in explaining this word for the purposes generally of studies on its conceptualization. [Olivier \(1970\)](#) conceives the project as a set of technical, economic, financial and human studies that define what each must do to achieve a specific goal. In addition to this definition, [Bridier and Michaelof \(1993\)](#) consider that the project is a set of means (material, financial and human) implemented in a coordinated manner in order to achieve financial and/or economic objectives set in advance. For [Dayan \(1999\)](#), the project is a unique process of transforming resources with the aim of punctually producing a specific extract that meets one or more specific objectives, within budgetary, natural, human and time constraints. Furthermore, a project is a partial operation that involves the physical realization of an idea by means of an investment that will implement different types of resources to be exploited to produce a certain type of revenue ([Kamulete, 2014](#)). From these definitions, we could then perceive the project as a set of coordinated and combined activities aimed at achieving a specific objective, under the constraint of a budget and a previously defined period of time. The project would then appear as a series of coherent activities to be carried out in order to obtain predefined results.

More recently, several companies have used projects to increase their efficiency in the context of strategy development ([Ramirez Levy, 2019](#)). Since then, the notion of a project has benefited from a plurality of approaches that are distinguished from each other depending on the points of view from which it is understood ([Legros, 2011](#): pp. 59-75). In this particular context, the Project Management Institute (2021) defined a project as a temporary effort decided with the aim of creating a unique product, service or result.

The analysis of the evolution of the term “project” over time shows the desire of the various actors to integrate performance parameters in order to achieve the set objectives and to realize the expected results ([Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967](#); [Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978](#)). These motivations are nowadays at the center of the essential concerns of the stakeholders ([Weinzimmer 1993](#); [Birley & Westhead, 1990](#): pp. 535-557; [Lohmann, 1998](#); [Brilman, 1998](#)).

Indeed, etymologically, the word performance comes from the word “performer” used in old French in the 13th century, according to the “Petit Robert” dictionary. The term “performer” then meant to accomplish, to execute ([Pesqueux, 2004](#)). As such, we can define the performance of an organization as the capacity it has to achieve its results or to effectively fulfill its mission. [ACDI \(2005\)](#) recognizes that the concept of performance has several definitions. Performance is also a multi-criteria and polysemic concept whose use refers to the terms: success, result and action ([Bourguignon, 1995](#): pp. 61-66). As such, [Baret \(2006: pp. 1-24\)](#) defines overall performance as “the aggregation of economic, social and environmental performances”. However, [Issor \(2017: pp. 93-103\)](#) adds the nuance that although

it is a vague and multidimensional concept, the notion of performance ultimately only makes sense in the context in which it is used. The author specifies that depending on the context, the evaluation of one aspect of performance (for example, financial performance) may be sufficient, while in other cases, it will be preferable to work on a notion of multi-criteria performance that includes economic performance, financial performance, process performance, etc. Performance is, therefore, a matter of perception and is relative to the vision of an organization, its strategy and its objectives (Issor, 2017: pp. 93-103). Performance is also a concept commonly used in project/program management. It has been the subject of several studies whose foundations are inspired by organizational theory (Wernerfelt, 1984: pp. 171-180; Barney, 1986: pp. 656-665; Sandberg, 1986; McDougall & Moviatt, 1994: pp. 45-64). Sandberg and Hofer (1987: pp. 5-28) have even formalized performance by defining it (P) as a function of the entrepreneur (E), the structure of the organization (industry) (SI) and the strategy (S). The proposed model is of the form $P = f(E, SI, S)$, where SI and S are adopted according to the environmental conditions. The authors estimate, for this purpose, that when the environmental conditions change, the SI and S variables adapt and affect performance. In a study of a sample of 650 projects, Baker et al. (1974: pp. 187-196) identified about ten factors likely to influence the performance of a project.

