

A STUDY ON THE CONTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTIVE
SAFETY NET AND FAMILY PACKAGE PROGRAMME OF
SNNPR STATE IN ENSURING FOOD SECURITY.

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL
DEVELOPMENT, SCHOOL OF CONTINUING EDUCATION
IGNOU IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENT FOR M.A DEGREE IN RURAL
DEVELOPMENT.

PREPARED BY: WUBNEH BEKELE GEBEREMARIAM

ENROLMENT NUMBER: MARD 069124964

ADVISOR: DR. MENGISTU HULLUKA

APRIL 2011

Declaration

I hereby declare that the dissertation entitled "A Study on The Contribution of Productive Safety Net and Family Package Programme of SNNPR State in Ensuring Food Security" submitted by me for partial fulfillment of M.A in Rural Development to Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU), New Delhi is my own original work and has not been submitted earlier to IGNOU or any other institutions for fulfillment of requirement of any course or study. I also declare that no chapter of this manuscript in whole or in part is lifted or incorporated in this report from my earlier work done by me or others.

Place: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Enrollment Number: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

E-Mail: _____

Telephone: _____

Certification

This is to certify that Mr. Wubneh Bekele Geberemariam student of M.A (RD) from Indira Gandhi National University (IGNOU) was working under my supervision and guidance for his project work for the course MRDP-001. His project work entitled “A Study on The Contribution of Productive Safety Net and Family Package Programme of SNNPR State in Ensuring Food Security” which he is submitting is genuine and original work.

Place: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Adviser Name: Dr. Mengistu Hulluka

Acknowledgements

So many people influenced this research paper that it would be impossible to mention all, but I must say special thanks to my adviser Dr. Mengistu Hulleka for his extraordinary advice and suggestion.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude and thanks to my mother W/r Attalelech G. Tsadike whose financial and material support goes beyond what I can inscribe on paper, it will remain engraved in my heart.

I am also deeply indebted to my father Ato Bekele G. Mariam. I wish you were with us in moment like this.

I would like to express my heart felt thanks to my sister Mulu and my brothers Asfe, Dere, Buze, Kecho and Zola.

Thank you all indeed

Wubneh

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction ---.....	1
1.1 Background of the study	1
1.2 Statement of the problem.....	4
1.3 Important terms used in the study	6
1.3.1 Food security	6
1.3.2 Food insecurity.....	8
1.3.3 Hunger ---.....	8
1.3.4 Contribution.....	
9	
1.3.5 Ensuring food security	9
1.3.6 Productive safety net programm.....	9
1.3.7 Family package programme	9
1.4 Objectives of the study	10
1.5 Hypothesis	10
1.6 Scope and Limitation of the study	11

CHAPTER TWO

2. Review of Related Literature	
13	
2.1 Origin and Concept of food security	
13	

2.2 Factors affecting food security	23
2.2.1 Population growth, Environmental degradation and Food security	23
2.3 Approach to food security	29
2.4 Consequences of food insecurity	41

CHAPTER THREE

3. Research Methodology.....	47
3.1 Research Design	47
3.2 Sampling	48
3.3 Data collection	49
3.4 Processing and Analysis of Data	50

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Result and Discusion	51
-------------------------------	----

	4.1 Household Characteristics	51
	4.2 Causes of Food Insecurity	52
	4.3 Beneficiaries Food Gap Priors to the Programme	55
	4.4 Respondents Engagements in Public Works	56
	4.5 Contribution of Public Works Payments in Reducing Food Gap	59
	4.6 Efforts Made in Ensuring Food Security	62
64	4.7 Length of Time Respondents Wish to Stay under PSNP	
	4.8 Responsibility for Ensuring Food Security	70
	4.9 Fate if Programme Terminated	72
	4.10 Perception Toward Public Works	74
	4.11 Coverage of FPP	76
	4.12 Income generating activities	79

4.13 Backward and Forward Linkages	81
4.13.1 Backward Linkages	81
4.13.2 Amount of Credit Delivered	84
4.13.3 Credit Repayment	92
4.13.4 Delivery of Inputs	94
4.15 Forward Linkages.....	99
4.15.1 Marketing	99
4.2 Performance of the income generating activities	101

CHAPTER FIVE

5. Conclusion and Recommendations.....	111
5.1 Conclusion	111
5.2 Recommendations	121

List of Tables

Table	Page
Table--1-----	7
Table--2-----	46
Table--3-----	48
Table--4-----	50
Table--5-----	52
Table--6-----	54

Table--7-----	56
Table--8-----	58
Table--9-----	59
Table--10-----	61
Table--11-----	63
Table--12-----	65
Table--13-----	67
Table--14-----	69
Table--15-----	71
Table--16-----	73
Table--17-----	74
Table--18-----	76
Table--19-----	78
Table--20-----	80
Table--21-----	81
Table--22-----	82
Table--23-----	83
Table--24-----	85
Table--25-----	87
Table--26-----	88
Table--27-----	89
Table--28-----	92

Acronyms

AH	Animal husbandry
BOP	Beneficiary oriented programme
DA	Development assistance
FEDR	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
FIS	Food insecurity
FPP	Family package programme
FS	Food security
FSP	Food security programme

HH	House holds
IGA	Income generating activities
KFSTF	Kebele food security task force
NCFS	New coalition for food security
PSNP	Productive safety net programme
PSNPM	Productive safety net programme manual
SNNPR	South nation nationality and people regional

Abstract

This study identified that PSNP and FP programmes contributed little toward ensuring sustainable food security. In some instances the programmes had perpetuated further food insecurity and dependence. The objectives of enabling beneficiaries to enjoy a twelve month sufficient food were not attained. PSNP enabled beneficiaries to cover only 2.57 months of their food gap. Low outputs of public work projects were responsible for such under performance. Against the targeted 30 days, beneficiaries engaged in public works only for less than 20 days.

Beneficiaries exhibited dependence attitude toward meeting food needs. Such attitude perpetuated by the inherent nature of PSNP (the programme assist

beneficiaries for unlimited time) it also lacks strong mechanisms for assessing the status of the beneficiaries.

The coverage of FPP was unsatisfactory. Moreover, it didn't provide full-fledged backward and forward linkages. Some beneficiaries didn't receive inputs at all; others received poor quality inputs but in most cases inputs didn't arrive on the time required. Under FPP provision of marketing facilities, motivation, skills, entrepreneurial, and management training were denied.

Most of the income generating activities were, declining or stopped operating. Beneficiaries of such income generating activities were unable to pay their loans and they face the risk of selling their assets.

CHAPTER ONE

1 Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

Globally, food security is increasingly becoming an issue of considerable concern. It causes catastrophic amounts of human sufferings (One World Guide, 2008).

Lack of food security results in severe health, cognitive, psychological, behavioral, social, and economic consequences.

Food insecure mother will give birth to an underweight baby, who then faces a future of stunted growth, frequent illness, learning disabilities and reduced resistance to diseases. Research study conducted in Ethiopia revealed that food insecurity not only undermined health it also brings poor school attendance and educational attainment that thwart future chance in life (ITC, 2010).

According to McIntyre, (2008) food insecurity creates psychological responses such as anxiety, hostility, and negative perception of self worth and feeling of alienation. It also strongly correlated with unemployment and impaired work performance.

Though food insecurity is considered as the problem of developing countries, some research findings revealed that more than 34 million people of developed nations lack food security. For instance, in America and Canada people are food insecure.

The major cause of food insecurity in developed world is poverty (One World Guide, 2008).

Some areas and groups of people are particularly vulnerable to food insecurity. Tekola,(1997) indicated that pregnant and lactating mother, their babies and young children, people too poor to obtain adequate food particularly casual laborers, landless agricultural workers and urban unemployed as well as people living in areas unfavorable to food production and poorly served in terms of food, transport and marketing facilities are especially vulnerable to food insecurity.

Overpopulation, environmental, degradation, unfavorable climate condition, insufficient agricultural development, natural disaster, poverty, war, corruption, political instability, poor national policy, lack of secure tenure, barrier to trade, social and gender inequality, lack of production resources etc. are the main factors affecting food security(Tekolla ,1997).

Some of these factors affect the supply side of food security and the others affect the demand side. Rapid population growth which causes high demand for food on one hand and environmental degradation which adversely affects food production on the other are emphasized by many scholars in the area of food security (Kuzma, 2010).

Others give little weight to population growth by arguing that availability of food doesn't ensure that every one get enough to eat. Even when food is available at local, national and global level many suffer from food insecurity just because they don't

have money to make legitimate claim on it or other [obstacles](#) that deny access to the food available(Edger ,2008).

