# CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

## **Background**

Ethiopia is characterized as a large country in the horn of Africa with a total area of about 1.1 million square km and population of more than 79.8 million at a growth rate of 2.6 percent (CSA, 2007). Average HH size and number of HH are 4.7 and 15.5 million respectively. More than 80 percent of the populations or eight of ten Ethiopians live in rural areas depend mainly on agriculture with average landholding of 0.93 hectares (FTF, 2010). This shows that agriculture is the basis of the livelihood for the majority of the people. Agriculture provides approximately 70 percent of raw materials for the industrial sector, generates more than 90 Percent of the export earnings and account for 85 percent of employment and primary sources of income for more than 85 percent of the country's population (IFAD, 2009). The sector also contributes to GDP 43% (MoFED, 2010). Recently, industry and service sectors have shown a progress in share of country's GDP, 13% the former and 44% the later (ibid).

Albeit, agriculture is imperative for the livelihoods of the people and its potential, it is dominated by subsistence, low-input, nature dependent practiced and using traditional farming methods in turn low productivity and low-output typify the sector. Several studies indicated that different causes for low productivity and output of the sector. Some pointed out that the problems are mainly attributed to limited access by smallholder farmers to improved production technologies, financial services, irrigation and agricultural markets and poor land management practices (IFAD, 2008; Bamlaku, 2006). Lack of alternative employment opportunities, low level of education and health services and low level of skill are aggravators of the problems (MoFED, 2006; AEMFI, 2000). Consequently, chronic poverty and chronic food insecurity are the main issues in economic development of Ethiopia, in which 34.6% of the population lives below poverty line consuming less than 2200-kilo calorie per day and life expectancy at birth is 56 years, however, Ethiopia experienced 6 – percentage point decline in rural poverty from 1999/00 – 2004/05 (MoFED, 2008). The per capita income of the country is USD 180 as at the end of 2006 (Bamlaku, 2006). Incidence and severity of poverty is higher in rural area than urban areas; 52% in the former and 36% in the later areas (IFAD, 2006). Daily per capita income for most of the rural households is less than USD 0.50 (IFAD, 2008). According to (IFAD, 2007) rural poor include women and men who depend on herding for a livelihood and affected more with poverty. Most of these households are engaged in subsistence farming on small fragmented plots of degraded land, and a livelihood increasingly subject to weather fluctuations as a result of climate change.

Hence, the population of Ethiopia remains one of the most food insecure in the world, in spite of significant political and economic reform during the 1990s, a number of years of record harvests and increasing levels of assistance from the international donor community. For the past twenty years, the number of beneficiaries in Ethiopia in need of annual food assistance has steadily risen and the country continues to be one of the largest recipients of emergency food aid on an annual basis (Jenden, 2002).

According to MOARD (2010) dramatic variations in the climate contribute to food insecurity. Rainfall data for the period 1967 to 2000 indicate that annual variability in rainfall across different zones in Ethiopia ranged from a low of 15% to a high of 81% – among the highest in the world. Repeated environmental shocks have severely eroded rural livelihoods, leaving households with little capacity to cope. Beyond rainfall shocks, health risks, including both malaria and HIV/AIDS, exacerbate the vulnerability of the poor, driving thousands of people into poverty traps (WHS, 2008). Many households are not able to fully meet their most basic consumption needs even in years when rainfall is adequate (Jenden, 2002, MOARD, 2010).

As a result, every year for over two decades, the Government has launched international emergency appeals for assistance. This annual emergency assistance was channeled to meet the consumption needs of all food insecure households. It did not distinguish between different types of food insecurity – whether it was temporary and caused by specific shocks, or whether it was regular and a reflection of general poverty (MOARD, 2010). Although this humanitarian assistance was substantial or estimated at about US$265 million a year on average between 1997 and 2002 and saved many lives, however, evaluations have shown that it was unpredictable for both planners and households, and often arrived too little, too late. The delays and uncertainties meant that the emergency aid could not be used effectively and did little to protect livelihoods, prevent environmental degradation, generate community assets, and preserve physical or human household assets (MOARD, 2010).

In 2003, building on its National Food Security Strategy, the Government of Ethiopia launched a major consultation process with development partners that aimed to formulate an alternative to crisis response to support the needs of chronically food insecure households, as well as to develop long-term solutions to the problem of food insecurity (MOARD, 2010). This culminated in the New Coalition for Food Security that proposed a Food Security Programme (FSP) aimed at shifting households out of the emergency relief system while also enabling them to ‘graduate’ (MOARD, 2010).

Furthermore, Ethiopia adopted and developed a long-term strategy measures including ADLI and PASDEP. The first PRSP namely Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program was implemented from 1991 to 2004/05 and the recent one, PASDEP was also in place for the period of 2005/2006 to 2009/10.

Under the FSP, in 2005, the Government started a major new initiative - the Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) that distinguishes between chronic and transitory food insecurity and aimed to assure food consumption and prevent asset depletion for food insecure households in chronically food insecure woredas, while stimulating markets, improving access to services and natural resources, and rehabilitating and enhancing the natural environment (MOARD, 2006).

The productive safety net program has two components: a labor-based public work (85%) for those able to work and a direct support (15%) for those unable to work. It includes cash and in-kind transfer or mode of payment to chronically food insecure households. A program also address transitory needs through contingency budgets and risk financing mechanism after re-designed in assessing phase one five year program (2005-2009) for the phase two five year programme (2010-2014) being implemented (MOARD, 2010).

According to the Department for International Development (DFID) (2006), Ethiopia experiences both chronic and transitory food insecurity problems. A study also indicated there are more than eight million people who are chronically food insecure.

Although, PSNP was originally planned to reach more than eight million chronically food insecure people within the years 2005 to 2010, more than seven million people have received PSNP transfers in about 263 woredas (districts) of Ethiopia’s eight of the nine regions since its inception the year 2005 (MOARD, 2010).

The targeting approaches for identifying eligible households are the combination of administrative and community targeting. The chronically food insecure people of PSNP woredas required food assistance in the ten years preceding the design of the PSNP up to 2004 (MOARD, 2009 & Samuel, 2006)

Albeit, some studies have been carried out at the national level on the food security and PSNP situation in Ethiopia (Sharp, 1997, Samuel, 2006, Fikadu & Ignatius, 2009), there is hardly any study has been done to find out the factors affecting the PSNP implementation at grass root level. The main purpose of this study is to focus on the factors affecting the implementation of PSNP in Wuchale woreda, North Shewa Zone, Oromia region, Ethiopia. The area was selected because it was identified as chronically food insecure woreda and targeted for PSNP implementation since 2005 when PSNP started operation for the first time.

It is, all the more appropriate for the region and the country at large to launch a study to fill up the gap left untouched by researchers till today.

## **Productive Safety Net Programme Development**

###  1.2.1. Overview of PSNP in Ethiopia

 Food insecurity in Ethiopia is normally understood in terms of recurrent food crisis and famines, and responses to food insecurity have conventionally been dominated by emergency food-based interventions. In the ten years from 1994 to 2003, an average of five million Ethiopians were in need of emergency assistance, and since 1998 the numbers of food aid beneficiaries in Ethiopia fluctuated between 5 and 14 million every year (Devereux S, et al, 2006). However, a high proportion of households that receive emergency food aid, or work on public works projects, every year are not “famine prone” but are “chronically food insecure” – they face predictable annual food deficits caused by agricultural production constraints and poverty. These predictable food insecure people are also exposed to shocks usually triggered by draught, that raise their vulnerability further, by forcing them to dispose of their assets to survive. This results in a gradual deterioration of food security status overtime, which decades of large-scale food aid deliveries have done little to prevent and rather it has steadily increased dependency on food aid (Jenden, 2002).

In recognizing this dilemma, the Government of Ethiopia initiated a Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) in 2004 and started implementation in 2005 with the objectives of reducing household vulnerability, improving household and community resilience to shocks, and breaking the cycle of dependency on food aid. The overarching principle of the Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) is to facilitate “a gradual shift away from a system dominated by emergency humanitarian aid to productive safety net system resources via multi-year framework” (MOARD, 2004).

The provision of cash and food transfers through PSNP includes the following grab bag of reasons or specific objectives (Stephen D. & et. al., 2006):

* + **To smoothen household consumption** – to bridge production deficits in chronically food insecure farming households that are not self-sufficient, even in good rainfall years;
	+ **To protect household assets** – to prevent poor households from falling further towards destitution, vulnerability to future shocks and chronic dependence on external assistance;
	+ **To create community assets** – by linking the delivery of transfers to activities that are productivity-enhancing, in order to promote sustainable developmental outcomes.

A productive safety net program has two components: a labor-based public work (85%) for those able to work and a direct support (15%) for those unable to work. It includes cash and in-kind transfer or mode of payment to chronically food insecure households. A program also address transitory needs through contingency budgets and risk financing mechanism after re-designed in assessing phase one five year program (2005-2009) for the phase two five year programme (2010-2014) being implemented (MOARD, 2010).

## Regarding coverage, PSNP has been implemented within eight regions in Ethiopia: Amhara, Oromia, Tigray, SNNPR, Dire-Dawa, Harari, Somali and Afar (see table 1.1)

**Table 1.1:**

**List of PSNP Areas and Beneficiaries in Ethiopia**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Region | No. of Zone | No. ofDistricts | No. of Special Districts | Total Beneficiaries |
| 1 | Amhara | 8 | 52 | - | 2,519,529 |
| 2 | Oromia | 9 | 79 | - | 1,378,876 |
| 3 | SNNPR | 10 | 55 | 3 | 1,298,981 |
| 4 | Tigray | 4 | 31 | - | 1,453,707 |
| 5 | Dire-Dawa | - | 1 | - | 52,614 |
| 6 | Harari | - | 1 | - | 16,136 |
| 7 | Somali | 9 | 50 | - | 1,102,017 |
| 8 | Afar | 5 | 29 | - | 472,229 |
|  | Total | 45  | 298 | 3 | 8,294,089 |

##  Source: MOARD, 2006

Generally, the Productive Safety Net Program, which has been implemented by the Government of Ethiopia since January 2005, with technical and financial support from a joint donor group that includes the Department for International Development (DFID) and the World Bank embraces three phases as below (MOARD, 2010):

* Phase 1**:** from January 2005 to December 2005. This established PSNP processes and delivered transfers to 4.84 million food insecure people in Ethiopia.
* Phase 2: from January 2006 to December 2009. During this phase the PSNP scaled up significantly to cover 7.57 million people.
* **Phase 3:** from January 2010 to December 2014. This phase will further strengthen implementation of the PSNP for existing 8.2 million people to achieve the objectives in all programme areas and maximise linkages with other elements of the FSP to ‘graduate’ chronically food insecure people out of dependence on external support except during food crisis.



 Figure 1: PSNP Coordination Mechanism

###  1.2.2. Overview of PSNP in Wuchale Woreda

####  1.2.2.1. General

Wuchale Woreda in which the study was conducted is one of the five chronically food insecure PSNP implementing woredas such as Kimbibit, Kuyu, Jidda, Wuchale and Abichu-Gnea of North Shewa Zone, Oromia Regional State, of Ethiopia. A Woreda has a total population of 108,974 and an average household size of 6.7 (USAID survey report, 2007). According to 2010 WFP assessment report, Wuchale woreda is moderately disaster risk-prone and frost is the major hazard and people are vulnerable largely due to lack of resistant and agro-climatically suitable crops. Moreover, access to infrastructure like roads, electricity, health and education is in a poor state. The study also revealed that awareness about disaster management system is inadequate and less than 15% of population can read and understand text and write letters easily. The study also revealed over 75% of the population of Wuchale Woreda had faced food shortage in the last six months when they did not have enough money to buy food or cover other essential expenditures.

The Wuchale district started the implementation of PSNP since 2005 with the total beneficiaries of 6,304. There are also a total of 1,791 households within 4 peasant associations or kebeles in the Woreda. Of these, 1,269 households have engaged in public works (PWs) while 522 have involved in direct support (DS) programme(refer to table 1.2).

Table 1.2:

 PSNP Households in the Wuchale Woreda

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Kebele (Peasant Association) | Public Work(PW)Households | Direct Support(DS)Households |
| M | F | T | M | F | T |
| 1 | Bole-bacho | 276 | 80 | 356 | 48 | 30 | 78 |
| 2 | Nono | 223 | 80 | 303 | 54 | 72 | 126 |
| 3 | Ichiko kura | 114 | 58 | 172 | 27 | 48 | 75 |
| 4 | Aroji Walanso | 329 | 109 | 438 | 137 | 106 | 243 |
|  | 942 | 327 | ***1269*** | 266 | 256 | ***522*** |

 Source: WOA, 2011

####

The Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) is one of the four components of Food Security Programme like Household Asset Building Programme (HABP), Complementary Community Investment (CCI) and Re-settlement. It is also multi-faceted approach involving various Offices and line departments and has been implemented in chronically food insecure Districts since 2005; however, the Districts have different capacities (MOARD, 2006).

According to MOARD, 2010 the Productive Safety Net Programme also embraces the following major outputs:

* Transfers for chronically food insecure households
* Transfers for households affected by shocks
* Public Works to create sustainable infrastructure
* Strengthening the effectiveness of PSNP implementation
* Coordination between programme implementers and with other and relief development efforts

#### 1.2.2.2. Institutional and Management Arrangements of PSNP

The Productive Safety Net Program is a component of the larger Food Security Program of the Government of Ethiopia. Food Security line agencies at every level of Government are accountable for the oversight and coordination of the FSP with implementation being undertaken by line ministries, Government agencies and other partners at all levels. These arrangements and roles and responsibilities are cemented in a Memorandum of Understanding between Government and development partners (MOARD, 2010).