Following on from this study, Storey (1994) identified a set of determinants that he divided into three groups: the characteristics of the founders (notably their experience, their number, their complementarity); the characteristics specific to the firm (notably age, size, financial structure, links with other firms, mastery of technology, degree of innovation, use of strategic planning) and external characteristics (mainly the local environment and economic conditions). Following him, but with a view to enriching and refining the theory, Belassi and Tukel (1996: pp. 141-151) categorized the explanatory factors of the project's performance into four groups. These authors distinguish between variables relating to the project (its size), those relating to the project team (skills, etc.), those dependent on its organization and those determining its external environment.

Empirical studies on project or program performance are numerous and varied, sometimes focusing on specific factors, such as project coordination or management, socioeconomic factors, gender, duration, etc. In a study conducted on the basis of a questionnaire covering 46 factors and administered to 180 organizations, consultants and project managers, Gary et al. (1997: pp. 304-310) identified the experience of the project manager as the most determining factor in the success or failure of projects. This study also revealed other explanatory factors that are no less important for performance, such as cost estimation, work definition, client criteria, project objectives, etc.

Turner and Müller (2005: pp. 49-61) looked specifically at the influence of the project manager's management on their performance and concluded that this variable remains decisive in the success of the project. For Okon et al. (2010: pp. 489-530), on the other hand, the integration of the "gender" factor in projects increases

their performance. The authors estimate, to this effect, that in terms of project performance, the participation of women is more significant than that of men. [Yeankong et al. \(2010: pp. 814-824\)](#), indicate that in Thailand, it is the duration of the project that favors its performance. The work of [Lavagnon \(2011: pp. 165-182\)](#) on development aid projects shows that their success is insensitive to the planning effort; but significantly supports the idea that the use of monitoring and evaluation can improve their performance.

Basing their study on a sample of 570 projects financed by social funds, [Lorena and Wachtenheim \(2000\)](#) were interested in the factors of project success in Latin America. At the end of their work, the results indicate that the socioeconomic factors of the beneficiaries, such as community participation, the level of education of the grassroots communities, and the level of organization of the beneficiary populations, are the determining factors of project performance.

[Koudougou \(2012: pp. 300-313\)](#) also reviewed this idea by reporting that the works of the authors: [Okon et al. \(2010: pp. 36-43\)](#) reached similar conclusions on the influence of beneficiaries' socio-economic factors on project performance.

However, in the same article and studying the determinants of the performance of development projects and programs in Burkina Faso using a Tobit model, this author estimates that the level of physical execution of activities and the characteristics of the intervention area, namely the level of education of the local population, the number of projects, associations and community groups are the main determinants of the performance of development projects and programs implemented in Burkina Faso. On the other hand, this study rejects the hypothesis that the quantity of human and financial resources are determining factors in the search for the performance of projects and programs in Burkina Faso.

Also interested in the determinants of the performance of development projects and programs in Burkina Faso, while basing their analysis on the ANOVA model, [Ouédraogo and Sossa Lopez \(2021: pp. 300-313\)](#) showed at the end of their work that the variables: "the quality of the work delivered"; the "delivery time of the work by the companies"; the "disbursement time"; the "processing time of public procurement files"; the "level of representativeness in the project and program review committees"; the "number of underfunded activities" and "insecurity" have an influence on the performance of said projects and programs.

"Project management has grown worldwide in recent decades in many companies encouraged by the possibility of organizing their activities in project mode" recognized [Ramirez Levy \(2019\)](#), who studied the key success factors in collaborative project management. The data analyses of this research highlighted factors such as project mission, support from senior management, personnel, communication, power and political issues as determinants in the performance of collaborative projects in strategic companies dealing with the collaboration of different stakeholders (internal and external).

At the end of this brief review, the conclusion is easily drawn that there are numerous explanatory variables in the performance of projects and programs. This

could be justified by the fact that any project comes from a single idea and is a reflection of the context and environment in which it evolves, the characteristics of the management team and stakeholders, etc. Moreover, on this subject, the work of Lavagnon and Donnelly (2017: pp. 44-63) reveals the difficulty of identifying the common success factors for all development projects. “These projects are greatly influenced by the context in which they evolve” the authors acknowledged. Nevertheless, all these analyses inspire us in the context of this research, which intends to refine them in order to adopt a conceptual model, after being subjected to the test of facts, which will undoubtedly provide us with fairly relevant results to interpret and comment on.