Avoiding the impingements of factors that deny access and increasing agricultural productivity along with ensuring the safety and nutrient content and considering the consumer preferences and production system can ensure food security.

In this regard a number of national and international responses ranging from small-scale local feeding programme to large scale international action, involving, the UN children fund, the World Bank and many NGO's have been established(Kent, 2005).

Beside a number of international commitment and declaration has been drafted and targets have been set to ensure food security. In 1974 world Food Conference was held in Rome. During the conference a universal declaration of eradication of hunger and malnutrition was issued and a target was also set to eliminate hunger by 1984. Following this a series of conferences were held and various target dates set. The most important one was the 1996 World Food Summit. The summit made a commitment to achieve food security for all with an immediate view to reduce the number of undernourished people to half their present level no latter than 2015(Amanda and Mickey, 2007).

With these international declarations and commitments, having adequate food is increasingly recognized as human right. Now the right to food is part of an international convention on economic, social, and cultural right, and ensuring the realization of right to food is posing on government of each countries as well as international community.

In spite of all these national and international interventions and commitments, and making adequate food a human right, millions of people suffer from food insecurity.

According to FAO, (FAO 2008) world population is projected to increase from 6 billion to 9 billion by 2050. The World Bank estimated that cereal production needs to increase by 50% and meat by 85% to meet demands.

However, many believe that increasing food production above the present level will be very difficult (S.Namar, 1992).

1.2 Statement of the problem

Ethiopia is one of the most food insecure nations of the world. The country experience several famines in the last 45 years. The first most devastating occurred in 1973-74 and the later in 1984. Other small scale famines also occurred in the 1990's. In the last 20 years the frequency of famine has increased. The major causes of famine are dramatic variation in the climate. Rainfall data for the period 1967-2000 indicated that annual variability in rainfall across different zones in Ethiopia ranged from as low as 15% to as high as 81% (PSNPM ,2008).

In addition to those occasional famines, millions of rural people lack food security and require regular food aid every year. According to official figure, 38.5% of rural households still live below the food poverty line. Most of these households are engaged in subsistence farming on small fragmented plots of degraded land. Repeated environment shock, health risks and shortage of land driving millions into

a state of food insecurity. Currently, more than 5 million people need regular food assistance even when there is favorable climate condition (PSNPM, 2008).

Eradicating famine and ensuring food security have remained a priority task in national development agenda and various measures have been introduced to ensure food security.

Earlier, the effort in this regard focuses on providing emergency assistance to all food insecure households. In order to do so, every year, for over two decades, the government has launched emergency appeals. Although this humanitarian assistance was substantial (estimated at about US \$ 265 million a year on average, between 1997 and 2002) and saved many lives, evaluations have shows that it was unpredictable for both planners and households and often arrived too little, too late as it could not solve the problem of food insecurity in sustainable fashion (PSNPM, 2008).

Since Southern Nation Nationalities and People State (SNNP) is one of the food insecure region of the country, food security programme have been carried out in the region.

According to SNNPR State Food Security Disaster Prevention and Preparedness bureau more than 1.9 million people reside in 72 districts have been identified as food insecure. The bureau considers shortage of land, drought, and environment degradation as major causes of food insecurity (FSDPP Report, 2006).

The Productive Safety Net Programme implemented in the 72 districts of the region aims at ensuring food security at family level and developing community asset by providing cash and/or grain for the beneficiaries in return for their labour on public works. However, for those who couldn't engage in public work due to old age or physical disability the payment is delivered unconditionally.

Family Package Programme, on the other hand, aimed at helping the beneficiaries to create income generating asset through provision of soft loans. It was believed that while the PSNP provides a stable platform from which the beneficiaries will raise out of chronic food insecurity, FP helped them to move toward full food security.

However, it felt that these programme have not fully achieved its objectives and not sustainable in the sense that those who had been graduated to food security relapse to food insecurity status (PSNPM, 2010).

As food security is a complex sustainable development issue linked to health, environment, political stability and human right, and there is a wide spread chronic food insecurity in Ethiopia, it is vital to assess food security programme, identify their weakness and strength and find out ways and means to make these programmes achieve their objectives. However, until recently no concrete study have been undertaken to identify the contribution, strength and weakness of these programme in order to improve their efficiency and effectiveness by external body.

1.3 Important Terms Used In This Study

1.3.1 Food security

The term food security defines differently by different scholars and organizations. Maxwell and Frankenberg, (1992) identified thirty definitions. However the current understanding of the notion is dominated by the definitions which have been adopted by a large number of international organizations. Among them the most influential one is the definition offered by the 1996 World Food Summit held in Rome. According to this definition food security is “a situation when all people at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life”

This is a complex definition and once it is broken down into its component parts a wide range of human economic activity, social structures, and system are revealed within its ambit.

Novib, (2001) provides a useful adoption and initial deconstruction.

Table1: Definition of food security and all aspects involved.

Every one has	Equality; all people
At all times	Stability of food availability, access, and utilization through out the year and over time.
Access to	The right to food. People are entitled to enough food. Affordability of food depending on purchasing power and market prices. Own production depending on

	land right.
And control over	The power to take decisions concerning food production, distribution, consumption etc.
Sufficient quantities	Enough food to meet daily food requirements, sufficient stock at household and community level to resist shock.
Of good quality food	Variety of nutritious, safe, and culturally appropriate foods.
For active and healthy life	Proper consumption and a good biological utilization of food, resulting in an adequate nutritional status of people.

Source: Novib, (2003)

From the above information it is clear that food security as concept cover a wide range of areas in that it cuts across the physical supply and availability of food, the macro and micro social system that determines entitlement to food, nutritional value, and the capacity of the body to use food and others. Availability refers to whether food is physically available. Is enough food being produced to meet the needs? If sufficient food is available at a higher level (say national) are distribution systems in place to deliver to local areas? How stable is the supply of the food? Is the available food enough to meet daily requirements at individual, household and community level with reserve to with stand shocks? In general production and distribution system are central to availability.

Access to food depends on availability, but goes beyond it by identifying whether a specific individual, household, locality is able to gain access to the food that is available. A central issue here is how food is procured. There are two basic ways to get food- either produce it your self or exchange something else for it. While the first requires production asset the second needs economic capability. Utilization of food serves as the inter connection between food production and distribution and other sectors, in particular health. Utilization refers to the food quality and nutritional contents and the biological capacity of an individual to absorb the available nutrients effectively.

The social context that enhances or reduces food security is an important element for consideration.

1.3.2. Food insecurity

It implies a limited ability to secure adequate food. Specially, food insecurity is having limited or uncertain availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods or limited or uncertain ability to acquire acceptable food in socially acceptable ways (Anderson, 1990).

1.3.3 Hunger

Hunger also defined by Anderson, (1990) referring to it in two respects. First, as “the uneasy or painful sensation caused by a lack of food.” Hunger, that is lacking access to food and malnutrition were both cited as potential, though not inevitable, consequence of food insecurity.

1.3.4 Contributions

The achievement made by Family Package and Productive Safety Net Programmes of SNNP toward ensuring food security.

1.3.5 Ensuring food security

In this study the term ensuring food security consider as the previously food insecure beneficiaries of FP and PSPNP able to produce food and /or earn income on sustainable basis which enable them to have sufficient food for 12 months of a year in the absence of PSNP or emergency transfer.

1.3.6 Productive Safety Net programme

A programme implemented by SNNP state to ensure food security at the family level by providing cash and /or food grain to food insecure beneficiaries in return for their labour on public works meant to create income generating and durable community assets.

1.3.7 Family package programme

A programme implemented by SNNP State to help the beneficiaries of PSNP to create their own income generating productive asset which enable them to increase their income and thereby achieve food security.

1.4 Objective of the study

The general objective of the study is to investigate the role and effectiveness of Productive Safety Net and Family Package Programmes of SNNP State in ensuring food security, the specific objectives includes;

- To assess the extent to which these programmes help the beneficiaries in creating in come generating asset;
- To study whether these programmes create dependency on the part of beneficiary;
- To study the efficiency of service delivery mechanism; and
- To identify the limitation of the programmes and recommend possible measures to improve them.

1.5 Hypothesis

The hypothesis framed for this study includes;

- Productive Safety Net and Family Package programmes create dependency among the beneficiaries and
- These programmes made little towards ensuring food security.

1.6 Scope and Limitation of the study

Family Package, Productive Safety Net, and Resettlement programmes have been implemented in the region to ensure food security. In this study, however, only Family Package and Productive Safety Net programmes implemented in 8 food insecure districts shall be undertaken. These districts are Sodo Zuria, Alba, Offa Aleta Wondo, Selti, Loma, Loka Abaya and Burji. In addition to data collected from beneficiaries residing in these districts similar information will be collected from beneficiaries residing in the districts.