**Box 1: The PSNP budget arrangements**

* **Beneficiaries’ transfers/payments** (constitute 80% of the base programme cost at district level)
* **Administrative** budget(5% of the base programme cost at district level)
* **Capital budget**(15% of the base programme cost at district level)
* **Contingency funds** (20% of the base programme cost at district level; 15% managed by region while 5% is by district)
* **Regional management budget**(2% of the programme costs only for each Region)
* **Federal management budget**(1% of the total programme cost)
* **Capacity Building budget**(1% of the regional base programme cost)

Source: Extracts from PIM 2010

According to MOARD, 2010, the planning process of PSNP is participatory and bottom up approach based on community priorities taken into account the Woreda development plan.
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Figure 2: **Woreda FSP Coordination and Management Mechanism**

####  1.2.2.3. TARGETING

Targeting is the selection of relevant or needy beneficiaries for PSNP. The targeting principles of the PSNP are set out in the Program Implementation Manual (PIM 2004/2006/2010) which is a basic reference document for implementers. According to the PSNP memorandum, the primary targeting objective of PSNP is to guarantee ***timely and adequate*** ***transfers to the most food insecure people*** ***in the*** ***most food insecure areas*** (DFID Ethiopia 2005). The PIM also defines these target areas and people at woreda and household level respectively as quoted in the box 2:

Box 2: **Definition of Target Areas and Households**

1. **Chronically Food Insecure Districts:**
* For the purpose of the Safety Net, a District is considered chronically food
* insecure if it :
* is in one of the 8 regions(Tigray, Amhara, Oromia, SNNPR, Somali, Afar, rural Harari and Dire-dawa and
* has been a recipient of food aid for a significant period, generally for at least each of the last three years and above prior to commencement of PSNP
1. **Chronically Food Insecure Households:**
* The households should be members of the chronically food insecure community;
* Has been assessed by a mix of administrative guidelines and community knowledge to have faced continuous food shortages ( usually 3 months of food gaps or more) in the last 3 years and received food assistance
* Households who suddenly become more food insecure as a result of a severe loss of assets (financial, livestock, means of production, assets), especially if linked to the onset of severe chronic illness, such as HIV/AIDS, and who have been unable to support themselves over the last 1 to 2 years; and
* Households with no adequate family support and other means of social protection and support.

Extracts from PIM 2010

Moreover, the following criteria are also included in the PIM 2010, especially for selecting direct support (DS) beneficiary households:

* People who are too young to qualify for Public Works, i.e. 16 years of age and under
* People who are too old to qualify for Public Works.
* Physically disabled people
* Mentally disabled people
* People who are temporarily unable to work who would normally do so. This includes women from the sixth month of pregnancy; lactating mothers in the first ten months after birth; and people who are sick.

## **STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS**

Extreme poverty is widespread in Ethiopia. The major causes of poverty and food insecurity in rural areas include land degradation, recurrent drought, population pressure, low input subsistence agricultural practices, lack of employment opportunities and limited access to services. As a result, more than 38% of rural households fall below the food poverty line (MOFED 2006). The WMS 2004 survey also found that around 8.78 million people in Amhara, Oromia, SNNPR, Tigray, Dire-Dawa & Harar faced a food gap of four or more months. The figure is comparable with the PSNP beneficiary figure of 8.2 million of those regions.

In response to the food insecurity threat, Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) has been instituted to alleviate food insecurity. The Productive Safety Net Program is a core program meant to benefit individuals and households who are chronically food insecure, unable to work or experience temporary decline in purchasing power by providing them with transfers which include cash and/or in-kind in the form of a labour based public works(PWs) component and a direct support(DS) component to ensure support to the households who are unable to work and have no other means of support, and who are chronically food insecure (Samuel 2006, MOARD, 2009, Coates & Rogers, 2000).

The PSNP also covers transitory needs among households negatively affected by shocks after the needs are frequently assessed and determined through the early warning system. These households are then covered by the PSNP contingency budget at woreda and regional levels or by the recent risk financing at federal level (MOARD, 2010)

However, significant progress has been made in stabilizing livelihoods and reducing food insecurity of beneficiary households, the implementation of PSNP has faced challenges vis-à-vis to targeting, quality of public works, institutional arrangements for managing and coordinating PSNP (Ethiopian food security impact Assessment report, 2008). Furthermore, according to MOARD, 2009, however, graduation of significant numbers of beneficiaries was proposed within the previous first five year of PSNP implementation; only 56,895 households out of 7.3 million beneficiaries have been graduated from PSNP as of April 2009. This figure actually reflects the lower side of reality when it is compared to the massive support provided since 2005. Hence, there have been various factors of problems that affecting the implementation of PSNP and needs to be researched.

## [**General Objective**](#_Toc276467483)

The overall objective of the study is to identify factors affecting PSNP implementation at local level in the Wuchale Woreda, North Shewa Zone, Oromia, Ethiopia.

##  [**Specific Objectives**](#_Toc276467484)

* To identify socio–economic and other factors affecting the implementation of PSNP in the study area;
* To study the understanding of people on the implementation of PSNP at local level in rural settings;
* To study the extent of poor people’s inclusion in the PSNP and the participation of community in the programme

## [**Research Questions**](#_Toc276467485)

* Why farmers were selected or targeted for PSNP?
* Was targeting fair?
* What were the major problems affecting the PSNP?
* Did the communities, particularly the poor/women participate in decision making process?

## [**Significance of the Study**](#_Toc276467486)

The Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) has been implemented by the Government of Ethiopia since January 2005, with technical and financial support from a joint donor group that includes the Department for International Development (DFID) and the World Bank provides transfers to chronically food insecure populations in a way that prevents asset depletion at the household level, creates assets at the community level and stimulates markets (Stephen D. and et. al., 2006).

According to MOARD, 2010, the progress towards graduation from the PSNP impacts is greater, when implementation is more effective.

This study was, therefore, designed to identify factors affecting the implementation of PSNP at grassroots level in the study area to fill the gap left untouched by researchers. The result would also serve as a springboard to higher level of policy makers, beneficiary households, donors, etc. to indicate the area of attention and to make corrective measure for the success and expansion of the PSNP. Moreover, the study will indicate the way forward and measures to be taken as means to overcome the major limiting factors for implementation.

##  [**Scope and Limitations of the Study**](#_Toc276467487)

This study was undertaken in two of the four PSNP implementing Kebeles operating in Wuchale district focusing on limited number of a sample of rural households; those who received transfers like cash and food mix from PSNP. On the other hand, the scope of this study is on targeting process, public works related issues, participation of community in PSNP. Therefore, the final result of this research may not be representative and applicable to all households who are involved in PSNP program throughout the region. Some of the major constraints of the study include the time allowed to conduct the research is short, financial limitation, availability of reliable recorded data and area coverage of the study.

# CHAPTER 2: Literature Review

## 2.1. **Conceptual Framework and Definitions**

###  2.1.1. [**Origin, Concept, and Objective of**](#_Toc276467490) PSNP

According to MOARD, 2010 Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) is one of the Government of Ethiopia’s (GoE’s) flagship reform programmes and represents a significant transformation of the Government’s strategy for meeting the Poverty and Hunger Millennium Development Goal (MDG) in Ethiopia. It is also formal program of the government of Ethiopia which was designed in 2004 and started implementation in 2005 to provide transfers to food insecure population who are chronically food insecure with the aim in which it prevents asset depletion at the house hold level, creates assets at the community level and stimulates markets. The productive safety net program has also two components: a labor-based public work (85%) for those able to work and a direct support (15%) for those unable to work. It includes cash and in-kind transfer or mode of payment to chronically food insecure households. A program also address transitory needs through contingency budgets and risk financing mechanism after re-designed in assessing phase one and two five year program (2005-2009) for the phase three five year programme (2010-2014) being implemented (MOARD, 2010).

According to MoARD, 2010 PSNP, the PSNP has been implemented based on the following major elements of its objective:

* It focuses on chronically food insecure Districts;
* It focuses on food insecure households – primarily chronically food insecure households but also those who are transitory;
* It aims to assure food consumption, so that chronically food insecure people have enough food to eat throughout the year;
* It aims to prevent asset depletion, so that food insecure households do not have to lose their assets in order to provide food for themselves;
* It aims to address underlying causes of food insecurity by rehabilitating the natural resources base;
* It aims to have a positive impact by stimulating markets and injecting cash into rural economies and,
* While doing that it also aims to contribute to the creation of an enabling environment for community development by increasing access to services, such as health, education, roads and market infrastructure.

Looking at these elements of the objective, it is clear that the PSNP provides a safety net to protect people falling further into trouble, while also providing a secure food and asset platform from which they may be able to improve their household status and become food secure. It is also clear from this that while everyone wishes that graduation of households from the PSNP will be as widespread and fast as possible, the PSNP is not designed to make this happen, however, the safety net that the PSNP provides help to prevent people falling lower. Hence, other measures are also needed to people create assets or rise higher. These other measures are provided through other Government’s Food Security Programme (FSP) like Household Asset Building Programme(HABP).

### 2.1.2. EMPERICAL STUDIES

####  2.1.2.1. GEOGRAPHICal Targeting within woreda

According to Sharp, et.al, 2006, the Woreda allocate the PSNP resources and number of beneficiaries to kebeles under their jurisdiction and the kebele food security task force allocates numbers to the communities in the presence of no clear technical guidance in the process of criteria. Various types of information was used to decide quota like previous years food aid receipt, current harvest, population size, and in some case direct need assessment. The study conducted in 2006 in the four regions: Tigray, Amhara, Oromia and SNNPR revealed that it was generally agreed that community targeting was more successful in some cultural and governance contexts than others. The study also showed that there was significant improvement in the accountability and transparency of targeting process during the second year of the programme. The study also recommended there should mix of community and administrative targeting because it helped to ensure community participation, ownership and oversight over the selection of the beneficiaries.

#### 2.1.2.2. Institutions and Process

The main responsibility for targeting of PSNP beneficiaries falls on specially constituted Food Security Task Forces (FSTF) at woreda, kebele, and community levels supported by the woreda and kebele council and administration (Sharp, et. al, 2006)

According to MOARD, 2010, targeting under the PSNP is a combined administrative and community targeting approach. The four bodies who decisively take part in the selection of beneficiaries at different levels are: Community Food Security Task Force (CFSTF), Kebele Food Security Task Force (KFSTF), Kebele Council and Woreda Food Security Task Force (WFSTF) refer to table 2.1.

Table 2.1:

 Composition of Food Security Task FORCES (fstfs)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Woreda FSTF** | **Kebele FSTF** | **Community FSTF** |
| * Head of WOARD
* Food Security Desk
* Woreda Office of Finance and Economic Development
* Natural Resource Management Desk
* Women’s Affairs Desk
* Health Office and
* Other relevant line
* Departments
 | * Kebele Administration
* Development Agents
* Health Extension Workers and/or Volunteer -Community Health Workers
* Teachers
* Community members such as Youth and Women’s Associations
 | * Representatives from the KFSTF
* A Development Agent(DA)
* A Health Extension Worker or Volunteer Community Health Worker
* Two or three elected female representatives
* Two or three elected male representatives
* An elected youth representative
* An elected representative of the elder
 |

####  2.1.2.3. Targeting of Public Works and Direct Support

A research conducted by Sharp, et. al, 2006 on the topic of Targeting of Ethiopia’s PSNP after 18 months implementation of PSNP revealed that labour-poor households like female-headed households and people affected by HIV/AIDS who are often among the poorest and Direct Support (DS) beneficiaries became disadvantaged by the then targeting system, because there was a pressure to minimize the numbers of Direct Support (DS) beneficiaries and pre-set quota was applied for PW and DS and did not match with the needs of the communities. Labour-poor households who qualify for Public Works (PW) did not also earn the monthly full transfer entitlement for their family unless they worked the full work allocation. Furthermore, the temporary maternity and sick leave for PW beneficiaries was poorly implemented in practice or it was not granted by the community food security task forces (ibid).

#### 2.1.2.4. ERROR of Exclusion and Inclusion

Exclusion errors occur when relevant and chronically food insecure households are not targeted by the programme whereas inclusion errors are occurred when non-poor households are selected for the PSNP (MOARD, 2010).

The PSNP has a large inherent exclusion rate, meant that the chronically food insecure people is generally agreed to be higher than the resources of the Safety Net can cover (Sharp, et. al, 2006). According to Clay, Daniel Molla, et.al. 1998, some 46% of rural households were found to be in food deficit in 1995/96 which means they had net per capita food availability of less than 2,100 kcal per day. Even if the projected reduction in the poverty headcount to 34% by 2004/05 has been achieved, this still represents approximately 24 million people (ibid).

It is clear and unrealistic for the Safety Net to expand to such scale. The point is that the chronically food insecure are not an easily separable minority rather than targeting of Safety Net beneficiaries depends on relative need or the prioritization of the most food insecure. Hence, it is not based on identifying a clear category of people using absolute criteria (Sharp, et.al. 2006).

Regarding exclusion and inclusion errors data, the study conducted by Clay, Daniel Molla et.al. 1998 revealed that the error of exclusion and error of inclusion were 18% and 12% respectively.

####  2.1.2.5. Period of Graduation and Registration

According to PIM 2004/2006 the retargeting and registration was required every six months during the implementation of the first five years PSNP. It is modified for the current phase implementation period and being done annually and the duration of beneficiaries are five years until the end of the programme unless and otherwise they are graduated after fulfilling the criteria of graduation (MOARD, 2010).

The frequent re-targeting, uncertainty over the selection criteria and forced graduation of the beneficiaries as soon as they acquire some assets in some places had made the safety net unpredictable and unreliable for households (Sharp, et. al., 2006).

**Box 3: Graduation**

A graduation is absence of receiving PSNP transfers; it can meet its food needs for all 12 months and is able to withstand modest shocks. This state is described as being ***food sufficient***, which is a lower state than being ***food secure****,* (MOARD, 2006). Graduation arises from the combined effect of Food Security Programme components and other development processes , not from the activities of the PSNP alone. Improvements in all of these contributors are required for graduation (MOARD, 2010). Therefore, the success of the PSNP cannot be judged by graduation rates.

The graduation is a key goal of the overall food security programme. Over time, the PSNP in conjunction with other facets of food security programme should enable beneficiary households to become food secure and hence graduate (Sharp, et. al., 2006).

#### 2.1.2.6. Process of Appeals and Grievance

According to Sharp, et. al. 2006, errors and occasional abuses are inevitable in any targeting system**.** Programme Implementation Manual (PIM) that offers guide on appeal process was nominally in place and it was not functioning very effectively in most Districts. Because the members of targeting and appeals bodies overlapped and there was no independent channel for complaints (ibid).