4. Methodological Framework of the Study

The purpose of this part is to specify the project performance in the Ministry of Health of Benin through certain variables likely to explain it. This is a concrete way of highlighting the influence of certain variables on the performance of the projects previously studied.

The methodological approach adopted in this research is inspired by that taken by Ouédraogo and Sosa Lopez (2021) of a performance function defined from the annual disbursement rate, represented by the ratio of the annual amount actually disbursed by a development project or program by the overall cost of the project. But unlike these authors, our approach is distinguished by two fundamental differences. Indeed, unlike the annual disbursement rate, which characterizes the dependent variable in Ouédraogo and Sosa Lopez (2021), we will rely on the indicators of the projects or even the activities. The latter has already been evaluated in the performance reports, which had the merit of already distinguishing the performance indicators having reached their target from those having not reached it, which are considered as the arguments of the dependent variable. We will use them by considering the number 1 as an indicator of having reached its target and the number 0 as an indicator of having not reached its target. The variable (Y) representing project performance, approximated by the indicator, is therefore dichotomous of the type:

$$Y = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{si l'indicateur de performance a atteint sa cible} \\ 0 & \text{si l'indicateur de performance n'a pas atteint sa cible} \end{cases}$$

To summarize, over the period 2016-2018, there were 45 performance indicators, 10 of which were not calculated, 27 were unable to reach their target and only 8 reached their target.

That said, then taking into account the above causes listed by the performance reports and based on the above literature review, the independent variables are specified as follows:

a) the delay in making available the resources to come from the national budget noted “RN”. The delay in positioning resources from the national budget tends to delay the completion of activities. A score of 0 to 4 is awarded depending on whether the positioning is anticipated (4), arrives at the standard time (3), is

slightly late (2), is significantly late (1) or is not done at all (0).

b) the management level of the management unit, rated “**NM**”. Indeed, good management by the executive body responsible for leading a project facilitates good planning of activities and their execution over time. With reference to the assessment of the CSE (Monitoring-Evaluation Unit, the body responsible for monitoring, following up and evaluating the Ministry’s projects), a score of 0 to 4 is assigned to the management unit, depending on whether its level is low (0), poor (1), fair (2), good (3) or very good (4).

c) the availability of work equipment (materials and machines), noted “**DT**”. The unavailability of work equipment (office equipment, rolling stock, etc.) is common in projects and programs in Benin. This state of affairs is likely to negatively affect the smooth running of certain activities. This situation is assessed from 0 to 4 according to the degree of availability of the equipment.

“**DP**” procurement files. This variable is assessed by the CSE on the basis of its knowledge and the documents in its possession on a scale of 0 to 4. In light of [Ouédraogo and Sosa Lopez \(2021\)](#), it is the structures in charge of public procurement that are rated according to whether they have a bad reputation or a good reputation.

e) availability (in terms of adequacy or sufficiency) of financial resources allocated or made available “**DR**”. As in the case of the availability of work equipment, this variable is evaluated from 1 to 4, depending on the degree of adequacy of the financial resources required.

f) the nature of the recruitment of the Project Coordinator (or Head), “**RC**”. The political and administrative authorities, often behind the scenes of trade union organizations, are often criticized for designating Project Managers by simple appointment to the detriment of a normal and regular recruitment procedure based on merit by call for applications. This way of proceeding is often the source of strong criticism, which attributes the poor performance of projects to this fact. The authors of this criticism believe that, rather than the appointed managers being in a contract of “obligation of results” for said projects, the latter fall into a certain “obligation of allegiance” towards the authorities who appointed them. In doing so, they privilege and work in the interests of the person in Authority to the detriment of the performance of the project, the two results often being contradictory. These same critics believe that these appointed Managers do not very often have the skills required to successfully complete the projects they are supposed to manage. In this study, a score of 0 or 1 will be awarded depending on whether the Project Manager is appointed or recruited on merit (i.e., by call for applications).