CHAPTER TWO

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Origin and Concept of Food Security

In 1970's the issue of food security was conceived in terms of sustainable macro level food supplies and price. Such conception was clearly reflected on the definition of the 1974 Rome World Food Conference which defined it as:

“Availability of all times of adequate world food supplies of basic food stuff to sustain a steady expansion of food consumption and off set fluctuation in production and price.”

The above statement implies that in the 70s food security was considered as a matter of having food sufficient to meet the world's ever growing demand with stable price. The global concern of food security in 1974 was on volume and stability of food supplies (Clay, 2009).

Many scholars observe the 1970's concept of food security as the one which characterized by efforts to achieve higher production and ensuring availability of food and regulating price.

Accordingly international organization and national government were busy in designing and implementing programs to achieve higher growth in food production (Kuzma, 2010).

The 1979 World Food Programme report also emphasizes that increasing food production in developing countries would be the basis on which to build their food security (Ayallew, 2008).

Conceptual work of FAO in the 70's was focused on increasing food production, stabilizing food supplies and creating world and national food reserve (World food security, 2008).

Many scholars argue that the 1970's conception of food was the result of the 1970 crises.

Rabinowicz, (2002) noted that:

".....the tendency was to equate the world food security problem with the world food problem by concentrating attention on increasing food production, stabilizing food supplies and using food surplus creatively and constructive..."

Another feature of food security in the 70's was that individual and household access to food was overshadowing by national access. A country was considering food secure as long as there is enough food in the country to feed the people.

At that time the theory was that if national government could produce enough food to supply the demand in their country, hunger would disappear (Amanda and Mickey, 2007).

Ayallew, (2008) also indicated that if availability is more or less equal to the food needs of the country's population in general they conceived that the country is food secure.

The assumption underlying this perspective is that whatever amount of food is produced in the country it will be distributed to each region and to each household.

In the light of the above concepts of food security, in the past, nations have had essentially two options in pursuing food security. One option tended toward self reliance, producing all or a significant majority of one's food needs. The other option tended toward exploitation of the concept of comparative advantage, using income gained from nonagricultural production to import food or pragmatically a combination of the two (Kuzma, 2010).

Toward the early 1980's scholars in the area of food security increasingly challenged the perception that food insecurity occurs due to availability decline, as such and increasing food production will ensure food security. They argue that mere availability of food does not ensure food security by indicating that the world's food production is more than enough to feed all of us.

Discussing this fact Ruvimbo, (2009) noted that:

“.....if that were the case, then no one go hungry since total food production is more than enough to feed the world population.”

Richman, (1993) also argues that increasing food production doesn't necessarily translate into better diet for every body.

The 1980's exhibit a shift from a sole availability to accessibility and from global and national focuses to individual and household oriented.

Ayallew, (2008) also criticized the 1970's view as;

“..... global food availability does not ensure food security to any particular country because what is available in the world market (or the surplus in the US or Canada) cannot be accessed by famine affected people in African countries.”

Focusing on national availability of food as a means to ensure food security is also criticized. Conway, (2008) note that:

“Food security is not a matter solely for producing sufficient food. It is too simplistic to add up a nation's food production and divide by the size of the population ----- to achieve (food security) each individual or, in practice each household must grow sufficient food or be able to purchase the food from income earned either through selling agricultural products or by engaging in agricultural or non agricultural employment.”

This line of thought were largely influenced by Amartya Sen's(1981) ground breaking book “Poverty and Famine an essay on entitlement and deprivations which questioned traditional assumption on famine and argued that “famine was a result of entitlement failure rather than food deficiency”.

Dean Dre'zean and Amartya Sen's analysis was anticipated by Atikins and Bowler who argue that hunger is due primarily to failure of entitlement rather, say to inadequate agricultural productivity or excessive population growth (Atikins and Bowler, 2001).

Observing Amartya Sen's work Amanda and Mickey, (2007) noted that using the entitlement framework Sen, (1981) demonstrated that a decline in food availability was neither necessary nor sufficient to create hunger. They consider this period as there were a paradigm shift from national and global to individual and household food security. And it was during this time that food analyst's distinguish between availability of food which refers to over all quantities of foods in any particular place and food accessibility which refers to the ability of individuals to obtain that food.

Though the shift from global and national food security to individual and household and from a mere availability concern to the one which subsume accessibility was a considerable achievement, it does not escape criticism. Maxwell and Frankenberger (1992) noted that:

".....although food availability at the household level is a key issue, there are intra-household factors that affect equitable and adequate access to food by all members."

Maxwell and Frankenberger (1992) have said that:

"It is misleading to assume that household members share common preference with regard to (a) the allocations of resource for income generation and food acquisition or (b) the distribution of income and food within the household."

In the 1980's -1990's the paradigm shift as policy maker began to explore individual and household food security as opposed to food security from national perspective.

Thus in the early 80's access to food increasingly recognized as one aspect of food security. Moreover in 1983 FAO expanded its concept to include securing access by vulnerable people to available supplies implying that attention should be balanced between the demand and supply side of food equation:

“---ensuring that all people at the times have physical and economic access to the basic food that they need.

The above definition incorporates the terms “all people, physical access and economic access.” The term all people indicate the transfer from global and national availability of food to individual access to food while physical and economic access implies a shift from a mere availability to individual capacity to acquire and utilize it.

The 1984 -85 Africa famine also brought another paradigm shift on the concept of food security. Amanda and Mickey, (2007) noted:

“.....the 1984-85 famine in Africa also had a profound impact on food security theory and practice which led to livelihoods perspective.”

They further indicated that people intentionally suffering from hunger rather than losing their asset. This is especially true in populations that are frequently subjected to crisis...” (Amanda and Mickey, 2007)

It was accepted that food is not always the first priority of people living through a famine but one objective out of many.

This theory challenges the entitlement theory as entitlement theory does not consider individual's action and choice rather, it views the individual as passive.

The year 1986 brought another dimension on the concept of food security with a definition provided by World Bank. The Bank defined it as:

"...access by all people at all time to enough food for on active and health life."

As Ayallew, (2008) see it the definition encompasses many issues. According to him it;

- 1 Deals with production in relation to food availability.
2. Addresses distribution in that the produce should be accessed by all.
3. Covers consumption in the sense that individual food needs are met in order to be active and healthy.

The availability and accessibility of food to meet individual food needs should also be sustainable.

It also introduced the widely accepted distinction between chronic food insecurity, associated with problem of continuing or structural poverty and low incomes, and transitory food insecurity which involved period of intensified pressure caused by natural disaster, economic collapse, or conflicts (Tekolla,1997).

The above definition considers achieving food security as a means to enjoy a health and active life.

Previously it had been considered that 2100g calorie is enough to have a health live, however, toward the end of 1980's this objective indicator was challenged. The objective focus began to change to a subjective one with the realization that each individual has different needs in quantity, quality, and type of food rather than 2,100 calories standard.

This subjective focuses was also capture a shift in indicators. Result indicator of food security which measure food consumption over a set period of time was changed to process indicators which also measures vulnerability to food insecurity (Amanda and Mickey, 2007).

There are generally two categories of process indicators used today;

A) Provision of food and

B) Access to food or survival capacity indicators, which can be measured by the sale of assets, change in crop, migration, rationing food e.t.c (Amanda and Mickey, 2007).

In the 1990's the concepts of food security become broaden and incorporated issues of food safety, nutritional balance, food preference, human right etc.

The 1994 UNDP Human Development Report and the 1996 World Food Summit play significant role in broadening the concept. The 1994 UNDP Human Development Report promoted the construct of human security, including a number of components of which food security was only one. This concept is closely related to human right perspective on development that has, in turn influence discussion about food security (Clay, 2008).

In 1996 World Food Summit was held in Rome and offered a more complex definition of food security.

"Food security, at the individual household, national, regional and global level (is achieved) when all people at all time have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for active and healthy life. "

As indicated above the definition of food security here includes safety and quality food as well as food preference. Clay, (2008) indicated that food preference, socially or culturally determined now become a consideration.

The addition of food preferences change the concept of food security from mere access to enough food to access to food preferred. This implies that people with equal access to food but different with food preferences, could show different level of food security.

As long as the term preference, it is interpreted to mean foods that are socially and culturally acceptable and consistence with religious and ethical values, rather than a broader interpretation to mean household or individual preference among type of foods (Allen, 1999).

This definition reinforces the multidimensional nature of food security and includes food access, availability, food use and stability Dr. Ruvimbo Mabeza Chand,(2009) summarized the four pillars of food security as

Availability

Access

Quality

Stability

The 1996 summit was important for the adoption of right based approach to food security. It was agreed that the food security paradigm and practice should include not just economic and resource aspects but also human right.