# To solve such problem a revised appeals process has been established for all aspects of PSNP implementation and includes a Kebele Appeals Committee and access to the Woreda Cabinet for unresolved complaints (MOARD, 2010). While it is expected that concerns about the client selection process (both targeting and graduation) may make up the majority of appeals. Moreover, clients and non-clients can also make complaints about the management of public works, timeliness and completeness of transfers and any other perceived abuses of the PSNP. The study also showed female-headed household who were not targeted for PSNP more likely to appeal than men; however, their appeals were less likely to succeed (ibid).

####  2.1.2.7. Attendance of Schooling and Child Labour

The research revealed that the age-limits on PW participation were largely adhered to only about 8% workers under 18 and 3% over 60. People 20 and older have got the advantage of access to education (Sharp, et. al., 2006).

####  2.1.2.8. Payments

Payments is the transfer of PSNP beneficiaries that is given in the form of cash only, food only and cash as well as food mixture. Provision of transfers to chronically food insecure people is central to the strategy of the PSNP to achieve its objective of guaranteeing food consumption and protecting assets (MOARD, 2010). For the achievement of this objective, transfers must be ***appropriate,*** ***timely*** and ***predictable.*** When it is realized, PSNP clients are able to anticipate their own household cash- and food-flow, and plan more effectively for food consumption and asset protection. Meanwhile, use of the payment software, Payroll and Attendance Sheet System (PASS) is mandatory in all PSNP woredas of Amhara, Oromiya, SNNP and Tigray Regions, including those supported by NGOs since January 2010(ibid).

According to Slater D., Sabates-Wheeler, et.al. 2006 study report, different PSNP transfer packages were delivered across the regions. Beneficiary households received either cash transfers, food transfers, or a combination of food and cash. In these ‘mixed’ cases, beneficiaries typically received cash in some months and food in other months, rather than a package of cash plus food at the same time. Approximately one in six PSNP households’ sampled received only cash (*16%)*, one in five received only food (*19%)* while over three in five received both cash and food (65%).

The wage rate or payment rate was fixed at 6 Birr per day (3kg grain where paid in food) (Sharp, et. al. 2006), however the wage rate or payment has been increased to 10 Birr per day (3kg grain where paid in food) since January 2010(MOARD, 2010).

There was beneficiaries preference for food over cash because of the current imbalance between the lower purchasing power of the cash provided compared with the quantity of food given and because of the distant of the respondents from the markets that made the purchasing of food difficult( Slater, Ashley et.al,2006). There was delay in payment of transfer and brought about indebtedness on the beneficiaries (ibid).

####  2.1.2.9. Public Asset Creation

Public works are labour intensive community-based activities which are designed to provide employment for chronically food insecure people who have able bodied labour(MOARD, 2006).

In addition to asset protection at the household level the objective of the PSNP was to rehabilitate and develop infrastructural assets with the potential to generate and raise incomes in the long term. The public works implemented by the PSNP were identified by the communities and involved primarily access roads within the Peasant Associations, community bridges, soil and water conservation works, water harvesting structures, aforestation, etc. While these public goods were deeply appreciated by farmers and local government, there was little evidence that they were being appropriately maintained (Devereux, Sabates-Wheeler, et.al. 2006).

**Table 2.2:**

**Some Characteristics of Different Public Works in Ethiopia**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Public Works****(PWs)** | **Employment Generation Scheme (EGS)** | **“MERET”** | **Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP)** |
| National examples | Most relief operations to date | Six regions in Ethiopia | Eight regions in Ethiopia |
| Primary Objective | More productive use of relief resources | Asset creation : Infrastructure, environmental rehabilitation | Food consumption and asset protection for chronically food insecure HHs |
| Secondary Objective | Asset creation: Infrastructure, environmental rehabilitation | Reduce vulnerability | Community asset creation Infrastructure, environmental rehabilitation |
| Target | Those affected by climatic shocks | Able bodied poorChronically food insecure | Able bodied and Disabled poor Chronically food insecure HHs |
| Resources | Determined by relief needs in Ethiopia on annual basis(no certainty on the amounts of resources for the woreda or districts) | Multi annual | Multi annual through the Government’s Safety Net budget line |
| Mode of payment | Primarily food to date but increasing emphasis on transfers in a form that support local market | Food | Cash first principle, but, based on preference:Cash only, Food only, Cash and Food mixture |
| Institutional responsibility | DPPC centre/zone/region/wereda | MOA centre/ region /zone/ woreda | Food Security line Offices at every level have oversight PWs components center/region/zone/ woreda |
| Financial responsibility | External donors | External donors | External donors and Government of Ethiopia |
| Planning | Public works were not planned as part of development strategy for the woreda | Based on community priorities includes in the woreda development plan | Based on community priorities taken into account in the woreda development plan |

#  Source: Summarized from MOARD, 2010

###  2.1.3. [Definition of Poverty](#_Toc276467491)

####  2.1.3.1. POVERTY AND FOOD SECURITY

There are different definitions by different people regarding poverty. As indicated by (Shimelles and Islam, 2009) the UN's World Summit on Social Development, the Copenhagen Declaration described poverty as a condition characterized by sever deprivation of basic human needs including food, safe drinking water, sanitation facilities, health, shelter, education and information. The Scottish Poverty Information Unit defines poverty as people live in poverty when they are denied an income sufficient for their material needs and when these circumstance exclude them from taking part in activities which are an accepted part of daily life in that society. According to World Bank, the most commonly used way to measure poverty is based on incomes. A person is considered poor if his/her income level falls below some minimum level necessary to meet basic needs. According to (IFAD, 2001) poverty is lack of capabilities to pursue normal live condition such as economic capabilities, human capabilities, socio-cultural capabilities, political capabilities and protective capabilities.

Generally, poverty is complex in nature and scope; therefore, there is no guaranteed approach to solve the problems associated with it (Mwaniki, 2006). Poverty persists both in urban and rural areas. But, there is a wide gap between urban and rural poverty. It is more apparent in rural areas. Carney (1999) provides witness on the issue indicating that about 70% of the world's poor live in rural areas; however, urban poverty is still rising. The same author stated that the main reasons why rural poverty persists are as follows: rural people are isolated from economic opportunities, have less access to services (health, sanitation and education), lack knowledge of rights and information.

**Box 4: International Consensus on Poverty**

“Poverty is more than inadequate income or human development- it is also vulnerability and a lack of voice power and representation. With this multidimensional view of poverty comes greater complexity in poverty reduction strategies” World Development Report 2000/01

Beginning with an understanding of who the poor are, where they live, and their main barriers to moving out of poverty are a key.

Further, the multidimensional nature of poverty (low income, poor health and education, gender, insecurity, powerlessness, etc) needs to be carefully considered. An appropriate framework for selecting and tracking measures to indicate progress for chosen poverty outcomes is needed to test the effect of policies and programs and adjust as needed (Jenden, 2002).

In Consultation with the Poor , for example for the rural poor in many areas of Ethiopia, the priorities are land, agricultural inputs, and the problems caused by drought and rainfall irregularity, while the urban poor suffer from unemployment and lack of municipal services. Food security is the overriding concern of both groups.

 **Box 5: International Consensus on Food Security**

 Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. Achieving food security means ensuring that sufficient food is available, that supplies are relatively stable and that those in need of food can obtain it’ Rome Declaration on World Food Security 1996.

Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family, including food…" Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948

**Box 6: Food Sufficiency**

A household can be deemed food sufficient when, in the absence of receiving PSNP or emergency transfers, it can meet its food needs for 12 months and is able to withstand modest shocks (MOARD, 2010).

####

####  2.1.3.2. Sustainable LIVELIHOOD AND ITS FRAMEWORK

The sustainable livelihoods framework promoted by DFID2000 presents the main factors that affect people’s livelihoods, and typical relationships between these, the framework:

* + - * Provides a checklist of important issues and sketches out the way these link to each other;
			* Attempts to draws attention to core influences and processes; and
* Emphasizes the multiple interactions between the various factors which affect livelihoods.

**Box 7: What is a Sustainable Livelihood?**

A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and non material resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base. DFID, 2000

In using Sustainable Livelihood Frame work, people are at the centre of the analysis, which is most likely to begin with simultaneous investigation of people’s assets, their objectives (the Livelihood Outcomes which they are seeking) and the livelihood strategies, which they adopt to achieve these objectives. For these reasons, the framework was also used as input for this research.



 Source: DFID, 2000

Figure 3: Sustainable Livelihoods Framework

The livelihood framework identifies five core asset categories or types of capital upon which livelihoods are built, described as the asset pentagon. It is important therefore to look at what have been termed these livelihood building blocks to try to understand what is happening at household level.

***Human capital***: The skills, knowledge, ability to labour and good health that together enable people to pursue different livelihood strategies and achieve their livelihood objectives. It is required in order to make use of any of the four other types of assets.

***Social capital***: Relationships of mutual trust and reciprocity. Networks and connectedness that increase people’s trust and ability to work together and expand their access to wider institutions.

***Natural capital :*** is the term used for the natural resource stocks public and private on which livelihoods depend

***Physical capital***: comprises the basic infrastructure and producer goods needed to support livelihoods.

***Financial capital***: denotes the financial resources that people use to achieve their livelihood objectives. It includes income flows and stocks/ savings.

 

 **Source: DFID, 2000**

 Figure 4: The Asset Pentagon

####  2.1.3.3. Policies and Strategies of Food Security

Productive Safety Net Programme(PSNP) is a component of the larger Food Security Program of the Government of Ethiopia. Accordingly, there are a number of important policies and strategies that relate to food security and supporting the implementation of PSNP in Ethiopia. The main policy level documents are the followings (Slater, and et. al., 2006):

* The Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Programme (SDPRP) of 2002, which was soon replaced by the Plan for Accelerated and Sustainable Development to end Poverty (PASDEP) in 2005/2006. These set the national framework for poverty reduction and economic development within which food security fits.
* The Rural Development Policies Strategies and instruments document of 2001 establishes the strategic framework and principles for rural development within the framework of the national development plans.
* The Food Security Strategy which was redesigned in 2002 establishes the framework for food security interventions. This new Food Security Policy has the double aim to protect people against hunger and asset depletion, and lift them out of poverty. It is a joint initiative of the Government of Ethiopia and the International Community (Donors).

# CHAPTER 3: Methodology OF RESEARCH

###  3.1. [Description of the Study Area](#_Toc276467505)

####  [3.1.1. North Shewa Zone](#_Toc276467506)

North Shewa zone in which a study District found is one of the 18 zones in Oromia National Regional State. The zone has an area of 1,165,013 hectares of which 626,256(53.8%) hectares cultivated, 96,558 (8.3%) hectares forest, bush and shrub lands, 212,109 (18.2%) hectares grazing land and the rest 230,090(19.7%) hectares settlement and miscellaneous land (ZDOA, 2011). The zone is located in the central high land part of Ethiopia and in the North West part of the region bordered by region three to the North, the West Shewa zone to the West, the Addis Abeba special zone in the South and the region three in the East. It is sub-divided into 13 districts and 267 rural kebeles. There are 21 towns in the zone. Fitche, a capital town of the zone, is located some 112Km from Addis Ababa.

Moreover, the zone is a semi humid area and characterized by a bi-modal rainfall type. The main rain seasons starts in the mid of June and ends in mid of September whereas the *belg* (small rainfall season) starts in the early March and ends in April.

The zone has also a total population of 1,445,993 (male 724,894 and female 721,099) of which 89.5% are rural inhabitants and 10.5% are urban dwellers. The number of households and average household size are 301,249 and 4.8 respectively at growth rate of 2.9 percent (CSA, 2007).

 Despite poor productivity, the Zone possesses vast resources of livestock that includes cattle (1,321,758), sheep (78,905), goats (243,858), donkey (191,466), horses (96,872), mules (10,150), poultry (898,531) and beehives (125,138) (ZARDO, 2011)

Furthermore, there are two cropping seasons: the Meher (main production season) and the Belg season (small rain season). The dominant crops cultivated in the Zone are the followings: wheat, teff, bean, chick peas, lentil, sorghum, oil crops and others. The major cropping season is the one that starts in May and ends in October, whereas the small rainy season (February and March) is rarely favors double cropping of barely, shallot and some legumes. The rainfall situation of the Zone is unreliable or erratic.

In the zone, particularly five districts namely Wuchale, Jida, Kuyu, Kimbibit and Abichu-Gnea are totally categorized under food insecure areas. These districts are benefited from productive safety net program. Some of the determinant factors that influencing livelihood and well-being of the people are limited off-farm activities and alternative livelihood options, increasing land-less household, declining in land productivity, water logging and frost problem, poor livestock and soil management practices as well as increasing population pressure. The government and some of community-based responses to the challenges include volunteer migration and government initiated settlement programs within the region to potential areas.

####  [3.1.2. Wuchale District](#_Toc276467507)

#####  [**3.1.2.1. Location and climate**](#_Toc276467508)

Study area, Wuchale district, is one of the 13 districts which are found in North Shoa zone, Oromia National Regional State, Ethiopia. Muka-Turi is a capital town of the district, which is situated at a distance of 78 kms and 34 kms from Addis Ababa and zonal town, Fitche respectively along the main road that takes to Amhara region, Bahir-dar. The district is bordered by the Debre-Libanos, Yaya Gulele districts and Amhara region in the North, Abichu-Gnea and Jida Districts in the East, Sululta district in the South and Yaya-Gulele district in the West. The total land coverage of the area is estimated to 48,880 hectares (DARDO, 2011). The topography of the area is gentle slope flat fields (80%), undulated land (15%) and hilly (5%). The district is also located in the altitude ranging from 1,200 to 2,880 meters above sea level (DARDO, 2011). There are 24 rural administrative units (kebeles) and two urban *Kebeles* (Muka-Turi and Hobori) in the woreda(district).

Wuchale is categorized into three agro-ecological zones: *Kolla* (Lowlands) 3.4%, *Woyna-Dega* (Midland) 11.06% and *Dega* (Highlands) 85.54%. The mean annual temperature is 12oc and the mean annual rainfall ranging from 900 mm to 1400 mm (DARDO, 2011).

 



 **Wuchale District (Study area)**

 **Figure 4: Map of North Shewa Zone, Oromia, Ethiopia**

#####  [**3.1.2.2. Socioeconomic Aspects**](#_Toc276467509)

 Based on information obtained from (CSA, 2007) the total population of the district is 108,974 at growth rate of 2.9 %, of which women accounts 55,031(50.49%). The male are 53,943(49.5%). Total number of households is also 19,728 (16,363 males and 3,363 females). The average family size is 6.7 and population density in the area is 1.6 persons/ hectare. Economically active persons who are in age category of 15 to 64 years are constituted about 40% of the total population in the district.