g) the disbursement period noted “**DD**”. Disbursement conditions greatly delay the start of projects; the first disbursements are often made late ([Ouédraogo and Sosa Lopez, 2021](#)). Indeed, as mentioned above, the non-payment of statements on time leads to a significant overrun of the contractual deadline for contracts and thus causes the underperformance of projects. Depending on the delay observed before the payment of the first disbursement, the latter is assessed on a scale of 1 to 4. Thus, if there is no delay, the score 4 is assigned; from 1 to 2 months it is the

score 3; from 2 months to 4 months, it is the score 2; from 4 to 6 months, it is the score 1; more than 6 months, it is the score 0.

These independent variables are informed by documentary information available at the Ministry of Health. This information is supplemented with regard to the variables “MN” and “DP” by a survey conducted on the basis of a short questionnaire administered to the CSE (Monitoring-Evaluation Unit) of the Ministry.

Then, the second difference compared to [Ouédraogo and Sosa Lopez \(2021\)](#), who used the ANOVA model, this research bases its analysis on logistic regression.

Y follows a Bernoulli distribution with parameter:

$$p = \frac{e^X}{1 + e^X} = \frac{e^{b_0 + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \dots + b_jx_j}}{1 + e^{b_0 + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \dots + b_jx_j}}$$

The logit of p is:

$$\logit(p) = \ln\left(\frac{p}{1-p}\right) = b_0 + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \dots + b_jx_j$$

Logistic regression makes it possible to explain the probability p that a project is performing at the time of the survey by the set of independent variables presented above.

$$= b_0 + b_1RN + b_2NM + b_3DT + b_4DP + b_5DR + b_6RC + b_7DD + u$$

The performance indicator table for the period 2016-2018 will be used. For each indicator, the related activities will be linked. Based on these activities, the independent variables will be filled in.

As a reminder, above are the exogenous variables, probable determinants of the situation (performance or not) of a project. Each of these variables has appropriate modalities, which will be translated in turn by the items of the questions presented. It is on this basis that we obtained the results summarized in [Table 3](#) below.

5. Analysis and Interpretation of Results

The estimates of the Logit explanatory model of the performance of a Project are presented in [Table 3](#) below.

Table 3. Project performance equation (logit estimation).

Dependent variable (DP)	Logit: performance of MS project (PP)				
	Independent Variables	B Parameters	ES	Forest	Sig F ¹
RN (Time limit for making resources available)	4,008	2,411	5,372	0.020	Significant
NM (Management Unit Management Level)	1,638	0.886	3,418	0.172	Not significant
DT (Availability of Work Equipment)	-1,102	1,134	0.712	0.410	Not significant
DP (Processing time for procurement files)	2,548	1,712	2,215	0.061	Significant

Continued

DR (Availability of allocated financial resources)	-0.113	0.081	1,937	0.164	Not significant
RC (Coordinator Recruitment Method)	3,911	1,671	3,879	0.039	Significant
DD (Disbursement Deadline)	2,022	1,230	2,702	0.100	Significant
Constant	-3.498	3.590	0.589	0.449	
"-2Log likelihood"				21,228	
KHI²/Sig KHI²				125,568/0,000	
Correctly classified cases/N				87,230/100	

Sources: the author.