More recently the ethical and human right dimension of food security has come to focus.

Convention on the Right to Food contains;

- The obligation of each country government to ensure the realization of the right to food by people of that country,
- The obligation of the international community to ensure the realization of the right to food by people of all countries including the provision of both emergency and non emergency assistance,
- The obligation of individual government and of armed opposition groups to ensure the realization to right to food during time of war or other forms of armed conflict, and
- Sanction against governments or armed group that fails to take adequate step to ensure the realization of the right to food by people of the country (Tony Hall 1993).

Currently over 40 countries have the right to food enshrined in their constitution and FAO estimates that the right to food could be judicial in some 54 countries (Mc chain Nhiopo, 2004).

However the right to food has been criticized by some scholars as Onora ol Neil (2001) noted:

"... it can be mockery to tell someone they have the right to food when there is nobody with the duty to provide them with food."

2.2 Factors Affecting Food Security

2.2.1 Population Growth, Environmental Degradation, and Food Security.

There have been considerable debates regarding the relationships between population growth and environmental degradation on one spectrum and their impacts on food security on the other.

Some scholars argue that high rate of population growth leads to environmental degradation which in turns threat world food security. On the other extreme there are scholars who believe that population growth neither causes environmental degradation nor food insecurity. In between there are others who consider that it is the interaction between population growth, consumption and technology that determines the extent to which population growth brings environmental degradation and food insecurity.

The formers argue that accelerated population growth leads to increasing demand for resources which adversely affects agricultural productivity through environmental degradation. They consider over population as real danger to our environment .One of them S.Porter,(1998) noted that:

“Human population growth is a number one threat to world’s environment.”

Talking about population growth and environmental degradation W.Kate,(1993) indicated that:

“The relationship between population growth and environmental degradation may appear to be straight forwarding.”

He also mentioned that this occurs due to the fact that more people demand more resource and generate more waste. According to him both the increased demand and waste generated put pressure on the environment.

He further noted that:

“..... clearly one of the challenges of growing population is that the more presence of so many people sharing limited number of resources strains the environment”(W.Kate, 1993).

They argue that as population grows, demand for resource is increased and efforts for meeting such increased demand pose pressure on the environment. Harries and Pearce, (2001) indicated that such phenomenon occurs at all level by stating:

“All ecosystems from local to global are under threats from the pressure of human source extraction, and pollution drives by population consumption and technology (Harrison Pearce, 2001).

Discussing about the impact of population growth on the environment Y. Tekola,(1997) noted that:

“As population increases, natural resources are over exploited, landholding are fragmented; living trees are chopped down for fuel; grass land are over grazed by livestock; fallow period are shortened; crop lands are over ploughed; air is polluted and near-shore water are over fished”

In addition to environmental degradation, resources necessary for food production are also increasingly scarce. As global population continuing to grow on such limited global resources as arable land, portable water and forest have come into sharp focus.

For instant, since the middle of the country 65% of Africans crop land has been degraded (Tekola, 1997).

Moreover, the amount of land converted to crop land each year is about equal to the amount removed from production due to soil erosion, dryness, salt deposit, or water saturation. (P.Green,1993).

This indicated that though world’s population increase every year no additional land brought into cultivation. In addition to this our world faces acute shortage of water. FAO,(2010) indicated that currently 434 million people face either water stress or scarcity.

According to AAAS report we have transformed approximately half of the land surface for our uses with concomitant wide spread impact on planet’s forest, oceans, fresh water, and atmosphere (Harrison and Pearce, 2001).

Concerning the impact of environmental degradation on agriculture and food security Tekola,(1997) noted that:

“Environmental degradation can stunt food and agricultural development through varieties of adverse consequences such as soil erosion, drought and flood, air and water pollution, loss of biodiversity etc. Each of them is interrelated and carries important implication on local, regional, and even international food security.”

Population growth doesn't only bring environmental degradation but also increase the demand for food. Concerning the relationship between population growth and the demand for food Y. Tekola, (1997) noted that:

“With a population growth rate of three percent per year, every twenty five years or so one has doubled the amount of food production (Tekola, 1997).”

The basic argument here is that accelerated population growth on one hand causes scarcity of water and arable land on which food production depends and on the other increase demands for food.

While the above mentioned environmental degradation and scarcity of resources threat food security, the prospect of having sustainable technology to mitigate their impacts or improve productivity further is not promising.

Sai, (1994) noted that:

“.....the real problem is that meeting the food security agenda using current techniques cannot be achieved with out causing serious environment degradation.”

According to FAO in order to meet the food needs of the ever growing world's population, food production needs to be increased by 70% by 2050(FAO, 2008).

However the prospect of achieving such increase seems demy as many agriculture experts believed that significant increase in food production is tiresome task.

As Cynthia P. Green, (1993) noted:

"Increasing food outputs above today's level may be difficult".

According to her this happens mainly because of environmental degradation, scarcity of resources needed for agricultural production and lack of sustainable agricultural technology.

Based on the arguments highlighted so far, the proponent of this view advocated that population growth and its consequences threat local, regional as well as international food security. They also argue that since achieving significant increase in food production to meet future demand is not rosy, the only viable option we have to ensure food security is controlling population growth.

Supporting this view R.Brown, (1994) stated that

"Achieving a humane balance between food and people now depends on family planner than farmer"

However, other scholars argue that population growth does not necessarily causes environmental degradation and food insecurity. There are other factors that

intervene between population growth and environmental degradation. Regarding this view Martian, (1994) indicated that:

“Overall pressure on environment is a product of three factors; population, consumption and technology”.

According to him how the resources are used and how much wastes are produced from each unit of consumption also important.

S.Nanara, (1992) also indicated that there are strong indication that we can drastically reduce the resource consumed and waste generated per unit of human advance.

Technology enables us to find more resources and to use them more efficiently (k.Steven, 1993).

Others still argue that population growth does not causes environmental degradation or food insecurity, rather its human beings that identify, develop and brought natural resources in to use.

While presenting his argument against the anti-population, Richman, (1993) noted that:

“The initial plausible claim that more people deplete resources faster has no more foundation.”

He considers people not as a threat to environment as he noted:

“People do not deplete resources they create them.”

Concerning the claim that the global natural resource is getting scarce he forward counter argument by indicating price as indicator of relative scarcity. He argues that for centuries resources of every kind have been getting cheaper. The only thing getting more expensive is labour, an indication of scarcity of people (Richman, 1993)

Regarding the relationship between population growth and food security he argues that though the world's population continuously increases, food production has out paced the increase in population by about one percent. The prices of agricultural products have been falling for more than 100 years (Richman, 1993).

He even went as far as suggesting that its sparse population that contributes to food insecurity. *"Since 1985, we have witnessed famine in Ethiopia, Sudan, and Somalia. Those nations have one thing in common: They are among the least populated areas on earth.... Moreover, the very sparseness of their population makes them vulnerable to famine because there aren't enough people to support sophisticated roads and transportation system that would facilitate the movement of food."* (Richman, 1993)

2.3 Approaches to Food Security

A wide variety of views have been held regarding how to ensure food security. These divergent views basically emanate from the different perceptions towards the causes of food insecurity.

Those who believe food availability decline cause food insecurity advocate that increasing world's food outputs will solve to the problem of food insecurity.

Others argue that increasing world's food production doesn't solve the problem of food insecurity as the problem did not occur due to shortage of food.

The proponent of the first view stated that the present state of food insecurity exist due to insufficient food production and inappropriate marketing mechanism. Accordingly the solution lies in developing mechanisms that can be used to enhance world food production and facilitating national and international food trade. To keep with increasing demand food production must increase at a steady pace (R. Brown, 1994).

They believe that agricultural sector has been neglected and investment on it has declined. So that more focused attention and greater investment is require to increase food production and hence ensure food security.

Regarding the need to increase agricultural production, while delivering speech at World Economic Forum, Japanese prime minister emphasis the need to increase investments and mitigating the negative impacts that may occur wherefrom to enhance agricultural development. He further said that '...investment will be the only viable solution for sustainable future.' He also suggested that investment boosting agricultural science and technology, secure people right, access to finance and human capital are required to increase agricultural production.

Though the proponents of this view believe that increasing agricultural production will solve the problem of food insecurity, they suggest different means.

The market oriented model advocates the use of large scale modern farms which is suitable to utilize sophisticated farm machineries, bio-technologies and huge capital in order to increase food production and meeting the future food demand.