 Agriculture is the main means of livelihoods in which about 94% of the population of a district are directly or indirectly engaged in this sector. Mixed of crops production and livestock raring characterizes the farming system of the district. According to information from (DARDO, 2011), the level of production and productivity of both sub-sectors remains below its potential. Adverse weather condition (erratic rainfall and drought), high price and unavailability of agricultural inputs, declining soil fertility and absence of appropriate soil management system, weak market information and management system, obsolete technology and farming methods and techniques are among main reasons (DFEDO, 2011).

According to USAID, 2007 survey report, the Woreda has three livelihoods zones known as Ambo Selale Ginde-Beret Teff and Wheat Livelihood Zone, Selale-Ambo Highland Barley, Wheat and Horse bean belt Livelihood Zone and Abichu-Kimbibit Livestock, Wild Oats and Barley Wheat Livelihood Zone.

There is cropping diversity, categorized according to the existing various livelihood zones. The crops are wheat, teff, beans, barley, etc. which helps building their capacity to switch crops in times of crises, though, most crops are grown only in one season (Meher). The livestock diversity is largely in the form of cattle (mostly for draught) sheep, horses and donkeys (WFP study report, 2010).

Wuchale district is moderately disaster risk-prone. Frost and water logging is the major hazard in the district and people are vulnerable largely on account of lack of resistant crops and monoculture. Access to infrastructure like roads, electricity, health and education is in a poor state. Awareness about disaster management system is inadequate ((WFP study report, 2010).

# Table 3.1:

# Number of Livestock in the District

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of Livestock** | **Heads** |  |
| Cattle | 123,256 |  |
| Sheep and goats | 132,409 |  |
| Equines(horses & donkeys) | 34,244 |  |
| Poultry | 54,081 |  |

 Source: DARDO, 2011

Crop production is going on in the area both using rain-fed and irrigation systems. According to information from (DARDO, 2011), the total area under cultivation is 21,365 hectares of which about 80% hectares used during rainy seasons (*meher* and *belg*) and less than 20% hectares using irrigation water to produce vegetables (potato, onion and garlic). Irrigation development has shown a significant contribution in improving households' income and combat food insecurity. The main crops grown using rainwater include *wheat, barley, wild oat*, *teff*, *bean*, *pea,* and others.

###  3.2. Research Methodology

The “**Descriptive Research Method**” was selected as a research **methodology** for this study because it was designed to obtain information of the current situation, relationships and existing implementation practices of the PSNP in the study area. A case study method was also adopted for this study to identify factor affecting implementation of PSNP. Furthermore, both qualitative observation and quantitative questionnaire based surveying method was conducted.

In this study, two of the four kebeles (Villages) in Wuchale Woreda implementing PSNP were randomly selected for study. The selected kebeles Nono and Bole-Bacho had a total of 863 beneficiary households. Of these 659 were engaged in public works (PW) while 204 received direct support (DS). Furthermore, a sample of 172 households were drawn from both PW and DS components proportionally in using systematic random sampling technique. Accordingly, 132 were selected from PW participants while 40 were drawn from DS individuals.

During the period, from March to June 2011, both primary and secondary data were collected. The major primary data collection methods included use of both structured and unstructured questionnaires, focus group discussions, key informant interviews, and field observations. The questionnaires contained questions on socio-economic characteristics of the PSNP beneficiary households, assets ownership, transfers, targeting process, public works related issues and participation of community in PSNP. The focus groups were three in numbers such as non-beneficiaries, women and other public work participants who were formed in each of the two sample kebeles. The information obtained through this method complemented that collected through the beneficiaries’ survey. The key informant interviews were also conducted with members of Food Security Task Forces (FSTFs) at woreda, kabele (village) and community levels Development Agents (DAs), and community leaders so as to get in-depth information on factors affecting implementation of PSNP at woreda and kebele levels.

Moreover, checklists were prepared and used to provide a framework within which the researcher facilitated discussions to explore perception of the participants in the program deeply.

Furthermore, secondary data were collected from Oromia Agricultural and Rural Development Bureau, PSNP implementation manual (PIM), PSNP monitoring and evaluation guidelines and PSNP reports of Wuchale woreda and sample kebeles, journals of research findings and other reports served as the key sources of this data and helped to augment the primary data.

#### [3.2.1. Selection of the Study Area](#_Toc276467513)

The study area, Wuchale district was selected purposively based on its convenience, accessibility. Moreover, Productive Safety Net Programme(PSNP) activities have been undertaken in the area since 2005 during phase one when PSNP started operation and no study on measuring the challenges has been conducted in the specified *Woreda* (district).

####  3.2.2. [Sample Size](#_Toc276467515)

It is obvious that various constraints may face a researcher and force him or her to limit the sample size to his or her capacity (Bartlett *et al*., 2001). Similarly, in this study constraints of budget, time, facilities and other factors have been taken in to consideration to determine the sample size.

Hence, two of the four Kebeles(Peasant Associations) namely Nono and Bole-Bacho in Wuchale Woreda implementing PSNP were randomly selected for this study. These kebeles are situated at some 15km and 16 km from the Muka-Turi, woreda town respectively. The selected Kebeles have a total of 863 beneficiary households. Of these, 659 have engaged in public works (PWs) while 204 have involved in direct support (DS) programme. A sample of 172 households were drawn from both PW and DS components proportionally based on systematic random sampling technique. Hence, 132 households were selected from PW component beneficiaries, while 40 households were drawn from DS beneficiaries of the total sample size. The study area, Wuchale woreda far from Addis Ababa and Zonal town, Fitche, some 78 km and 34 km, respectively.

####  [3.2.3. Data Type and Source](#_Toc276467517)

The quantitative and qualitative data types related to the study were collected both from primary and secondary sources. Primary data that were gathered from sample respondents (PW and DS beneficiaries) in selected two *kebeles* through a structured questionnaire (broken down into two parts and various sections) used as the main source for this study. To compliment primary data, secondary data related to population, area, clients were gathered from different sources including sector government offices’ reports, NGOs, journals and other sources. Three focus groups such as non-beneficiaries, women and other public work participants were formed in each of the two sample kebeles. The information obtained through this method complemented that collected through the beneficiaries’ survey.

Data surveying was held by the researcher. Field trip practice was also incorporated for pre-testing of the questionnaire and some modifications were made on the questionnaire.

Focus group discussion (FGD) was also undertaken with Woreda Office of Agriculture, DPPC and line departments’ staffs and officials at different levels (Woreda, Zonal and Head-quarter, offices), respondents ( beneficiaries, and non- beneficiaries) in each kebeleusing semi-structured questionnaires and also gathered qualitative data, through interview.

#### [3.2.4. Analysis](#_Toc276467518) and Interpretation of Data

The data processing and analysis involved the tabulation, classification, edition and arrangement of completed interview schedules before formal analyses. The data and information were analyzed, interpreted and presented through descriptive statistical measures such as tables, and percentages based on the study objectives and research’s questionnaires. Hence, SPSS software was considered for data processing.

## **Table 3.2:**

## **Definition of Variables**

|  |
| --- |
|  **Variable**  **Definition** |
|  AgeMarital StatusLiteracyFamily sizeOwn landEAFM | Age of respondent in yearMarital status of respondent, dummy variable taking on the value of 1 if individual is married; 0 otherwiseEducation level of respondent, dummy variable taking the value of 1 if the individual able to read and write or above; 0 otherwiseFamily size of household; continuesLandholding size of respondent in hectareEconomically active family member from 15 to 64, in years |
| Nonno, Bole-Bacho The two *kebeles* selected for the study |

#  CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1. **DEMOGRAPHIC AND Socio-economic -characteristics of the respondents**

###  4.1.1. SEX OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS

Regarding sex characteristics of sampled households, the majority (67.4%) were male-headed households while only 32.6% of them were female-headed households (Table 4.1).

**Table 4.1:**

**Sex structure of the sample HOUSEHOLDS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sex category** | **Frequency** | **Percent**  |
| Male | 116 | 67.4 |
| Female | 56 | 32.6 |
| Total | 172 | 100 |

 Source: Household survey, 2011

###  4.1.2. AGE OF HUSEHOLD HEADS

According to the 2011 household survey result, the majority of the respondents (94.8 %) were found in the productive age group that ranges (15 to 64) while only 5.2 % household heads were over 65 years.

**Table 4.2:**

 **Age distribution of respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Age category** | **Frequency** |  **Percent** |
| 31-35 years |  2 |  1.2 |
| 36-40 | 21 | 12.2 |
| 41-45 | 30 | 17.4 |
| 46-50 | 32 | 18.6 |
| 51-55 | 36 | 21 |
| 56-60 | 24 | 14 |
| 61-65 | 18 | 10.4 |
| Over 65 years | 9 | 5.2 |
| Total | 172 | 100 |

 **Source: Household survey, 2011**

### 4.1.3. MARITAL STATUS OF HOSEHOLD HEADS

Regarding marital status 74.4 % of them were married. The unmarried ones were mostly those who were living with their aged and/or disabled family members.

**Table 4.3:**

 **Marital status of the sample farmers**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Marital Status** | **Frequency** | **Percent**  |
| Single | 44 | 25.6 |
| Married | 128 | 74.4 |
| Total |  |  |

 **Source:** Household survey, 2011

###

### 4.1.4. FAMILY SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS

Concerning the family size of the respondents who were participated in the interview, the average family size was five, although about 30 % had seven or more household members indicating that their household sizes were indeed large, which had an implication on feeding them properly.

**Table 4.4:**

**The family size of the sampled farmers**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Family size categories** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| 1-3 people | 9 | 5.2 |
| 4-6 people | 110 | 64 |
| 7-9 people | 53 | 30.8 |
| Total | 172 | 100 |

 **Source: Household survey, 2011**

###  4.1.5. EDUCATION LEVEL OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS

Regarding the educational level of the respondents who participated in the interview, about 60.5% households were illiterate or had no education opportunity, while 36% of them had attended grade 1- 8 or elementary education and only 3.5% had gone above grade eight( Table 4.5 ).

**Table 4.5:**

**Education level of the sampled households**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Education level** | **Frequency** | **Percentage**  |
| Illiterate | 104 | 60.5 |
| Grade 1-8 | 62 | 36 |
| Above grade 8 | 6 | 3.5 |
| Total  | 172 | 100 |

 Source: Household survey, 2011

 Figure 7: Level of Education of Respondents

###  4.1.6. OWNERSHIP OF Assets

In this study, asset ownership, as well as their quality, was used as an indicator of wealth of a household to a certain extent. The asset ownership status of the households was then manifested through their domestic assets, which included housing, livestock ownership, and farmland. Hence, the survey results indicated that the majority (98%) have their own houses of different types. However, most of these houses were of poor quality with walls made of mud and wood. Only two percent of the households reported not having a house of their own and stay with their closely related individuals.

The ownership of other domestic assets, such as tables, chairs, and radios is also very low and most of them are of low price. None of the respondents reported owning a television, bicycle, or any other major domestic asset (Table 4.6). This indicates that the targeted community is poor, as its domestic assets are limited and their estimated values relatively low.

**Table 4.6:**

**Domestic Assets of Sample Households**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Type  of  Asset |   | Quantity  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | EAP |
|  |  1 |  |  2 |  |  3 |   | 4 |  | 5 |  | Total |  |
|  |  Fr |  % |  Fr |  % |  Fr |  % | Fr | % | Fr | % |  Fr | % |  |
|  Bed |  105 |  61 |  1 |  0.58 |  -  |  | - |  |  - |  |  106 | 61.6 | 31.72 |
|  Chair |  21 |  12.2 |  6 |  3.4 |  4 |  2.3 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 2.3 |  42 | 24.4 | 27.28 |
|  Table |  16 |  9.3 |  1 |  0.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  17 | 9.8 | 34.50 |
|  Radio |  30 |  17.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  30 | 17.4 | 47.48 |
|  TV |  - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Bicycle |  - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

 **Source: Household Survey, 2011**

Note: EAP refers to Estimated Average price, Fr-Frequency, 1USD = 17.0955 birr as in the 1st week of October 2011

Study further revealed that the households in Wuchale Woreda kept livestock which included cattle, sheep, and goats, however, the ownership of such assets is also generally low (Table 4.7).

**Table 4.7:**

**Livestock Ownership Status of Sample Households**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  No. |  1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 Total EAP |  |  |
| Fr | % | Fr | % | Fr |  % | Fr | % | Fr |  Fr % |  |  |  |
|  Oxen | 61 | 35.4 | 18 | 10.4 | 10 | 5.8 |  |  |  |  89 51.7  | 497.20 |  |
|  Bull | 22 | 12.7 | 6 | 3.4 |  3 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  31 18 | 251.52 |  |  |  |  |
|  Cow | 57 | 33.1 | 7 | 4.1 |  4 | 2.3 |  |  |  |  68 39.5 | 304.17 |  |  |  |  |
|  Calf | 46 | 26.7 | 6 | 3.5 |  5 | 2.9 |  2 | 1.2 |  |  59 34.3 | 57.32 |  |  |  |  |
|  Sheep | 24 | 13.9 | 20 | 11.6 | 15 | 8.7 | 10 | 5.8 |  |  69 40.1 | 26.32 |  |  |  |  |
|  Goat | 10 | 5.8 | 8 | 4.6 |  3  | 1.7 |  - | - | - |  - 21 12.2 | 21.93 |   |  |

Source: Household survey, 2011

On the basis of the survey result, about 51% of the households owned oxen while only 39.5% had cows. Of the 89 households, 61 of them had only one ox per household. Similarly, of the 68 households who had cows, 57 of them owned only one cow per household. The average estimated price of an ox in the woreda is 497.20 USD while that of a milk cow was 304.17 USD. As for ownership of other livestock, some had calf, sheep, and goat, respectively indicating the extremely low level of ownership of the assets (Table 4.7). The total estimated asset value of sample households ranges from 31.72 birr (for households with only one bed) to 1,207.00 USD (for households having both livestock and some domestic assets). Thus, asset ownership level has indicated that there is high magnitude of poverty in the woreda as a whole.