The performance equation of a project of the Ministry of Health of Benin, management: 2016-2018, is written:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LogPP} = & -3,498 + 4,008RN + 1,638NM - 1,102DT \\ & + 2,548DP - 0,113DR + 3,911RC + 2,022DD \end{aligned}$$

From the observation of **Table 3**, we note that four variables out of the seven are significant. They are all positive and are, in order of magnitude, the following explanatory factors: "Time to make resources available" (DR), "Method of recruiting the project coordinator" (RC), "Time to process procurement files" (DP) and "Time to disburse funds" (DD). Although consistent with theoretical predictions by its positive sign, the variable "Level of management of the project management unit" (NM) is not significant. We can therefore conclude, based on these results (generated in **Table 3**), that the performance of a project of the **Ministry of Health (2019)**, management: 2016-2018 is a positive function:

- the time taken to make the resources necessary for the implementation of the project available. Indeed, if the implementation and operation of a project require resources to be allocated to said project, its performance requires that these resources be made available as soon as possible. This is all the more true since the delay in the availability of resources is likely to cause loss of time, cramming and many other defects whose effects could affect the effective or even efficient execution of the activities scheduled in the project schedule;
- of the method of recruiting the coordinator responsible for leading the implementation of the project. It is considered to this effect that the appointment of the coordinator is not the recruitment procedure conducive to the success of the project. This method of selection could make the coordinator "accountable" to those who contributed to his appointment. To this end, his "hands would be tied" and ultimately would be heavily dependent on the authority that appointed him. His management would rather be influenced by the "external", which generally has no control over the project files. In doing so, rather than rigorous management focused on results, the project would be conducted with

“complacency, laxity and levity” without any stated performance objective. The coordinator recruited under these conditions would not act responsibly since he would be aware that he would not be “worried” in the event of mismanagement, given his “acquaintance” or even his “complicity” with the hierarchy, which “ensures his protection”. On the other hand, if the selection method is based on a call for applications with appropriate tests, there is a high probability that a competent coordinator, free from any compromise, will be recruited. This type of selection would promote the efficient implementation of the project;

- of the processing time of procurement files. It is noted that if the contracts are awarded within the required time limits, the project concerned has the chance of being executed efficiently. Indeed, by its definition, a project is a set of technical, economic, financial and human studies contributing to achieving a specific goal (Olivier, 1970). As such, it generates needs whose satisfaction requires the intervention of external skills. These are “contracts” whose award to third parties is governed by clear and predefined procedures. Consequently, a slight delay in these award procedures could be detrimental to the efficient execution of the project. This state of affairs is explained by the relative importance of the regression coefficient of 2.548 found in the present case. It is, therefore, important that procurement deadlines are respected in order to promote the performance of a project;
- of the disbursement period of funds allocated to the project. If, by its definition, the project is a set of means (material, financial and human) implemented in a coordinated manner in order to achieve financial and/or economic objectives set in advance (Bridier & Michaelof, 1993), it should be noted that these means are made available thanks to the financial resources whose forecast and disbursement planning are generally made during the project design phase. This planning is often subordinate to the different stages of concretization, execution and realization of the activities. In doing so, a deficiency or even procrastination in the disbursement procedures is likely to negatively impact the efficient realization of the project. This situation is reflected in the context of this study by the positive regression coefficient (i.e., 2.022) of the DD variable. Indeed, the longer the delay in the disbursement of the required funds, the less efficient the reference project is. Compliance with the deadline for disbursement of funds is, therefore, decisive in the performance of an MS project.

Furthermore, **Table 3** informs us that the variables; “Level of management of the management unit”, “Availability of work equipment” and “Availability of allocated financial resources” are not significant.

As recommendations within the framework of projects under the responsibility of the Ministry of Health (MS), we suggest to the (ministerial) authorities to ensure that the deadline for making funds available is respected without any detrimental delay. This involves ensuring the availability of funds before launching the execution of any project, ensuring that no major delay is observed in the provision

of funds allocated to the execution of the project. To this end, it is necessary for the MS authorities to become more involved in the operations of making funds available by working in concert with their counterparts from the Ministry of Finance. Furthermore, with regard to the governance of the project, it would be more judicious to opt for a call for applications procedure, subject to a proper recruitment test. This method of selection is likely to guarantee not only transparency, but also the recruitment of qualified, independent and highly experienced individuals for the task in order to obtain the expected results. These Coordinators must be professionals, even experts in the field of project management and real proven managers. They must have the required skills, that is to say, the knowledge, know-how, and interpersonal skills that they will impart to the base composed of staff and users, whose motivation and satisfaction would also contribute to the performance of the projects. In addition, just like the deadline for making funds available mentioned above, those relating to the processing of procurement files and the disbursement of funds must not suffer from punctuality. The Ministry must also ensure that regular checks are made in this regard in order to guarantee the proper functioning of the projects. It is in this respect that the State's ambition to make these projects "development tools" will become a reality.