While supporting this View Wenter, (2009) suggested that:

“Many from agro-industry and the finance world, as well as a number of economic historian observing how grain industry develop, say it need to be done commercially”

He also indicated that fragmented farm land is not suitable for large scale technologically oriented farming and small holders must group their farms and agreed on how to handle modern farm technologies to make their farms viable.

To boost food production small peasant farm land should be consolidated and alternative livelihood options must be found for surplus labour (Oster, 2010). According to him consolidating small peasants' farms and providing alternative income generating opportunities for surplus labour not only increase access to food but also create opportunity to use the money earned to buy varieties of food and thereby achieve better food security.

However this model has been criticized as it doesn't suggest model for how to increase income at significant scale through alterative livelihood.

Small farmers oriented model on the other hand advocate that providing productive assets, necessary inputs, finance, technology, technical advices, price incentives and enabling environment for small farmers would increase farm productivities and ensure food security(One World Guide, 2008) .

While discussing about food security Kent, (2005) noted that:

"-----the issue is not simply about access to food as such; it is also about access to means of production and to decent opportunities for doing productive work"

This model advocate secure access to land, local ownership and control over full chain of resources by small farmers. It accept peasant farmers for what they are; encourage their sustainability though subsidized inputs , credit, and incentive to grow more through price support (one world Guide, 2008).

Transferring technology and support farmers play important role in achieving food security in developing countries. Supporting farmers through better access to credit and advanced technology such as high yield seeds, water conserving irrigation, renewable energy a long with sound technical advice can go along way in increasing agricultural production and ensuring food security (Mission 2014,2010).

In addition to economic and technical support, scholars like Owens stress the needs of providing social rights to small farmer as a basic ingredient of achieving food security.

Owens, (1987) noted that:

"..... Creating economic and social right for the world small farmers is the first step in enabling countries to feed their own people."

He also indicated that where these rights have been created and small farmers have access to productive resources, public organization and law, very high farm productivity has been achieved (Owens, 1987).

In general this model argues that providing secured access to land for more people, subsidized inputs, improved farming techniques through trainings and use of technology, low cost finance to help them to invest in high quality seed, fertilizer, small irrigations and pesticides, and encouraging them to invest by providing protection against the setback that nature delivers through innovative crop insurance would ensure food security.

On the contrary others argue that increasing food production to meet the future demand is a difficult task so that the solution to food insecurity should lie in controlling population growth.

They argue that for thousands of years, the world's human population grew at a snail's pace. It took over million years to reach one billion at the beginning of 18th century. But then the pace quickened. Now the world population is above 6 billions and projected to reach 9 billions by 2050.

Till 1980's world's food output expanded outstripping population growth by wide margin (R. Brown, 1994).

Such increase occurred due to expansion of arable land and improvement of farm technology. S. Chen, (1993) indicated that in Africa and Latin America much of the

production increases in the last several decades come from expansion of agricultural land.

P. Green, (1993) also stated that agricultural techniques have greatly increased crop yield per unit of land and have kept a head of population growth for several decades. But now the reserved amount of arable land is very little and prospect to improve technology without diversely affect the environments is dummy.

She also indicated that prospect for a major expansion of crop land that is economically profitable and environmentally sustainable are not good, since there is little fertile land waiting to be ploughs (P.Green,1993).

Shortage of arable land pose negative impacts on food production as S.Chen(1993) noted:

“----- decreasing farm land contributes to growing concern to the limited global food production”

Agricultural technology and inputs like fertilizer and irrigation facilities which are responsible for early increase in crop productivity cost too much in terms of environments.

The earlier rapid raise in fertilizer use has obscured negative effects on yields and aggravates soil erosion, air pollution, water logging and salting, and other forms of degradation (R.Brown, 1994).

Tekola,(1997)also indicated that environmental degradation stunt agricultural production.

Moreover the backlog of unused agricultural technologies has been shrinking.

R.Brown(1994) indicated that:

“----- as those long-standing technology have been exploited during the last four decades, no new technology that could leads to quantum leap in world food outputs have taken their place.

On the light of the above facts they argue that though world population continues to grow and demand 40% increase in food production by 2030, the prospect of increasing food output is not promising.

At present there is nothing in sight to reverse the world wide decline in per capital grain output (Glants, 1991).

So that to keeping balance between population growth and food production is not lies on increasing food production but on controlling population growth as noted by R. Brown (1994):

“ _____ world’s farmers can no longer be counted on to feed the projected addition to our number. Achieving a humane balance between food and people now depends on family planners than on farmers”

Other Scholars also argue that neither population growth nor insufficient food production causes food insecurity and finding solution on these aspects are wastage of time. According them the world can feed all of us adequately.

By many account over all world food production is currently enough to provide every one with a healthy and well balanced diet (Richman, 1993). “Food is

abundant and becoming cheaper and more plentiful. Earth is capable of feeding many more people than are now alive” (Richman, 1993).

According to Kent, (2005) population growth, or inadequate agricultural production are not the causes of food insecurity. He argues that lack of control over local resources and circumstance that would allow them to do meaningful production works are the basic causes. He believes that people are capable of providing adequate food for themselves. He further stated that:

“----- in well functioning societies normally individuals, in the context of their families and communities will provide adequate food for themselves”

To this ends impingements regarding providing secured tenancy and access to resource should be eliminated. Efforts should also be made to create favorable working environment.

In this regard he identifies four categories of government role; respect, protect, facilitate and provide. Considering the first categories he argue that since people are capable to provide for themselves, government should respect people’s effort and not interfere in their efforts. This includes providing secured tenancy and access to productive resources.

He also believes that government should not only respect and protect people’s effort but also facilitate their endeavor toward feedings themselves. Facilitations may come in the way of providing extension services, sound currencies, marketing information, and varieties of other services that make it easier for people to feed

themselves. Moreover in some circumstance, government may provide for people needs by directly supplying food through programme such as school meal, emergency shelters, subsidized staple foods etc (Kent, 2005).

Other still arguing that the underling causes of food insecurity is more of social than environmental or others. Effective and lasting solution to the problem of food insecurity will found in policies and actions that pay adequate attention to those process of development that allow community ownership of developmental process through community based institutions which operate with active participation of all members of the community (One Country, 1996).

The establishments' o f community based elected institution responsible for the development and regulation of resources, and decision making through enhanced consultative process contribute to food security (One Country, 1996).

It's only through enhanced process of social development which recognizes the fundamental value of spiritual principles in education, community organization and the application of technology that true food security can be established (One Country, 1996).

Others argue that protection of vulnerable groups can go a long way in achieving food security. Such protection may ranges from providing food aid to helping the poor to acquire productive asset.

However, there are great, deals of debate among scholars regarding the impact of food aids on achieving food security. In one extreme there are scholars who argue

that since everyone has the right to have adequate food, food aid in the form of emergency can relief famine and should be provided in coordinated manner (P.Hall, 1993).

He even went as far as suggesting that blocking the distribution such aid should be considered as human right crime. The world Community needs to agree that using food aid as a weapon or blocking it as a human right crime” (P.Hall, 1993).

On the other extreme there are scholars who argue that food aid has adverse consequences which erodes self-sufficiency, agricultural production and ultimately ends up with food insecurity.

Discussing the cause of Somalia’s famine Micheal Maren,(1993) noted that:

“The famine in Somalia was caused by the food that for years had been unloaded at the docks of Mogadishu. Food is killing people and that must stop.”

Free food that year after year dumped in these African countries undermines the local agriculture and so cause famine when rainfall is below normal (Bethell, 1993).

At the middle there are scholars who argue that food aid other than emergency food aid can have negative impact which leads to perpetuated dependency on the part of the recipients.

In non- emergency situation the dumping of subsidized grain or the delivery of food aid often benefits the donor more than the recipients as it finally make the recipient country depended on food import (Prendergast and Miller, 1992).

Talking about relief agencies and the impacts their activities on food security Prendergast and Miller,(1992) indicated that:

“Although their human motive were admirable, their actions were to very great extent misguided in that they perpetuated the situation that had produces the famine in the first place” (Prendergast and Millar, 1992).

Lately some relief agencies are start to fear that the relief food will now cause another cycle of dependency by depressing food market and making it unprofitable to farmers to farm (Bethell, 1993).

There are others who argue that though food aid can contribute for achieving food security, its contribution can not be sustainable. It is not the real solution to the problem.

Food aid is only a short term solution to break the cycle of hunger as it doesn't change the condition that promoted the need for assistances in the first place(Freedom from Hunger, 1993).

Project food aid is targeting specific groups in society in support of the reduction of rural food insecurity. It may include food for work and cash for work programmes.

Some scholars believes that such programmes improves food security, encouraged local economic growth through roads and irrigations, improving farm land and protect the environments.