Regarding ownership of farmland, the survey results had indicated that of the total 172 respondent households, 23.3% were landless; 35.6% had less than 0.5 hectare; 58.3% had 0.5 to 2.5 hectares, while only 6.1% had farm sizes of over 2.5 hectares, of which only three had the maximum farm size of five hectares (Table 4.8).

**Table 4.8:**

**Farm Size of Sample Households**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Farm Size (ha)** | **Frequency** |  **Percent** |
| Less than 0.5 |  47 |  35.6 |
| 0.5-2.5 |  77 |  58.3 |
| Over 2.5 |  8 | 6.1 |
| Total |  132\* | 100.0 |
| Farmland Rented in |  |  |
| 0.05-0.50 |  28 | 56 |
| 0.50-1.00 |  18 | 36 |
| 1.00-2.00 |  4 | 8 |
| Total |  50 | 100.0 |
| Farmland Rented in |  |  |
| 0.01-0.50 |  14 | 82.3 |
| 0.50-1.00 |  2 | 11.7 |
| 1.00-2.50 |  1 | 6 |
| Total |  17 | 100 |

 **Source: Household survey, 2011**

 \*40 households (23.2% of the 172) do not have farmland

Moreover, the survey had also depicted that the average farm size in the study area was about one hectare. This figure was not as such far-off from other regions of Ethiopia. For instance, North Shewa Zone, in Oromia, had an average of about two hectares and the Oromia Region as a whole, had about one and half hectares per household (CSA, 2007). As coping mechanism, the farmers supplemented their small holdings. For example 50 households had rented in farmland, but the units rented were generally very small since 92% of them were less than half hectare. On the other hand, 17 households rented out farmland of different sizes, although, it involves a very small piece of land (Table 4.8).

Because of the size of the farmland, subsistence agricultural activities were carried out on a small scale (Table 4.9). The major crops grown by households included wheat, teff, faba bean, and others.

**Table 4.9:**

**Annual Crop production in 2010 (in Quintal)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Quantity in Quintal |  wheat |  teff |  f. bean |  **Other** |
| Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
|  0.25-1.00 | 52 | 38.0 |  25 |  24.1 |  16  | 48.5 |  13 | 37.1 |
|  1.00-2.00 | 55 | 40.2 |  33 |  31.7 |  10 | 30.3 |  8 | 22.9 |
|  2.00-3.00 | 15 | 10.9 |  15 |  14.4 |  4 | 12.1 |  12 | 34 |
|  3.00-8.00 | 15 | 10.9 |  31 |  29.8 |  3 | 9.1 |  2 | 6 |
|  Total | 137 | 100 |  104 |  100 |  33 | 100  |  35 | 100 |

 Source: Household survey, 2011

The amount produced by these farm households was largely consumed, which in most cases cannot last until the next harvesting season. The study also revealed that about 5% of the households cultivated cash crops, such as onion, especially by using irrigation water.

Off-farm activities often supplement income obtained in agricultural activities in rural areas. Key informants revealed that able bodied persons often migrate to nearby town to work mostly as daily laborers. Other sell cow dung, firewood, and pottery, in nearby towns and earnings from such activities were low on average about 300 birr per annum.

##  **4.2. Issues Related to PSNP Implementation**

 **and Management**

### 4.2.1. Targeting FOR PSNP

Concerning targeting, the program implementation Manual (PIM) (2004/2006/2010) describes how to identify eligible groups (i.e. chronic food insecure households). The mechanisms used for targeting eligible households included geographical, administrative, and community targeting approaches. According to Barret & Clay (2001), geographical targeting was used when programs were targeted spatially by state, district, municipality, or community in the expectation that these areas were relatively homogenous according to wealth, income, or other indicators of vulnerability. However, this approach restricted participants administratively and often entails substantial leakage to the non-needy within the target sub-population. Administrative targeting mechanism applied a specific set of criteria for qualified household selection. It requires documentation of household incomes and assets. This mechanism can be relatively accurate in higher income setting when selecting the most vulnerable households.

In low-income settings, it is not feasible and often open to leakage. Community targeting allows individuals who feel they should qualify to put themselves forward to participate in the safety nets. The final selection decision rests with a committee made up of community members. However, difficulties often arise in having an appropriate representation in the committee (Humphrey, 1998). These three definitions of targeting were used in this study.

As to geographical targeting, lack of reliable socio-economic data, effective crop indicator, livelihood, and socio-economic assessment of each kebele was mentioned by the woreda Food Security focal person as a major challenge faced when identifying kebeles with affected and vulnerable households. As a result, the tendency had opened gap to include simply targeted all or partial kebeles into the program and resulted poor geographical targeting in the woreda as a whole. This created the challenge of achieving the selection of intended or relevant households.

With regard to administrative and community targeting, the targeting process involved allocation of quotas to kebeles by the woreda, and the kebele assembly votes for poorest of the poor. The list targeted by the community task force was submitted to kebele cabinet for verification before being presented to the woreda Food Security Task Force (FSTF). The woreda cabinet then refined the beneficiary list before it was submitted to the regional bureau (MOARD, 2010)

The study revealed that the process was with nepotism and corruption as it was realized during group discussions with focused groups. Hence, voting for relatives, family connections, and households of the same tribe was prevalent at the kebele level.

Regarding households’ perception on the major criteria of targeting, 75% of the respondents indicated that generally the poorest were targeted; 5.2% attributed to political orientation of the household heads; 5.2% attributed to farm size, 8.7% to family size; and the rest 5.9% to the aged and disabled individuals (Table 4.10).

Accordingly, while the poorest were targeted, it was evident that other factors challenged targeting of the real poor. This calls for the continuing community education on the essence and objectives of the programme.

 **Table 4.10:**

**Households’ Perception on the major Criteria of Targeting**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Poorest | 129 | 75 |
| Farm Size | 9 | 5.2 |
| Political Attitude | 9 | 5.2 |
| Family Size | 15 | 8.7 |
| Aged and Disabled | 10 | 5.9 |
| Total | 172 | 100 |

 **Source: Household Survey, 2011**

As to whether the targeting process was fair or not, 75% of the respondents reported that the process was unfair, while the rest said it was fair. During non-beneficiary group discussions, it was highlighted that the program included the non-chronic food insecure (nearest and kin) of the community food security task force (CFSTF), however, some efforts were made to screen out these individuals to make full family targeting in the year 2010 or during resumption period of phase three.

To determine the inclusion ratio (i.e. the proportion of non-poor to those who were poor in the program) local wealth ranking method was used. The latter involved the assessment of the value of household assets and the farm size, which were then used to classify beneficiary households to rich, medium, and poor wealth categories. In the study area, a farmer was considered rich locally if s/he had two or more oxen, two or more cows, and farmland of 2.5 hectares or more, where as medium with one to two oxen, one to two cows and between 0.5 and 2.5 hectares of farmland, and poor with less than half hectare of farmland, one or ox, and zero to one cow. Thus, the ranking system takes into consideration the price of livestock as well as domestic assets together with farm size. According to this wealth classification, the survey results indicated that of the 172 households, 75% categorized under poor wealth status and the rest included into the medium and rich categories. This implied that PSNP resources were leaked to about 25% of the surveyed households. Thus, for every 100 beneficiary households, there were about 25 non-poor households participation in the program. The findings were corroborated by evidence from the non-beneficiary focus group discussion participants who express concern at the high level of non-poor households participating in the program at the expense of the real chronic food insecure households. This also calls for a thorough socio-economic assessment of all participating households with the aim of flushing out non-deserving households. The assessment should also be extended to non-participating beneficiaries so that those left out before can now be included in the program.

In this study, indirect political pressure was also observed on targeting. The situation made possible to use PSNP as a tool for election campaigns by both the ruling and opposition parties (Sharp, Brown & Amdissa, 2006). This study found that 5.2% of the surveyed households reported that their inclusion was due to political support. Information obtained from women focus group discussions also revealed the presence of some political influence in the selection of the program beneficiaries especially during the first year (2005) targeting process.

The survey further showed that the PSNP was implemented with formidable challenges ranging from non-inclusion of poor people to giving less consideration to eligible female headed households (Table 4.11)

**Table 4.11:**

 **Major problems AFFECting the process of targeting**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Problems** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Exclusion of the poor  | 43 | 25 |
| Non-poor inclusion | 43 | 15.7 |
| Corruption | 30 | 17.4 |
| Lack of community participation | 34 | 19.8 |
| Less consideration of aged and disabled | 25 | 14.5 |
| Less consideration of female headed households | 13 | 7.6 |
| Total | 172 | 100.00 |

  **Source: - Household survey, 2011**

When the survey respondents were asked to rank the major challenges of the targeting process, results revealed that the non-participation of chronic food insecure (due to quota system) was ranked as first. Others that followed were lack of community participation, corruption, and the inclusion of non poor and in that order. The inability to give priority to the aged, disabled and female headed households were not rated high indicating that the inclusion of non-chronic food insecure and corruption were burning issues in the communities. Program officials should therefore hold regular project review meetings with the communities where such issues can be addressed. The communities should be given the opportunity to come up with their own local solutions to mitigate the problems as needed. This again emphasized the need of communities’ involvement throughout the project cycle.

###

### 4.2.2. Appeals on targeting process

It is obvious that the program implementation manual (PIM) 2004/06/10 asserts that the individual households and groups have the right to appeal against targeting decisions. The kebele appeal committee and the woreda cabinet are the first and second tier of appeal, respectively. The former is responsible for hearing any complaints, claims or appeals on the beneficiary selection process and for taking appropriate corrective measures in consultation with the kebele cabinet (MOARD, 2010). Ideally, appeals should be resolved at the kebele level, and reviews and responses to an appeal should be done within three days at kebele level and a week at woreda level. The community, kebele, and woreda FSTFs have the right to appeal to the woreda council. In case of inadequate resources to cover the targeted beneficiaries, a contingency fund, which is equal to five percent of the base program costs, exists largely to respond to such appeals (MOARD, 2010).

The study results revealed that there was lack of strong institutionalized functional mechanism for appeals; however, the Kebele Appeal Committee was established with Community, Kebele and Woreda Food Security Task Forces. Non-beneficiaries (i.e. those excluded from the program) appealed to Kebele Appeal Committee and Woreda for inclusion in the program, but such appeals took long time and no solution was given as intended. The kebeles were blamed for referring every appeal to the woreda council rather than dealing with the case and taking corrective measures at local level. During focus group discussions non-beneficiaries complained against kebele Appeal Committee and the woreda council for delays in reviewing their cases.

Barriers to appeals are found to centre on the lack of awareness on the part of appellants (individuals) on modalities of raising grievances the restrictive quota system and the low rate of taking corrective actions by kebele appeal committee and wareda cabinet. Focus group discussions recommended that though various efforts have been taken to tackle the problems, there is still a requirement of strong corrective measures to be taken again and again at community kebele and woreda levels to make the appeal mechanism efficient and responsive.

### 4.2.3. Payments OF TRANSFER

PSNP is one of the government owned big components of Food Security Program co-financed by both donors and the Ethiopian government. Every registered individual in the family is entitled to 300 birr annually, as s/he is in either of the DS or PW component of the program. In Wuchale woreda, cash and food mix (three months cash and three months food) was the mode of transfer. Regarding the mode of transfer, 97% of the respondent households indicated that they prefer the transfer to be in kind/food. During participant group discussions it was raised that the amount of cash transfer which was raised from six to ten birr/day/person is also too little and cannot support the consumption level of the households vis-à-vis to the current food price inflation. Other concerns raised included the late payment of the 300 birr, which in most cases was transferred lately in most cases. It was also noted that the location at which payments were made- woreda town was often far from the kebeles and participants were made to stay up to evening waiting the payment of transfer. In such cases, participants were exposed to spend extra money for food transportation, and accommodation, hence, they suggested that to be paid at their work places or residences.

Moreover, concern that was raised was the fragmented nature of month based payments prohibits them from making bulk purchases of food crops during relatively better grain- marketing days. They noted that the timing of payments does not take into consideration the grain marketing periods of the localities. Mostly, it was during May to June for cash when little grain was available on the market and beyond June/July for food transfers that violated expectation since this period coincided with the “hungry season” – a period of chronic food shortage. Thus it can be concluded that the payment periods were not demand driven as they gave little attention to the period of households’ food shortage period.

###  4.2.4. Participation OF Community in public works

In the PSNP, chronic food insecure households with able-bodied adults were eligible to participate in the public works projects and involved in the construction of roads, bunds, check dams water ways, ponds, and wells. Beneficiaries were expected to contribute their labor and maintenance of the projects after once completed.

The field observations result and information obtained from DAs in the study areas indicated that a large proportion of the public works, which involved the construction of bunds and water-ways from 2005 up to now, PW activities were done in different villages within kebeles. For instance, till 2006 participants carried out PW near their homes. However, since the commencement of 2007 the thrust has been changed to focus on critical watershed areas identified in each kebele. All participants of the PW component work together on such projects regardless of how far they were from the participants’ homes. This situation created dissatisfaction among participants who resided far away from the implemented projects. One key informant indicated that in their area some individuals withdrew from the program because of the remoteness of PSNP projects implementing sites. This therefore, calls for the need for the DAs, Community and Kebele Task Forces to listen to the concerns of the community and take corrective measures as to the need of participants.

Regarding the selection of PW sites, in principle, it is the local people who select under the auspices of the DAs and experts who identify problem areas and select the implementation areas. However, survey results indicated that in the study areas, the communities were not involved in both problem identification and site selection. About 52.3% of the respondents’ reported that the DAs woreda experts and kebele cabinets decided on what was to be done and where it must be done. Only 15% reported their presence when the projects’ site selections were made. This clearly indicated that community participation was weak in project identification and planning of the study areas.

The focus group discussions also indicated that the workmanship displayed on the construction of bunds, roads and check dams was good in most cases. Though, it was felt that there was a need to incorporate indigenous knowledge systems in such constructions so as to minimize maintenance costs. In addition, non-beneficiary involvement in implementation of soil and water conservation construction projects where such infrastructure was located in their areas was emphasized so that they can acquire knowledge on how to maintain such structures in case of damage by agents through time.