6. Conclusion

By studying the factors behind the performance of the projects of the Ministry of Health in Benin, this work set itself the main objective of seeing if the method of selecting the coordinator has an influence on the performance of said projects. To achieve this objective, the analysis focused on documentary and survey data, which (data) were used using the logit model. At the end of the work, the results indicated that the performance of MS project during the 2016-2018 management period fundamentally depends on the variables: Time to make resources available (DR), Method of recruiting the project coordinator (RC), Time to process procurement files (DP) and Time to disburse funds (DD). In view of these results, it is advisable that the MS works in "good understanding" with the Ministry in charge of Finance so that the latter works on the positioning within the deadlines of the credits allocated to the projects before the phase of their launch. In addition, it must ensure that the management of these projects is made independent by providing them with coordinators recruited on the basis of merit (call for applications on test). Compliance with the deadline for processing procurement files and of disbursements of funds must be mandatory and subject to rigorous control.

It should also be noted that too few studies on project performance have addressed the "coordination selection mode" aspect. However, without being precise and detailed, the work of Turner and Müller (2005: pp. 49-61) identified the variable: "project team (skills)" as a determining factor in the success of a project; those of Gary et al. (1997), for their part, showed the influence of the factor "experience of the Project Manager" on the success of said project. In terms of this "managerial" aspect, the present study has a certain similarity with these two

studies. Furthermore, the results of this study partly match those of **Ouédraogo and Sossa Lopez (2021)** with regard to the variables “time to process procurement files” and “time to disburse funds”.

In addition, the study could have gained refinement if it had been able to take into account other contextual and sociological factors such as interference from the hierarchy, union influence, the opinion of beneficiaries, etc. However, this limitation does not significantly affect the results we have reached. Further research could also look into this.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- Agence Canadienne pour le Développement International (ACDI) (2005). *Déclaration sur l'efficacité de l'aide*.
- Baker, S. P., O'Neill, B., Haddon, W., & Long, W. B. (1974). The Injury Severity Score: A Method for Describing Patients with Multiple Injuries and Evaluating Emergency Care. *Journal of Trauma-Injury Infection & Critical Care*, 14, 187-196.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/00005373-197403000-00001>
- Baret, P. (2006). L'évaluation contingente de la Performance Globale des Entreprises: Une méthode pour fonder un mnagement socialement responsable? In *2ème journée de recherche du CEROS* (pp. 1-24).
- Barney, J. B. (1986). Organizational Culture: Can It Be a Source of Sustained Competitive Advantage? *The Academy of Management Review*, 11, 656-665.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1986.4306261>
- Belassi, W., & Tukel, O. I. (1996). A New Framework for Determining Critical Success/Failure Factors in Projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 14, 141-151.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0263-7863\(95\)00064-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0263-7863(95)00064-X)
- Birley, S., & Westhead, P. (1990). Growth and Performance Contrasts between ‘Types’ of Small Firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11, 535-557.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250110705>
- Bourguignon, A. (1995). Peut-on définir la performance? *Revue Française de Comptabilité*, 269, 61-66.
- Bridier, M., & Michaelof, S. (1993). *Guide pratique d'analyse des projets*. Éditions Economica.
- Brilman, J. (1998). *Les meilleures pratiques de management: Au cœur de la Performance*. Éditions Organisation.
- Dayan, A. (1999). *Manuel de gestion; vol 1 et 2*. ELLIPSES
- Gary, W., Shamil, N., & Professor, R. H. (1997). Determinants of Project Management Success. In *13th Annual ARCOM Conference* (pp. 304-310). Association of Researchers in Construction Management.
- Issor, Z. (2017). La performance de l'entreprise: Un concept complexe aux multiples dimensions. *Projectics, Proyéctica, Projectique*, 17, 93-103.
<https://doi.org/10.3917/proj.017.0093>
- Kamulete (2014). *Cours de préparation et évaluation des projets*. LISCA/ISP-BKV.
- Koudougou, L. (2012). Les déterminants de la performance des projets et programmes de développement au Burkina Faso. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and*