Megan, (2006) indicated that these programmes strengthen long term food insecurity by improving local infrastructure and /or agricultural potential.

Studies conducted in Malawi and Ethiopia also revealed that such programme generate economic benefit and increase calorie consumption.

Megan (2006) indicated that the food and cash transfer in Malawi found that each dollar transfer through the programme had economic benefit more than double the original input.

According to Gedamu, (2006) food for work in Ethiopia increased consumption by an average of about 455g calories, or 30 % or the daily intake. .

Such programmes also prevent poor household from disaster selling of productive asset in bad agricultural years when implemented in slack season (Ministry of agriculture, 2010).

S,Chen,(1993) indicated that such programmes are especially effective at reduces vulnerability to natural disasters. .

Though these programmes seem good in theory, they also exhibit a lot of shortfalls in practice. Pauling , (1994) criticized them as they exploit labour force , produce poor quality works and diverted people from important agricultural tasks.

According him the real solution should take the forms of structural economic and political change that treat the causes of poverty rather than the acute symptoms of food disaster (Pauling, 1994).

2.4 Consequences of Food Insecurity

Food insecurity results in catastrophic amount of human suffering. It may results in sever economic, social, psychological, behavioral and health consequences.

Talking about the consequences of food insecurity Sandy Rikount,(2010) said that:

“Food insecurity goes beyond the table, it has serious economic consequences.” Among adults it creates income loss, work absenteeism, higher demand for public benefits and social service and increase health care expenditure. These conditions create economic instability that make the food insecurity problem worse.

Food insecure individuals may manifest feelings of alienation, powerlessness, stress, and anxiety, and they may experience reduce productivity, work and school performance and income earning (Zhang, 2010).

Household dynamic may become disrupted because of preoccupation with obtaining food, which may leads to anger, pessimism, and irritability.

Adverse consequences for children include higher level of aggressiveness or destructive behavior, hyperactivity, anxiety, difficulties with social interaction (eg More withdrawal or socially disruptive, increase passivity, poorer overall school performance, increase school absence, and greater need for mental health care services (eg. for depression or suicidal behavior) (Schleode, 2010).

Recent study conducted in Ethiopia by Institute of Tropical Medicine together with colleagues from Jimma University and Brown university, revealed that food

insecure children clearly show lowered attainment and higher absentees compare to food secure children. According to the study one in three food insecure children skipped school for one or more days per week compare to one in five food secure children. Similarly one in four food insecure children finish primary school against one in 3 children without food problem. Such kinds of consequence stay with them for years or even for life. It brings a long poor school attendance and education attainment that thwarts your future chance in life (ITC, 2010).

Studies concluded that food insecurity has significant impact on social skill in boys and academic performance in both. Development in reading, particularly in girls, and math's skill of all food insecure children tends to develop more slowly (Acharya, 2006).

Chronic food insecurity can have detrimental effects on educational attainments, family dynamics, and economic mobility. Hunger and food insecurity create psychological responses such as anxiety, hostility and negative perception of self worth .Food insecurity and hunger strongly correlated with lower educational achievement, unemployment and impaired work performance (Mc Intryre, 2008).

Regarding the relationship between health status and food insecurity, it may be sufficient to define good health as the ability to withstand the effects of exposure to illness and injury. The connection between nutritious food and health status is, from this perspective, fundamental whether or not innate (Acharya, 2006).

Both health and food security are states of mind as well as physical conditions. Absent either the human organ eventually dies. In short, health and food security are necessarily to life- all life (Schleode, 2006).

Health and food security worth considerations because they are basic to life and because they have at all time existed in specific context of imbalance. Food insecurity has been like to negative health out comes, individual struggling with hunger and food insecurity endure the physical, psychological and cognitive consequence of hunger including anxiety, chronic illness, abnormal growth and depression(Freedom Corner, 2009).

Researches in the past two decades have come to appreciate the connection between food insecurity and the condition manifestation and ramification to ill health.

Individuals need adequate amount of varieties of quality and safe food to be healthy and well-nourished. Undernourished and malnutrition are two conditions widely agreed to be the result of hunger and food insecurity. Among children, conditions that can coincide with the latter include weight loss, fatigue, stunting growth and frequent illness (USDA, 2005).

WHO estimates that 60% of all child death in developing world is associated with chronic hunger and malnutrition. Malnutrition can leads to decreased energy levels, delayed maturation, growth failure, impaired cognitive ability, diminished capacity to learn, decreased ability to resist infections and illness, shorter life expectancy, increased maternal mortality and low birth weight. Undernourished

result from insufficient intake or an improper balance of protein, energy, and micronutrient. Nutritional consequences of insufficient food or under nutrition include protein energy malnutrition anemia, vitamin A deficiency, iron deficiency, and iodine deficiency.

In developing countries, persistent malnutrition leave children weak, vulnerable and less able to fight such common childhood illness as diarrhea, acute respiration infection, malaria and measles. Even children who are mildly to moderately malnutrition are at greater risk of dying from these common diseases (Nutrition and Well being A to Z, 2010).

Adolescent and adult also suffer the adverse consequences of food insecurity and malnutrition. Study have shown that under nourished pregnant women are more likely to bear babies with low birth weight and the babies are more likely to experience developmental delay, that lead to learning problem(Nutrition and Well being A to Z,2010) .

Iron deficiency anemia is also common among hungry and food insecure children on one end of the spectrum and older adult on the other. Children with iron deficiency anemia are also more susceptible to the effect of lead poisoning (USDA, 2005).

In people of every age group, iron deficiency anemia can cause fatigue, weakness, shortness of breath, and irregular heart rhythms, among other symptoms. Moreover, hunger and food insecurity worsen the effect of all disease and can accelerate degeneration condition especially among elderly.

A recent study has shown that food insecurity can lead to greater weight gain and increased complication during women pregnancy. We looked at the effect of food insecurity on variety of health factors related to pregnancy. we found that food insecurity is associated with a higher body mass index greater weight gain during pregnancy and higher risk for the development of gestational diabetes. Food insecurity affects school children academic performance, weight gain and a social skill (Journal of Nutrition, 2005).

In addition to its health consequences food insecurity can cause political instability and conflict. Recent report of NEPAD indicated that food insecurity may lead to political instability in Africa.

Food security is a major challenge on the Africa content. Food shortage, high food prices, and related social unrest can very often lead to other problem including political instability(NBPAD).

CHAPTER THREE

3 Research Methodologies

3.1 Research Design

Since the main purpose of this research is studying the contributions of Productive Safety Net and Family Package programmed, the 'before and after evaluation design with control group' were used in order to identify the real contributions of the programme .

To this end relevant data were collected from beneficiaries of the programme. These data were summarized and compared with the data that already collected by the implementers of the programme before they start implementing it. Any differences between them were recorded.

Data were also collected from non beneficiaries of the programme which were compared with the data already collected by the programme implementer. Any difference between them also recorded

Finally the differences exhibited in the former case were compared with the later one. Any differences between them were considered the contribution of Productive Safely Net and Family Package programme.

3.2 Sampling

To achieve the objectives of this study, multi stage stratified sampling method, which is believed to be suitable for large scale survey were used.

While using this method data were collected from beneficiaries as well as non beneficiaries households.

Therefore, for selecting sample households, in the first stage all the seventy two chronically food insecure districts were ordered geographically in order to ensure geographical dispersions of the sample and to cover the ranges of agro ecological zones. From these districts, eight districts representing different agro ecological zone and geographical areas were randomly selected for the study. These are: Alaba, Aleta Wondo, Burji, Loma, Loka Abaya, Offa, Sodo Zuria and Selite.

In the second stage, from the selected eight districts, all kebeles which were covered by Productive Safety Net and Family Package programme were recorded. At the third stage, three kebeles from each district were drawn randomly. In total twenty four kebeles were selected.

Finally, from each selected kebeles twenty six households which include men headed and female headed households were selected for the study. Among them twenty four households were beneficiaries of the programme and the rest were non beneficiaries' households.

In addition to these one project staff from each selected kebeles was also selected.

3.3 Data collection

Since the success of any research study depends on reliable and accurate data, intensive field survey were conducted to obtain such data.

During the field survey different tools of data collection were employed. However, the major tool used in this study was interview schedule. The interviews scheduled were mainly used to collect data from the beneficiaries of the programme. It consisted of four parts, the first part were established to collect information related to age, gender, family size, educational background, socio economic back ground etc. The second part of the interviews scheduled was designed to obtain data necessary to assess the contribution of the Productive Safety Net Programme. The third part of the interview schedule was focused on those questions which help to identify the contribution of Family Package programme. The fourth part of the interview schedule was focused on identifying the cumulative effects of the two programmes. Questions which were important to asses the status of assets created due to the programme were also included in the interview schedule. Here both structured and unstructured questions were used. The interview schedule was standardized and finalized based on the result of the pre -test which were undertaken prior to the final investigation.