During the field survey and observation, some damaged stone bunds that had been constructed previously were observed. One key informant said that once PW participants constructed all types of bunds, it was up to the owners of the farms of the whole community to maintain the assets. Thus, it became obvious that if the users did not have the capacity to maintain such assets then it was a waste of huge resources to build such structures in that place. Thus the issue of the sustainability of projects was crucial and should be taken into consideration when planning such community assets for the PSNP implementation.

**Table 4.12:**

**perception of Households on the challenges OF PARTICIPATION on major DECISION MAKING process of PSNP implementation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Problems | Frequency | Percentage |
| Done by DAs & cabinets | 90 | 52.3 |
| lack of information & appropriate contact | 60 | 34.9 |
| lack of request and/or pressure | 9 | 5.2 |
| lack of time | 8 | 4.7 |
| aged and disabled | 5 | 2.9 |
| Total | 172 | 100.0 |

 **Source: - Household survey, 2011**

The survey respondents were asked to indicate the challenges contributing to lack of community participation in decision, making process of PSNP. Their prioritization was shown in table – and revealed that, the majority of the households (52.3%) witnessed that the major challenges inhibiting them from participation in the decision making process on PSNP implementation were due to the imposing attitude of DAs and cabinets. Then, 34.9% indicated lack of information and appropriate contacts, 5.2% lack of request and/or pressure, 4.7% lack of time and 2.9% highlighted that some of the participants were aged and disabled. This result indicated that communities were not satisfied with the way of program implementation in their areas. Hence, all concerned the woreda cabinet and the DAs should ensure that communities are involved in all stages of planning.

### 4.2.5. Situation of Gender and Child laboUr

According to the Implementation Manual (PIM) 2004/06/10 special attention must be given to the nature of work that women are assigned to work in PSNP projects, i.e. the tasks assigned to them should not be high energy demanding. The women are also allowed to come late during the work starts and should go home early before a day working hours completed for the sake of child care and other home activities. But, the key indicated that gender aspects recommended by PIM were not implemented in the projects. In the project areas, male and female PSNP participants were assigned in the similar tasks which in some case demanded a lot of stamina. Women focus group discussions also revealed that no special consideration was given to women regardless of the nature of work that they were assigned to do in the program.

*We performed the same tasks as our male participants. Their presence was somewhat good because they backed us while facing activities that needed high energy. The reason was that we came here from different work burdens in the home and outside like cooking, child caring, fetching, and other social commitments (Woman participant of the focus group in* Nonno kebele)

In addition, women focus group discussions expressed that maternal leave was not offered in the project areas, although DAs informed that women had the right to such leave. Thus it showed the ignorance of such entitlements though Government proclamation No 377/2003, in its Article 88 sub article three, part six, points out that maternal leave is allowed for 90 days (60 day prenatal period and 30 days postnatal period) (FDREA, 2004). The discussions so far revealed that women, at times provided a replacement during such periods. In cases where such replacements were not available, they were forced to report for duty within two weeks of the postnatal period. However, during women focus group discussions, no woman was reported having been punished for being absent from the public work activities for prolonged periods due to child birth. This issue was of major concern not only to women, but also to all concerned with human rights. Women have a right for maternity leave and the program should abide by the Federal regulations. These are some of the issues that should be raised at the regular project review meetings.

Regarding child labor, the federal democratic republic of Ethiopia constitution (1995) Article 36, 1 (d) stipulates that “Every child has the right not to be subjected to exploitative practices, neither to be required nor permitted to perform work which may be hazardous or harmful to his or her education or elsewhere”. With regard to this issue, the PSNP implementation manual, 2010 clearly stated that “able bodied adults can work on the public work activities but children below 16 years are not allowed to work in such activities”. During the field survey, about 10 children of less than 16 years of age were found working on public work activities in three of the project sites. The members of PW focus group discussion as well as the DAs confirmed that some households sent children to represent them to the projects. When asked why they did they participate in the PW, the children cited various social problems: labor shortage in the household, maternity leave, problems related to health of participant family member, absence of participating family member due to different personal problems: *I am living with aged grand families and work not only here but also on other agricultural activities too: - Child in PW participant, Bole Bacho Kebele.*

This issue indicated the prevalence of child labour, especially from labour deficient families. However, it was difficult to conclude whether or not child labor exploitation was prevalent in the woreda. Nevertheless, the above citation was a good example of poor targeting as such a family should not be participating in PW rather they should be included under the DS component since such eligible household members were aged and disabled.

### 4.2.6. Arrangements OF Institutions

Regarding the institutional arrangements, the Programme Implementation Manual (2004/06/10) provides a framework on the institutional arrangements from federal to community level and assigns roles to each institution. Accordingly, the emphasis was given to the woreda level institutions and woreda sector bureaus, like agriculture and food security desk, early warning, finance, education, health, water resource, transport, & communication and livestock agency for the purpose of this study. These institutions established in the woreda by the respective line ministries.

### 4.2.7. Institutions OF Woreda Level

The PIM, 2004/06/10 claims that “the woreda cabinet is the highest decision making body in the woreda, and is responsible for the approval of PSNP beneficiaries lists, planned activities, and budgets”. It works together with the woreda Food Security Task Force (FSTF) to verify beneficiary lists before submitting to the region for final approval.

The study showed that the woreda cabinet has been negatively affected by high cabinet turn-over. The head of the woreda Office of Agriculture indicated that since the beginning of PSNP (2005), the woreda cabinets have been changed more than three times because of the taking place of reorganization programs. This created problems of lack of continuity in the execution of duties not only in the PSNP, but also in the other programmes of a woreda as a whole. This frequently changes also affected the timely revision and approval of PSNP annual plans and their execution. While these changes are at times it is necessary to revamp woreda administration, and efforts should be made to ensure that such moves do not negatively impinge on development projects.

### 4.2.8. Bureaus OF Woreda Sector

The sector bureaus, such as agriculture office, finance office, education, water supply and sanitation, and health, etc. plaid significant roles in supporting kebeles technically during planning and implementation of development activities of PSNP in the project area. They were given authority to prepare their own plans and sector budgets on safety nets, which were integrated into the PSNP overall budget. However, this was not happening in practice. The PSNP focal person witnessed that the responsible woreda personnel or subject matter specialists in charge of producing woreda PSNP plans were busy by the other regular duties and were not fully involved while PSNP integrated plans were prepared. As a result, the PSNP development plans of the woreda were haphazardly produced. Moreover, the accountant also revealed that major challenges faced by the bureaus included untimely finance transfers from the region to the woreda, the high rate of staff turn-over, shortage of vehicles and in accessibility of remote areas to facilitate the payment of beneficiaries at kebele level.

The above issues, therefore, call for sustained woreda and kebele staff training programs to ensure that they are equipped with the relevant knowledge to facilitate them to execute their duties by integrating the PSNP plan activities into the woreda’s annual development plans. Thus, both on job short term trainings and external up grading courses are necessary to achieve this successfully.

# CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

##  **5.1. Conclusions**

Ethiopia is a large country in the horn of Africa with a total area of about 1.1 million square KM and population size of more than 79 million. Eight out of ten Ethiopians live in rural areas mainly on agriculture. Agriculture provides approximately 70 percent of raw materials for the industrial sector, generate more than 90 percent of export earnings and account for 85 percent of employment. Even though, the sector is imperative for the livelihoods of the people and its potential, it is characterized by low productivity and outputs.

The main problems are mainly attributed to limited access by smallholder farmers to improved production technologies, irrigation, financial services, agricultural market and poor land management practices. Consequently, poverty and food security are the main issues in economic development of Ethiopia, in which 34.6 percent of the population live below poverty line, life expectancy at birth is 56 years and the per capita income of the country is USD 180.

To this end, and so as to promote sustainable agricultural development, the country adopted and developed a long term strategy measures including ADLI and PASDEP, in which the importance of the Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) that distinguishes between chronic and transitory food insecurity and aimed to assure food consumption and prevent asset depletion for food insecure households in chronically food insecure woredas, while stimulating markets, improving access to services and natural resources, and rehabilitating and enhancing the natural environment (MOARD,2006)

Two of the four Kebeles(Peasant Associations) namely Nono and Bole-Bacho in Wuchale Woreda implementing PSNP were randomly selected for this study. These kebeles are situated at some 15 km and 16 km from the Muka-Turi, woreda town respectively. The selected Kebeles have a total of 863 beneficiary households. Of these, 659 have engaged in public works (PWs) while 204 have involved in direct support (DS) programme. A sample of 172 households were drawn from both PW and DS components proportionally based on systematic random sampling technique. Hence, 132 households were selected from PW component beneficiaries, while 40 households were drawn from DS beneficiaries of the total sample size. The study area, Wuchale Woreda far from Addis Ababa and Zonal town, Fitche, some 78 km and 34 km respectively. The purpose of the survey is to investigate factors affecting the implementation of PSNP implementation at local level: the case of Wuchale woreda, North Shoa Zone, Oromia Region, Ethiopia.

The major primary data collection methods included use of both structured and unstructured questionnaires, focus group discussions, key informant interviews, and field observations. The questionnaires contained questions on socio-economic characteristics of the PSNP beneficiary households, assets ownership, transfers, targeting process, public works related issues and participation of community in PSNP. The focus groups were three in numbers such as non-beneficiaries, women and other public work participants who were formed in each of the two sample kebeles.

The study results revealed that the implementation of PSNP faced many challenges like poor geographical, administrative and community targeting. The process was also with corruption and nepotism as demonstrated by high rate of error of inclusion and error of exclusion. The other challenges that negatively affect the programme were lack of active community participation in decision making, and poor institutional arrangements.

## **5.2.** RECOMMENDATION

This research was designed to explore the factors that affect PSNP implementation at Woreda or local levels:the Case of Wuchale Woreda, North Shewa Zone,Oromia Region, Ethiopia. The study revealed that the implementation of PSNP faced many challenges that related to targeting, transfer of payments, community participation, institutional arrangements, and other related issues. Accordingly, the findings suggested the following measures as means to overcome the challenges and to alleviate the problems that affect PSNP implementation at woreda or grass root levels.

### 5.2.1. TARGETING OF BENEFICIARIES

According to PIM 2004/06/10, geographical, administrative, and community targeting are the major mechanisms used to identify eligible beneficiary households for PSNP in the woreda. As these were considered as the important mechanisms for identifying the relevant target groups, results of this study showed that the process was poorly done. Hence, there was a high inclusion ratio of non-poor households, who were participating in the program at the expense of chronic food insecure households. The process was also with corruption and nepotism as highlighted during non- participant group discussions.

In addition, the high exclusion of errors were also indicated since the eligible chronically food insecure households became out of the programme due to limited quota system and because of the reasons reflected for high inclusion ratio of non poor households.

To overcome some of these challenges, there is a need for a revision of the targeting guidelines and how to practice geographical administrative, and community targeting within the woreda. Some criteria should be set out based on periodical and local need assessments of the beneficiary households for the PSNP. Hence, local mechanisms must be strengthened to avoid bias towards relatives during the targeting process. For instance, the problem of voting for the same tribe by the community food security task force members must be discouraged and the essence of good governance should be developed right up to the kebele level in order to refute the corruptive deeds during the process of targeting.

###  5.2.2. Transfer OF PAYMENTS

Regarding the transfer of payments, the study results showed that the community preferred transfers to be in kind as opposed to the current practice of cash and food mix payments. The PSNP authorities have, therefore, to take heed of this genuine request by the communities that they are fully provided with grain rather than cash and food mix. Even, with regard to the current cash and food mix arrangements, there was a need to reconsider the amount, mode, and timing of transfer payments. The cash transfer payments should take into account the local grain marketing period. The payment site should also be easily accessible to beneficiaries’ site in order to save the time as well as financial resources expense while collecting the transfers. The regional government should also make efforts to improve budgetary provisions for transport and equipment to smoothen the programme implementation process successfully.

###  5.2.3. Participation of Community in Public Works

With the efforts made under PSNP, the public work activities like bund, check dam and road construction were commended. Moreover, the findings of the study so far revealed that community participation was not demand driven as community priorities were not thoroughly considered in the program. Hence, there was a need to consider and implement communities’ prior problem areas first as the case of water harvesting structure. To facilitate this scheme, participatory approaches should be adopted when doing situational analysis and designing of strategic plans for the program. The community, DAs, local leaders and food security task forces must formulate priority areas of PW activities.

Furthermore, the program sensitization and regular project review meetings should be carried out with beneficiaries, non beneficiaries, and other stakeholders to discuss on the issues; at the same time to enhance the awareness of the communities on the importance of maintaining community assets. This exercise can be facilitated by the DA’s and other relevant local authorities. The role of women in the PSNP should also be revisited further with the aim of improving their working conditions. Thus, issues of appropriate tasks that can be delegated to women and maternity leave are human rights issues which should be given sufficient consideration. Some of these have already been enshrined in the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia’s constitution and hence the PSNP should abide and institutionalize accordingly.