- Technologies*, 25, 300-313.
- Lavagnon, I. (2011). Les agences d'aide au développement font-elles assez en matière de formulation des facteurs clés de succès des projets? *Management & Avenir*, 12, 165-182.
- Lavagnon, I., & Donnelly, J. (2017). Success Conditions for International Development Capacity Building Projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 35, 44-63. <https://doi.org/10.3917/mav.012.0165>
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). *Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Legros, A. (2011). Définition et implantation des systèmes de suiviévaluation. *SETYM International*, 1, 59-75.
- Lohmann, D. (1998). Strategies of High Growth Firms in Adverse Public Policy and Economic Environments. In *Babson Entrepreneurship Research Conference* (16-29).
- Lorena, A., & Wachtenheim, E. (2000). *Determinants of Success of Social Fund Projects: The Case of FONCODES*. Mimeo.
- McDougall, P., & Moviatt, B. (1994). Toward a Theory of International New Ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25, 45-64.
- MS (Ministry of Health) (2019). *Rapports de performance, 2016, 2017 et 2018*.
- Okon, B., Ibom, L. A., Williams, M. E., & Etukudo, D. M. (2010). Effects of Parity on Breeding and Morphometric Traits of Eggs and Hatchlings of F1 Crossbred of Snails (*Archachatina marginata* var. *saturalis*). *Journal of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Ecology*, 3, 36-43.
- Olivier, R. (1970). Evaluation de la rentabilité économique des projets dans les pays en voie de développement. *Mettra*, IV, 489-530.
- Ouédraogo, A., & Sossa Lopez, A. (2021). Les Déterminants De La Performance Des Projets Et Programmes De Développement Au Burkina Faso. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies*, 25, 300-313. <https://doi.org/10.52155/ijpsat.v25.1.2791>
- Pesqueux, Y. (2004). La notion de performance globale. In *5ème Forum international sur "la performance globale de l'entreprise" ETHICS*.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. Harper & Row.
- Project Management Institute (2021). *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK Guide)* (7è édition). PMI.
- Ramirez Levy, Y. C. (2019). *Les facteurs clés de succès dans le management des projets collaboratifs avec la participation de parties prenantes internes et externes au sein d'une entreprise stratégique*. Master's Thesis, Université du Québec à Rimouski.
- Sandberg, W. R. (1986). *New Venture Performance: The Role of Strategy and Industry Structure*. Lexington Books.
- Sandberg, W. R., & Hofer, C. W. (1987). Improving New Venture Performance: The Role of Strategy, Industry Structure, and the Entrepreneur. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 2, 5-28. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026\(87\)90016-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(87)90016-4)
- Storey, D. J. (1994). *Understanding the Small Business Sector*. Routledge.
- Turner, J. R., & Müller, R. (2005). The Project Manager's Leadership Style as a Success Factor on Projects: A Literature Review. *Project Management Journal*, 36, 49-61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875697280503600206>
- Weinzimmer, L. (1993). *Organizational Growth of U.S. Corporations: Environmental, Organizational and Managerial Determinants*. Master's Thesis, University of Wisconsin.

- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). The Resource-Based View of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5, 171-180. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250050207>
- Yeankong, S., Koonawootrittriron, S., Elzo, M. A., & Suwanasopee, T. (2010). Effect of Experience, Education, Record Keeping, Labor and Decision Making on Monthly Milk Yield and Revenue of Dairy Farms Supported by a Private Organization in Central Thailand. *Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences*, 23, 814-824.