Questionnaires and observation were also used to collect data. In addition to the questionnaires observation were employed to assess the conditions of asset developed through public work, which is part of Production Safely Net Programme. Furthermore secondary data were also collected from Federal Productive Safety Net Program implementation manual, various documents of SNNP state Food Security

Council, annual report of various sectors of SNNP state involved in the programmes, monitoring and evaluation reports and other relevant literature.

3.4 Processing and Analysis of Data

The data collected from the above mentioned sources were scrutinized, verified, edited, and arranged serially. For coding, three master code sheets were prepared. One for data collected from the beneficiaries another for non beneficiaries and the third one for data collected from project staff. The data were then tabulated, summarized and condensed to bring out the main characteristics. Then it was organized, classified, and analyzed through descriptive statistical analysis method which includes measure of central tendency, measure of variability, measure of relationship, and measure of relative position. Moreover, to identify cause and effect relationship, test the hypothesis and make generalization inferential static methods were also applied. Finally the results of the data analyzed were tabulated.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Result and Discussion

4.1 Household Characteristics

In this study five hundreds seventy six beneficiaries households were contacted. Out of them 11.8% were female headed and the remaining were male headed households. Silti district had the largest number of female headed households constituting 19.45% of sample beneficiaries while Loma had the least with only 2.78% households (Table 2).

Examining the age of sample beneficiaries, 25% of them were between 21 and 35 years, 48.48% between 36 and 50 and 29.5% were above 50 years of age. In the first category (between 21 and 35) Burji district had the largest percentage with 37.50%. Concerning the second category Loka Abaya ranked first with 58.33% while Loma ranked least (Table 2).

Regarding family size, it varies from place to place. On average 23.44% of beneficiaries had 5 to 7, 36.33% had 7 to 9, and 39.93% had more than ten members of family. In Loka Abaya , 38.89% of households had 5 to 7 members in the family, whereas half of Loma and 33.33% of Alaba and Offa district households had more than 10 members each (Table 2).

Table2. Demographic data

Districts	Respondent households	Female headed households	Male headed households	Age			Family size		
				21-35	36-50	Above 50	5-7	8-10	More than 10
Alaba	72	4	68	19	32	21	10	38	24
Aleta Wondo	72	9	63	13	35	24	21	18	33
Burji	72	8	64	27	30	15	21	21	30
Loma	72	2	70	9	28	35	18	18	36
Loka Abaya	72	11	61	17	42	13	28	18	26
Offa	72	8	64	17	36	19	13	35	24
Selti	72	14	58	19	26	25	16	29	27
Sodo Zuria	72	13	59	23	33	16	8	34	30

Source: Own survey

4. 2 Causes of Food Insecurity

The data collected for this study revealed that shortage of land, frequent drought and infertile soil, large family size, and shortage of labour and livestock were the major causes of food insecurity. The intensity of these causes, however, varies from one district to another. In general, 48.26% of the respondents identified lower land size as the major cause of food insecurity, 29.17% of them said frequent drought and infertile

land, and 20.14% indicated lack of livestock and labour as the cause of their food insecurity. Among the respondents' only 2.43% indicated large family size. In terms of district 69.23%% of the respondents in Sodo Zuria district and 62.50%% in Offa district identified that shortage of land as the basic cause of food insecurity. we see the causes of food security in terms of gender and age, 69.44% of respondents aged 35 and below mentioned shortage of land and 71.04%% of female headed household mentioned shortage of labour as the cause. In terms of agro-ecological conditions the data clearly indicated that in districts situated in high lands, shortage of land is the major cause of food security. But in the lowlands and difficult terrains frequent draught and lack of livestock are major causes of their food insecurity (Table 3).

Table 3. Respondents view on causes of food insecurity.

Districts	Shortage of land		Frequent drought and infertile soil		Shortage of Labour and livestock		Large family size	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Alaba	24	4.17	28	4.86	19	2.30	1	0.17
Aleta Wondo	37	6.42	18	3.13	15	2.60	2	0.35
Burji	33	5.72	22	3.82	15	2.60	2	0.35
Loma	24	4.17	25	4.34	22	3.82	1	0.17
Loka Abaya	19	2.30	30	5.21	22	3.82	1	0.17
Offa	51	8.85	12	2.08	6	1.04	3	0.52
Selti	37	6.42	19	2.30	14	2.43	2	0.35
Sodo Zuria	53	9.20	14	2.43	3	0.52	2	0.35
Total	278	48.26	168	29.17	116	20.14	14	2.43

Source: Own survey

4.3 Beneficiaries Food Gap Prior to the Programme

To examine the extent of food insecurity status, the sample beneficiaries were asked to report their food gap in a year before PSNP. Accordingly, it was found that the respondents' food gap was ranging from 3 months to 9 months. Out of the total samples 22.05% of respondents had indicated that they had faced severe food shortage for seven to nine months each year. Among them, 2.95% of respondents faced food gap for nine months. While the largest percentages in this group were residing at Loma district, the least existed in Aleta wondo district. Similarly 44.97% of the respondents reported that their food gap was between 5 and 7 months, 26.04% had indicated that it was between 3 and 5 months, 6.94% of the respondents, indicated that they were not food insecure. The average food gap of the respondents was 4.76 months (Table 4)

Among the non- beneficiaries 64.58% reported that they have never been food insecure in five years. The remaining had indicated that they were food insecure once due to unexpected shock. The average food gap of non- beneficiaries were less than a month. Selling of assets and receiving food aids were measures taken by them during food insecurity.

Asked how they cover their food gap prior to the programme, 91.23% of sample beneficiaries said they had received food aid and 8.76% of them indicated that they had borrowed grain and returned after the harvest.

Table 4. Sample beneficiaries' Food gap prior to the programme

Districts	Food gap in a year							
	7-9 months		5-7 months		3-5 months		Food secure	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Alaba	23	3.99	20	3.47	21	3.65	8	1.39
Aleta Wondo	14	2.43	36	6.25	21	3.65	1	0.17
Burji	17	2.95	38	6.70	17	2.95	-	-
Loma	20	3.47	30	5.21	18	3.13	4	0.69
Loka Abaya	8	1.39	37	6.42	22	3.82	5	0.87
Offa	19	2.30	26	4.51	23	3.99	4	0.69
Selti	16	2.78	31	5.38	15	2.60	10	1.74
Sodo Zuria	10	1.47	41	7.11	13	2.26	8	1.39
Total	127	22.05	259	44.97	150	26.04	40	6.94

Source: Own survey

4.4 Respondents Engagement in Public Service

Regarding the number of days the beneficiaries of the programme engaged in the public works, only 21.53% engaged in public works for 25-30 days; 16.67% worked for 20-25 days; 32.47% worked for 15-20 days; 25.87% worked for 10-15 days and 3.47% engaged for less than 10 days.

Concerning districts the least number registered was at Selti district and the largest at Alaba district. In Alaba, more than 31% of sample beneficiaries work for more than 25 days. According to the guideline of Productive Safety Net Programme the beneficiaries should work for 6 months a year during slack agricultural season for at least 5 days per months. However, only 8.33% sample beneficiaries engaged in public work for 30 days and 34.38% sample beneficiaries' work for less than half of the targeted 30 days. The average number of days beneficiaries engaged in public

work was 19.59 which was around 65.30% of the targeted 30 days. These adversely have affected their ability to minimize their food gap (Table 5).

Moreover, beneficiaries' food gaps were supposed to be covered through the payments made for engaging in public works. Under such conditions beneficiaries with longer food gaps suppose to work for more days. However, it was revealed that such practice was not followed under PSNP. The data had clearly indicated that beneficiaries with longer food gaps were not provided additional days comparing to other beneficiaries (Table 5). For instance, those who had seven to nine months food gaps worked for less number of days as compared to those who have 3-5 months food gap.

Such practice (ignoring beneficiaries' prior food gap in providing public work opportunity) adversely affected their ability in covering their food gap. Data clearly indicated that number of days beneficiaries engaged in public work and coverings food gaps were related. Comparing number of days engaged in public work and food gap covered data shows that 59.68% of those who work for 25-30 days cover more than 3 months of their food gap while only 2.68% of those who work for 10-15 days cover more than 3 months food gap. 76.38% of those who have 7-9 months food gaps cover less than 3 months out of this 25.19% cover only one month of their food gap.