### 5.2.4. Arrangements of Institution

As to institutional arrangements, the findings of the study showed that the woreda institutions were riddled by high human staff turnover, which affected the production of program plans and their execution. This was still a national issue and regional government should strive to ensure that woreda level institutions to become well organized and strengthened through capacity building programs. This will enable woredas to provide kebeles with the necessary technical support during the planning and implementation of community programs and projects. This can be achieved again through regular training programs aimed at improving the performance of both the kebele cabinets and woreda staff in implementing the PSNP on sustainable basis.
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 **APPENDIX I: Principles of PSNP**

To ensure the effectiveness and achievement of PSNP’s objectives, it needs to be implemented in a certain way. The following principles are to be applied at all times (MOARD, 2010):

1. **Fair and transparent client selection.** Clients are selected through community-based targeting, with an effective appeal mechanism to address inclusion or exclusion errors. The client list is verified through public meetings during which it is read aloud and discussed. The final client list is also posted in public locations.
2. **Timely, predictable and appropriate transfers:** To create an effective safety net, clients must be sure that they can depend on the PSNP at all times. Transfers can be considered predictable if PSNP clients have timely knowledge of their eligibility for the programme, and they know what type of transfer they will receive, how much of this transfer they will receive and when they will receive it. A transfer is timely if it is provided to clients before or at the time during the year when they need the support. A timely transfer also takes place according to a planned transfer schedule. A transfer is appropriate if it meets the needs of households: cash is provided in settings where markets function well, while food is provided in areas where there is no food to purchase or food prices are extremely high. An appropriate transfer also has the same value whether it is provided in cash or food.
3. **Primacy of transfers:** Since the PSNP is primarily a safety net, and ensuring clients receive transfers takes priority over all considerations. Transfers should not be delayed for any reasons, including those related to public works implementation.
4. **Productive Safety Net**: The PSNP is a productive safety net means includes not only a commitment to providing a safety net that protects food consumption and household assets, but it is also expected to address some of the underlying causes of food insecurity and to contribute to economic growth in its own right. The productive element comes from infrastructure and improved natural resources base created through PSNP Public Works and from the multiplier effects of cash transfers on the local economy.
5. **Integrated into local systems:** The PSNP ***is not*** ***a project*** but a key element of local development planning. PSNP plans are integrated into wider development plans at woreda, zone, region and federal levels.
6. **Scalable Safety Net.** The PSNP is scaled up when needed in the event of shocks to ensure assistance is available to those households who need it most in PSNP Districts to prevent them from becoming more food insecure. The PSNP can scale-up to a predetermined ceiling; any transitory needs that cannot be met through the PSNP will be addressed through the emergency response system.
7. **Cash first principle.** When possible, cash should be the primary form of transfer. This assists with the stimulation of markets – since people spend their cash in local markets – and the move away from food aid. Food transfers are provided at times and places when food is not available in the market, or where market prices for food are very high. This protects PSNP clients from food shortages and asset depletion.
8. **Gender Equity.** The PSNP is designed to respond to the unique needs, interests and capabilities of men and women to ensure that they benefit equally from the Programme. This is done by promoting the participation of both men and women in PSNP decision-making structures and responding to women’s responsibility for both productive and reproductive work and the differential access of female-headed households to resources.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | APPENDIX II:  DETERMINING HOUSEHOLD ELIGIBILITY  |  |  | **Does household meet criteria to participate in the PSNP?** |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Yes** |  | **No** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **HH may participate in the Safety Net Programme** |  | **HH may not participate in the Safety Net Programme** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **What is the labour availability within the household?** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **No adult labour is available** |  | **Adult labour is available but is not sufficient to undertake public works to cover full household needs** |  | **Adult labour is available and is more than sufficient to undertake public works for all members of household** |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **HH is categorised as direct support (DS). Transfer amount is based on size of HH** |  | **HH is categorised as public works (PW), but actual work provided is capped at a maximum of 15 days per adult able-bodied person. Transfer amount is based on size of HH, even though less work is provided** |  | **HH is categorised as public works(PW) and provides labour sufficient to meet the needs of all household members** |

Source: MOARD, 201**0**

 **APpendix III: QUESTIONAIRE USED FOR STUDY**

**III A- Interview Schedule for PSNP Beneficiary Households**

The purpose of the questionnaire is to collect all essential information relating to Factors Affecting the Productive Safety Net Programme Implementation at local level.

**Consent request**

All information given by you will be strictly confidential. Your name will not be registered in this format and will not be used in connection with any information you are telling me. I greatly appreciate your cooperation in responding to this study.

Signature of the interviewer that the consent has been given by the respondent

Name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Part I – Background Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Respondent Number:** |  |
| **Date of interview:** | **Day: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Month: \_\_\_\_\_** |
| **Start time:** |  |
| **End Time:** |  |
| **Checked:** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Name** |
| **Region** |  |
| **Zone**  |  |
| **Woreda** |  |
| **Kebele** |  |
| **Village** |  |

1. 1. **Household Profile**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes: 1 | No: 2 |
| Yes: 1 | No: 2 |
| Yes: 1 | No: 2 |
| **E.C** |

1. Is he married? (circle one)
2. If married, Is this a polygamous household?(circle one)
3. Is this a female-headed household? (circle One)
4. When was your household formed? (write year)
5. **A.2. Household Members**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ID Code | Name | How related to head of household? (Write Code) | Male (M) or Female (F) (Circle one) | Age*(age in**complete**years*) | Can he orshe read aletter ornewspaper?*(circle one)* | Highest gradeof schoolcompleted*(write number or**00 if none)* | Labourcapacity*(write**code)* |
| (4) |  | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) |
|  |  |  |  M F |  | Yes No |  |  |
| 01 |  |  |  1 2 |  |  1 2 |  |  |
| 02 |  |  |  1 2 |  |  1 2 |  |  |
| 03 |  |  |  1 2 |  |  1 2 |  |  |
| 04 |  |  |  1 2 |  |  1 2 |  |  |
| 05 |  |  |  1 2 |  |  1 2 |  |  |
| 06 |  |  |  1 2 |  |  1 2 |  |  |
| 07 |  |  |  1 2 |  |  1 2 |  |  |
| 08 |  |  |  1 2 |  |  1 2 |  |  |
| 09 |  |  |  1 2 |  |  1 2 |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  1 2 |  |  1 2 |  |  |

**Codes: How related to head of household?**

01 = household head

02 = wife

03 = son / daughter of head or wife

04 = son-in-law / daughter-in-law

05 = grandson / granddaughter

06 = father / mother of head or wife

07 = brother / sister of head / wife

08 = other relative of head/ wife

09 = adopted

10 = non-relative / servant

**Codes: Labour capacity (for the last column above)**

 1 = young child (too young to work)

 2 = working child (herding livestock; domestic - chores; childcare; may be hired or fostered out)

 3 = adult (able to do full adult workload)

 4 = working elderly (not able to do full adult workload)

 5 = partially disabled (able to do light work only)

 6 = permanently unable to work (physically or mentally disabled, or non-working elderly)

 7 = chronically ill (unable to work for the past 3 months or more

**Part II – Issues relating to Factors Affecting PSNP Implementation**

1. **LIVEL**I**HOOD ACTIVITIES AND INCOME**

Please tell us about all the work that members of your household are doing to earn a living, and how much income they earned from doing that work.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Livelihood Activity** | ***Code*** | **Did anyone in****your household****do this activity****in the last year?***(Circle one only)* | **How many months****in the last 12 did****your household****earn income from****doing this work?***(Circle one only)* | **Total monthly****income earned****while doing this****work?***(Birr per month)* |
|  |  | (11) | (12) | (13) |
| **AGRICULTURE** |  |  |  |  |
| Crop production (for consumption and sale) | 01 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Rearing & selling animals (cattle, sheep, goats, camels) | 02 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Selling animal products (meat, milk, skins, etc.) | 03 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Poultry rearing and sales (chickens, eggs, etc.) | 04 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Beekeeping (selling honey, bees-wax, or bee-hives) | 05 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Other agriculture (specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | 06 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| **EMPLOYMENT** |  |  |  |  |
| Salaried job (specify):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | 07 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Public works (food-for-work, cash-for-work) | 08 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Agricultural worker (for cash or food) | 09 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Non-agricultural worker (for cash or food) | 10 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Domestic servant (e.g. house-maid) | 11 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Military service | 12 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Other employment (specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | 13 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| **TRADING (buying and selling)** |  |  |  |  |
| Trading in food crops (grains, pulses, vegetables) | 14 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Trading in livestock or livestock products | 15 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Trading in other commodities | 16 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| **SALE OF NATURAL PRODUCTS** |  |  |  |  |
| Selling firewood or charcoal | 17 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Selling water | 18 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Selling grass or fodder (for livestock) | 19 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Selling construction materials (sand, wooden poles, etc) | 20 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Selling wild fruits, bush meat, etc. | 21 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| **CRAFTS / SMALL INDUSTRY** |  |  |  |  |
| Making baskets or mats | 22 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Spinning or weaving cloth (cotton or wool) | 23 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| **Livelihood Activity** | ***Code*** | **Did anyone in****your household****do this activity****in the last year?***(Circle one only)* | **How many months****in the last 12 did****your household****earn income from****doing this work?***(Circle one only)* | **Total monthly****income earned****while doing this****work?***(Birr per month)* |
| Making traditional utensils or farm tools | 25 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 | (13) |
| Pottery | 26 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Blacksmithing or metal-work | 27 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| **SERVICES** |  |  |  |  |
| Water-carrier, Porter | 28 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Barber or Hairdresser | 29 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Musician (drum-beater, singer, dancer) | 30 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Traditional healer | 31 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Midwife or Traditional Birth Attendant (TBA) | 32 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Counselor (disputes, marriage) | 33 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Other services (specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | 34 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| **RENTS** |  |  |  |  |
| Sharecropping out land | 35 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Renting out oxen for farming | 36 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Renting out pack animals for transport (e.g. donkeys) | 37 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| **FOOD & DRINK PROCESSING** |  |  |  |  |
| Selling tea, coffee, bread, soft drinks, etc. | 38 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Selling alcoholic drink (e.g. *tella, tejj, shameta*) | 39 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Selling cooked food | 40 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| **OTHER** |  |  |  |  |
| Begging | 41 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Money-lending | 42 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
| Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | 43 |  Yes No |  1 2 3 4 |  |
|  |  |  | 1= Up to 3 months2= 3 - 6 months3 = 7 - 11 months4= all 12 months |  |

**C1.** **LAND OWNERSHIP AND ACCESS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Yes:* *1* | *No:* *2* |

*(14)* Do you (or any other member of your household) own any **land**? *(Circle one)*

*(15)* If **YES**, please tell us about the land you used for farming, and land you rented or sharecropped to others

 *[Note: Count land for all household members.]*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Access to land | Yes No | If “yes”, how much land? (Hectares) | Land given to others | Yes No | If “yes”, how much land? (Hectares) |
| Farmed own land |  1 2 |  |  |  1 2 |  |
| Sharecropped **in** land |  1 2 |  | Sharecropped **out** land |  1 2 |  |
| Rented **in** land |  1 2 |  | Rented **out** land |  1 2 |  |
| Free access to someone’s land |  1 2 |  | Gave land to someone for free |  1 2 |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Yes:* *1* | *No:* *2* |

*(16)* Did you sell, rent out or sharecrop out any land in the last farming seasons?

*(17)* If **YES**, why? *(Circle all that apply)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reason | Yes  | Reason  | Yes |
| We needed cash to buy food | 1 | We have more land than we need | 6 |
| We needed cash for family health expenses | 2 | We don’t have enough labour to farm the land | 7 |
| We needed cash for schooling expenses | 3 | We don’t have access to a plough and oxen | 8 |
| We needed cash for social obligations (e.g. wedding) | 4 | The land is poor quality | 9 |
| We needed cash for other reasons (specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | 5 | Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | 10 |

**C2. CROP FARMING**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes 1** | **No: 2** |
| **Yes 1** | **No: 2** |
| **Yes 1** | **No: 2** |

 *(18)* Last farming season, did you use fertilizer to improve your farm’s productivity?

*(19)* Last farming season, did you use animal manure to improve your farm productivity?

*(20)* Last farming season, did your household have enough land for farming?

*(21)* For each crop grown, how much was harvested last farming season (2010), and what did you do with the harvest?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Crop | **Total****kilograms****harvested** | **How many kilograms were:** | **Price per****kg sold***(Birr)* |
| **Eaten at****home** | **Given****away** | **Sold** |
| Maize |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sorghum |  |  |  |  |  |
| Barley |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wheat |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teff |  |  |  |  |  |
| Faba bean |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lentil |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beans |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peas |  |  |  |  |  |
| Potatoes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tomatoes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Onions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Garlic |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |

**E. INFORMAL TRANSFERS**

*(22)* In the last months (between now and the PSNP implementation years), has your household **received** any of the following types of assistance from any friend or relative living outside the household?

*[Note: Not from government or NGOs.]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of assistance received** | **Yes No** |
| Remittances (from relative living elsewhere) |  1 2 |
| Other cash gift |  1 2 |
| Cash loan (no interest) |  1 2 |
| Food or grain gift |  1 2 |
| Grain loan (no interest) |  1 2 |
| Seed gift |  1 2 |
| Seed loan |  1 2 |
| Free labour |  1 2 |
| Free use of oxen or plough (for farming) |  1 2 |
| Free use of pack animals (for transport) |  1 2 |
| Other (specify):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  1 2 |

**F. FORMAL TRANSFERS**

*(23) W*hat types of assistance did your household receive from government or aid agencies?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of assistance received** | **Yes No** | **Programme / Provider** | **Years started and how many times?** |
|  |  |  | **(24)** |
| Free food aid |  1 2 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |  |
| Free cash |  1 2 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |  |
| Food-for-work employment |  1 2 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |  |
| Cash-for-work employment |  1 2 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |  |
| Free seeds or tools |  1 2 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |  |
| Free fertilizer |  1 2 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |  |
| Credit/ Loan |  1 2 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |  |
| Livestock |  1 2 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |  |
| Other (specify)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  1 2 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |  |
|  | **Codes: Programme / Provider**1 = Safety Net Programme (PSNP)2 = Food Security Programme (FSP)3 = Other Government programme4 = World Food Programme | 5 = International NGO (e.g. Save the Children)6 = Local NGO 7 = Community-Based Organization (e.g. Church)8 = Don’t know9 = Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

(25) Did they receive the transfer at end of each month timely?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes 1 | No: 2 |

**(**26) If No, why?\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(27) If you took credit, did you reimburse as intended?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes 1 | No: 2 |

**(28) If No, Why?\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**G. ASSET INVENTORY**

As of today, how many of the following assets does your household own? *(If none, write ‘0’.)*

For livestock, include any animals that belong to you, but are being raised by other households.

Do not include any animals that you are rearing for someone else but do not belong to you.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Asset** | **Number****owned****today** | **Number****owned before Safety-Net** | **Cost of****replacing****one** *[Birr]* | **If the number owned today is different from****before Safety-Net, why?**  |
|  | (29) | (30) | (31) | (32) |
| **Livestock** |  |  |  |  |
| Oxen |  |  |  |   |
| Bulls |  |  |  |  |
| Cows |  |  |  |  |
| Heifers |  |  |  |  |
| Calves |  |  |  |  |
| Sheep |  |  |  |  |
| Goats |  |  |  |  |
| Donkeys |  |  |  |  |
| Mules |  |  |  |  |
| Horses |  |  |  |  |
| Camels |  |  |  |  |
| Poultry |  |  |  |  |
| **Productive assets** |  |  |  |  |
| Plough |  |  |  |  |
| Sickle (*machid*) |  |  |  |  |
| **Asset** | **Number****owned****today** | **Number****owned before Safety-Net** | **Cost of****replacing****one** *[Birr]* | **If the number owned today is different from****before Safety-Net, why?**  |
| (29) | (30) | (31) | (32) |
| Pick axe (*doma*) |  |  |  |  |
| Axe (*metrebia*) |  |  |  |  |
| Hoe (*mekotkocha*) |  |  |  |  |
| Spade (*akefa*) |  |  |  |  |
| Traditional beehive |  |  |  |  |
| Modern beehive |  |  |  |  |
| Water pump (hand/foot) |  |  |  |  |
| Water pump (diesel |  |  |  |  |
| Grain mill (stone) |  |  |  |  |
| Grain mill (diesel) |  |  |  |  |
| **Household goods** |  |  |  |  |
| Charcoal/ wood stove |  |  |  |  |
| Kerosene stove |  |  |  |  |
| Sofa (*mechegia*) |  |  |  |  |
| Leather/ wood bed |  |  |  |  |
| Modern chair |  |  |  |  |
| Modern table |  |  |  |  |
| Metal bed |  |  |  |  |
| Wheelbarrow |  |  |  |  |
| Animal cart |  |  |  |  |
| Mobile telephone |  |  |  |  |
| Radio |  |  |  |  |
| Television |  |  |  |  |
| Jewellery (gold, silver) |  |  |  |  |
| Bicycle |  |  |  |  |
| Wristwatch |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

**H. FOOD SECURITY**

*(33)* During the years of PSNP implementation, did your household suffer any shortage of food to eat? *(Circle one)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** **1** | **No:** **2** |

(34) Why and how many times? *-----……………………………………………………………………………………………………………….*

 *(35) Which months are worst or hungry months?* During the worst month last year, how many times a day did the adults and children in your household eat?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Number of meals per day** *(circle one for each row)* |
| Adults | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| Children *(= school-age / working, not infants)* | 0 1 2 3 4 |

**Code:** 0 = sometimes passed a whole day without eating anything

|  |
| --- |
| *Birr*  |

*(36)* How much do you usually spend on food items in one week?

Birr

*(37)* How much do you usually spend on non-food items in one week?

**I. COPING STRATEGIES**

*( 38)* During the hungry season, what did your household do to survive?

*[Note: This question is about unusual behaviour, not what the household normally does to get its food in a good year.]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Coping strategy** | **Yes No** |
| Ate less food (smaller portions) |  1 2 |
| Reduced the number of meals per day |  1 2 |
| Collected bush products to eat or sell for food |  1 2 |
| Relied on help from relatives and friends |  1 2 |
| Household members migrated to find work |  1 2 |
| Borrowed food or cash to purchase food |  1 2 |
| **Coping strategy** | **Yes No** |
| Reduced spending on non-food items |  1 2 |
| Sent children to stay with relatives |  1 2 |
| Rented out land to buy food |  1 2 |
| Sold land to buy food |  1 2 |
| Sold livestock to buy food |  1 2 |
| Sold other assets to buy food |  1 2 |
| Sold firewood or charcoal |  1 2 |
| Withdrew children from school |  1 2 |
| Sent children to work |  1 2 |
| Other *(specify):* |  |

**J. TARGETING**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Yes* *1* | *No.* *2* |

*(39)* Has your household received any food or cash from the new government?

Safety Net Programme since March 2005? *(Circle one)*

*(40)* If Not, When did you start receiving?\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_( year in E.C)

**J1. INCLUDED (BENEFICIARY) HOUSEHOLDS**

*(41)* How much food or cash did your household receive, in which months?(a last year only)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Food/ cash** |  |  |
| **Jan** | **Feb** | **Mar** | **Apr**  | **May**  | **Jun** | **July** | **Aug** | **Jan** | **Feb** | **Mar** | **Apr**  | **May**  | **Jun** | **July** | **Aug** |
| Cereal(kg) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash(Birr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*(42)* Did any members of the household work for this food or cash? *(Circle one*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Yes* *1* | *No* *2* |

*(43)* If NO, why not?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *[Circle all**that apply]* | **Reason** |
| **1** | There is no public works project here |
| **2** | Household contains no able-bodied adults |
| **3** | Household does not have enough labour |
| **4** | Household members are too old to work |
| **5** | Household member is pregnant or breastfeeding |
| **6** | Household members are too sick to work |
| **7** | Household members are disabled |
| **8** | Household head is female |
| **9** | Other reason (specify):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

*( (44)* If these household members had not been working on the PSNP project during those months, what would they have been doing instead?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Codes:** |  |
| 1. Domestic work | 7. Paid employment (local, sleeping at home) |
| 2. Childcare | 8. Paid employment (migratory, living temporarily somewhere else) |
| 3. Attending school | 9. Trading / going to market |
| 4. Farming work | 10. Other enterprise or income-generating activity (specify): \_\_\_\_\_ |
| 5. Livestock tending | 11. Something else (specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 6. Social, religious or leisure activities | 12. Nothing – working on the project made no difference to other activities |

*(45)* What do you think your household was selected to receive food or cash from the new government Safety Net Programme?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *[Circle all**that apply]* | **Reason for selection** |
| 1 | Our household is poor |
| 2 | We can’t get enough food to eat |
| 3 | We have no labour |
| 4 | We are landless |
| 5 | We have a small landholding |
| 6 | We have poor quality land |
| 7 | We don’t produce enough food |
| 8 | The household head is female |
| *[Circle all**that apply]* | **Reason for selection** |
| 9 | Household members are sick  |
| 10 | The household head is old |
| 11 | We don’t know |
| 12 | There was no selection – everyone in the village received something |
| 13 | We own no livestock, or only a few livestock |
| 14 | We have no source of off-farm income, or very little off-farm income |
| 15 | Members of our household are disabled or mentally challenged |
| 16 | We have no family support or remittances from relatives |
| 17 | We have not received other government assistance (e.g. food aid) |
| 18 | Our household is participating in other food security programmes |
| 19 | We received food aid or emergency cash transfer in previous years |
|  | (How many years? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ) |
| 20 | We were included only after we complained about being excluded |
| 21 | Other (specify): |

*(46)* Who decided which households in the community would receive the food or cash?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *[Circle all**that apply]* | **Who Decided** |
| 1 | The D.A. decided |
| 2 | Kebele Food Security Task Force |
| 3 | Community Food Security Task Force |
| 4 | Kebele Council or Administration |
| 5 | Wereda Food Security Task Force |
| 6 | Wereda Council or Administration |
| 7 | The community (we all decided together) |
| 8 | Don’t know |
| 9 | There was no selection - everyone in the village received something |
| 10 | Any other |

*(47)* Do you think the decision was fair? *(Circle one)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Yes* *1* | *No* *2* |

**K. USE OF PSNP CASH OR FOOD**

*(48)* If you received free cash from the Safety Net Programme, or worked on a cash-for-work project in the last PSNP implementation years, what did you do with all the money you received? *(Circle all that apply)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Consumption items** | **Yes No** | **Birr** |
| Bought staple food (e.g. grain) |  1 2 |  |
| Bought other food (e.g. meat) |  1 2 |  |
| Bought groceries (salt, sugar,coffee, soap, kerosene, etc.) |  1 2 |  |
| Bought clothes or cloth |  1 2 |  |
| Gave some cash to help others |  1 2 |  |
| Lent some money to others |  1 2 |  |
| Paid taxes |  1 2 |  |
| Social obligations (specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  1 2 |  |
| Debt repayment |  1 2 |  |
| Bought seeds for farming |  1 2 |  |
| Bought fertiliser for farming |  1 2 |  |
| Paid for health costs |  1 2 |  |
| Paid for education costs |  1 2 |  |
| Used for business (e.g. trading) |  1 2 |  |
| Bought livestock (specify):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  1 2 |  |
| Other (specify):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |  |

**L. ASSET PROTECTION AND CREATING**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Trends in Assets** | **Yes – because****of PSNP** | **Yes – for****another reason** | **No** |
| *(49)* | Have you enrolled more of your children in schoolthis year than last year? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| *(50)* | Have you kept your children in school for longer thisyear than last year? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| *(51)* | Have you used healthcare facilities this year morethan last year? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| *(52)* | Have you consumed more food or better food thisyear than last year? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| *(53)* | Have you avoided having to sell household assets tobuy food this year? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| *(54)* | Have you avoided having to use your savings to buyfood this year? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| *(55)* | Have you retained your own food production to eatyourselves this year, rather than selling it? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| *(56)* | Have you acquired any new household assets (e.g.livestock, roof, bicycle, radio, plough, land)? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| *(57)* | Have you acquired new skills or knowledge whichhave increased your income this year? | 1 | 2 | 3 |

*(58)* Within your household, who actually collected most or all of the food

|  |
| --- |
|  |

or cash from the Safety Net Programme?  *------------------------*

*(59)* Within your household, who decided how to use the cash or food

from the Safety Net Programme? *(Circle one only)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

**Codes**: 1 = I decided alone

 2 = I consulted with my spouse

 3 = My spouse decided

 4 = The whole household decided

*(60)* If you could choose, would you prefer to get assistance from the Safety Net

Programme in food, cash, or a mix of half food and half cash? *(Circle one only)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 |

**Codes**: 1 = Food only

 2 = Cash only

 3 = Half food, half cash

(61) **What were/ are the factors affecting asset creation and/ or income diversification?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/No. | Problems | YesAffecting(1) | NotAffecting(2) |
| 1 | Lack of credit/loan |  |  |
| 2 | Lack of business idea(knowledge & skill) |  |  |
| 3 | Shortage of land |  |  |
| 4 | Lack of extension service |  |  |
| 5 | Lack of infrastructure (road, electric, etc.) |  |  |
| 6 | Lack of market |  |  |

(62) What types of Public Work activities have been created or established?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/No | Activities | Yes1 | No2 |
| 1 | Soil& Water Conservation |  |  |
| 2 | Flood control & Improved Drainage |  |  |
| 3 | Water projects: community & micro-level: construction |  |  |
| 4 | Small Scale Irrigation: Construction or Expansion |  |  |
| 5 | Soil Fertility Management and Biological Soil Conservation |  |  |
| 6 | Agro-forestry, Forage development and forestry |  |  |
| 7 | Agro-forestry, Forage development and forestry |  |  |
| 8 | Community Road Earth/Gravel& footpaths |  |  |
| 9 | Social infrastructure Activities(School, Das houses, etc. construction/Rehabilitation& Fencing |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

(63) Have these Public Work activities still served the communities properly?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Yes* *1* | *No* *2* |

(64) Who have maintained those PW activities?\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(65) Did you involve children under 18 years of age on Public Work activities?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Yes* *1* | *No* *2* |

(66) Did you also involve the pregnant women as of 6 months and lactating mother until 10 months on Public Work activities?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Yes* *1* | *No* *2* |

(67) What were/are the major factors affecting the proper implementation of Productive Safety Net Programme implementation at local level?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/No. | Problems | YesAffecting1 | Not Affecting2 |
| 1 | Poor targeting  |  |  |
| 2 | Less awareness on the objectives of PSNP among the communities and government institutions |  |  |
| 3 | In accessibility of roads or remoteness of working environment |  |  |
| 4 | No community based participatory planning and implementation |  |  |
| 5 | Natural hazard E.g. flooding, etc.(specify) |  |  |
| 6 | Less technical support and follow up |  |  |
| 7 | No integration among stakeholders or actors |  |  |
| 8 | Weak institutional arrangements from the communities up to higher federal level |  |  |
| 9 | Delay of payment or transfer |  |  |

**End of interview for PSNP beneficiary households.**

**APPENDIX III B. Interview Schedule for NON-PSNP Beneficiary Households**

*(68)* Why was your household **not** selected to receive food or cash from the new government Safety Net programme? *(Circle all that apply)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reason** | **What we****were told** | **What I****believe** |
| We are not so poor as the selected households | 1 | 16 |
| We have enough food | 2 | 17 |
| We own livestock | 3 | 18 |
| We are landless | 4 | 19 |
| We have some land/ enough land/ or better quality land | 5 | 20 |
| We receive family support or remittances | 6 | 21 |
| We have other income | 7 | 22 |
| Our household did not receive food aid or emergency cash transfer in previous years | 8 | 23 |
| I don’t have friends or relatives among the decision-makers | 9 | 24 |
| We are not participating in other food security programmes | 10 | 25 |
| We are not registered on the kebele household list | 11 | 26 |
| Our household is not able to work on PSNP projects | 12 | 27 |
| Our household is not willing to work on PSNP projects | 13 | 28 |
| I don’t know | 14 | 29 |
| Other reason (specify):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | 15 | 30 |

*(69)* Who decided which households in the community would receive the food or cash?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *[Circle all**that apply]* | **Who Decided** |
| 1 | The D.A. decided |
| 2 | Kebele Food Security Task Force |
| 3 | Kebele Council or Administration |
| 4 | Wereda Food Security Task Force |
| 5 | Wereda Council or Administration |
| 6 | Community Food Security Task Force |
| 7 | The community (we all decided together) |
| 8 | Don’t know |
| 9 | There was no selection - everyone in the village received something |
| 10 | Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

*(70)* Do you think the decision was fair? *(Circle one)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Yes* *1* | *No* *2* |

Please explain why or why not:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*(71)* If **NO** (not fair), did you complain? *(Circle one)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Yes* *1* | *No* *2* |

*(72)* If **YES** (complained), who did you complain to?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *[Circle all**that apply]* | **Complained to** |
|  |  |
|  1 | Kebele authorities |
| 2 | Kebele Appeal Committee |
| 3 | Wereda authorities |
| 4 |  Zonal authorities |
| 5 | Community meeting |
| 6 | Church or mosque leaders |
| 7 | NGO, WFP or another organisation(specify: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_) |
| 8 | Other (specify: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *[Circle all**that apply]* | If not, why not? |
|  1 | There is no-one to complain to |
| 2 | We don’t know who to complain to |
| 3 | It would not do any good to complain |
| 4 | I am too frightened or intimidated to complain |
| 5 | The decision-makers are the same people who hearthe appealsOther reason (specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

*(73)* If YES (complained), was your complaint successful? *(Circle one)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes 1 | No 2 |

Please explain what happened:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**End of interview for non-beneficiary households.**