Table 5. Number of days respondents engaged in public work

Districts	25-30		20-25		15-20		10-15		Less than 10	
	N ₀	%	N ₀	%	N ₀	%	N ₀	%	N ₀	%
Alaba	23	3.99	18	3.13	20	3.47	11	1.91	-	-
Aleta	10	1.74	12	2.08	28	4.86	22	3.82	-	-
Wondo										
Burji	16	2.78	8	1.39	26	4.51	20	3.47	2	0.35
Loma	16	2.78	14	2.43	26	4.51	10	1.74	6	1.04
Loka	15	2.60	11	1.91	24	4.17	17	2.95	5	0.87
Abaya										
Offa	17	2.95	12	2.08	22	3.82	16	2.78	5	0.87
Selti	14	2.43	9	1.56	21	3.65	28	4.86	-	-
Sodo	13	2.26	12	2.08	20	3.47	25	4.34	2	0.35
Zuria										
Total	124	21.53	96	16.67	187	32.47	149	25.87	20	3.47

Source: Own survey

4.5 Contribution of Public Work Payment in Reducing Food Gaps

Respondents view on the contribution of Public work's payment in reducing food gaps varied. In general, 48.26% of respondents had indicated the extent of its contribution was very little, while 23.44% had responded that the payments fairly contributed to minimize their food gap. Only 7.81% of the respondents had indicated that their food gap is completely covered by the payments. When they were asked how many months of their food gap in a single year covered by the payments, 21.53% of them reported that it covered more than 3 months, 32.12% of them indicated 2-3 months, 17.53% 1 to 2 months and 26.04% 1 month. The average food gap covered by PSNP transfer as indicated by sample respondents was 2.57 months. As indicated earlier average food gap of sample beneficiaries prior to the programme was 4.76 months. The situation becomes worse while variation in terms of prior food gap were considered. Data had shown that beneficiaries with longer prior food gap (beneficiaries who had 7-9 months food gap) cover less months of their food gap than beneficiaries with shorter prior food gap (beneficiaries who had 3-5 months food gap). 76.38% of those who have 7-9 months food gap cover less than 3 months of their food gaps. Among these for 25.19% of them it covers only one month of their food gap while only for 65.32% of those who had 3-5 months prior food gap, can cover less than 3 months (Table 6). In examining their responses and number of families covered under the programme, their prior food gap, as well as the amount of other asset, it can be concluded that those who have more assets and less prior food gap had provided more positive answer (Table 6)

Table 6 Contributions of PSNP payments toward minimizing food gaps.

Districts	Contribution of PSNP payment									
	More than 3 months		2-3 months		1-2months		1 month		Can't say	
	N _o	%	N _o	%	N _o	%	N _o	%	N _o	%
Alaba	23	3.99	28	4.86	9	1.56	10	1.74	2	0.35
Aleta	10	1.74	21	3.65	13	2.26	25	4.34	3	0.52
Wondo										
Burji	12	2.08	19	2.30	10	1.74	31	5.38	-	-
Loma	17	2.95	24	4.17	13	2.26	12	2.08	6	1.04
Loka	18	3.13	24	4.17	16	2.78	12	2.08	2	0.35
Abaya										
Offa	16	2.78	20	3.47	12	2.08	23	3.99	1	0.17
Selti	14	2.43	26	4.51	14	2.43	17	2.95	1	0.17
Sodo	14	2.43	23	3.99	14	2.43	20	3.47	1	0.17
Zuria										
Total	124	21.53	185	32.12	101	17.53	150	26.04	16	2.78

Source: Own survey

Concerning the fairness of the payment in relation to the public work load they undertake, the majority of the respondents (52.78%) reported to be fair, while 37.15% responded negatively. For the question on type of the community work they prefer to undertake, 15.45% replied not to have any preference. However, 11.81% prefer construction of school, 39.93% prefer environmental protection related activities, 6.25% would engage in any works, 21.70% prefer farm related activity, and the remaining want to engage in construction of roads.

Regarding the impacts of time and labour spent on public work the response were greatly varied. The majority of those who actively engaged in income generating activities using the money borrowed from the Family Package component reported that the time and labour they had to spent in undertaking the public work great affect their private activities as the schedule for public works are not suitable for their activities. Accordingly 14.24% of them reported that the time and labour spent in public work greatly affect their private activities, 34.72% indicated that it affects somehow, 19.62% indicated the effect was not much, while 31.42 had claimed not to be affect.

4.6 Effort Made to Ensure Food Security

As stated in the previous chapters these food security programmes were intended to end chronic food insecurity and enable those who are food insecure achieve food security through various interventions. In this regard it is very vital to identify the extent to which programme intervention creates dependency on the part of beneficiaries. One of it was forwarded to exert especial effort on their own to be food secure and being out of the programme. Accordingly it was revealed that among the Productive Safety Net Programme clients only 35.76% made efforts on their own to be food secure. Concerning district variation difference was observed. The difference ranges from the highest 45.83% which was recorded in Aleta Wondo district to the lowest 26.39% in Alaba district. The study also revealed that there are considerable variations in terms of age. The younger respondents (age between 21 and 35) tend to make better efforts to be food secure than the older ones. Surprisingly, the percentage of women headed households who have made efforts of one kind or other were more than their male counterpart(Table 7).

Table 7. Effort Made by respondents to ensure food security

Districts	Beneficiaries who made own efforts		Beneficiaries who didn't made own efforts	
	No	%	No	%
Alaba	19	26.39	53	54.17
Aleta Wondo	33	45.83	39	73.61
Burji	26	36.11	46	63.89
Loma	28	38.89	44	61.11
Loka Abaya	26	36.11	46	63.89
Offa	27	37.50	45	62.50
Selti	24	33.33	48	66.67
Sodo Zuria	23	31.94	49	68.06

Source: Own survey

Those who never try made own effort to ensure food security and thereby quite participating in the programme also asked to explain for their reluctance, only 1.74% of respondents reported for their inability due to old age or permanent physical disability while 37.33% indicated lack of resources, and the remaining gave several other reasons. Out of those who made own, 56.45% of them mostly male, indicated that they have been working hard on their farm using modern inputs like fertilizer, 17.84%, majority of them young, engaged in off-farm activities, 10% involved in fattening of cattle, 15.67%, majority of them women, engaged in petty trade by traveling to the nearest town.

It was also found that most of the beneficiaries relied on government assistance to be food secure. Finding ways and means to ensure food security has been neglected especially among the elderly men. Except the 1.78% respondent households who are incapable of undertaking economic activities, the rest were supposed to make their own endeavor, unfortunately they didn't make any effort.

4.7 Length of Time Respondents Wishes to Stay Under PSNP

Clients of Productive Safety Net Programme were also asked the length of time to be covered under the program. Among the respondents, 39.06% had indicated that they would like to stay until they ensure complete food security, 43.75% replied as long as they are allowed, 7.29% of them were not sure, and the rest indicated that they want to withdraw from the programme right now (Table 8).

Table 8. How long respondents want to be covered under PSNP

Districts	Till ensure food security		As long as allowed		Not sure		Want to out now	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Alaba	27	4.69	29	5.03	6	1.04	10	1.74
Aleta Wondo	32	5.56	34	5.90	4	0.69	2	0.35
Burji	28	4.86	34	5.90	5	0.87	5	0.87
Loma	35	6.08	28	4.86	2	0.35	7	1.22
Loka Abaya	28	4.86	33	5.73	5	0.87	6	1.04
Offa	31	5.38	28	4.86	3	0.52	10	1.74
Selti	22	3.82	31	5.38	11	1.91	8	1.39
Sodo Zuria	22	3.82	35	6.08	6	1.04	9	1.56
Total	225	39.06%	252	43.75%	42	7.29%	57	9.90%

Source: Own survey

Those who responded to stay as long as they are allowed had indicated that they lose nothing, rather gain some from being covered under the program by staying under the programme, 39.68% indicated that they might be insecure in the future, the remaining gave different reasons. In contrast, those who expressed to quit PSNP had not been seeking assistance anymore and the time spent on their own business worth more than they can earn from the public work. More than 92% of those who wants to withdraw from the programme right now are those who made own efforts to ensure food security. However, 68.89% of those who indicated that the payment made under PSNP had helped them to cover their entire food need did not want to withdraw right now. Similarly, 17.86% of those who would not withdraw from programme were those who had covered more than three months of their food gap (Table 9).

Table 9. Respondents reason to stay under PSNP

District	Lose nothing		Fear of being food insecure again		Other reasons	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Alaba	14	5.56	11	4.37	4	1.59
Aleta Wondo	16	6.35	12	4.76	6	2.38
Burji	16	6.35	15	5.95	3	1.19
Loma	10	3.97	15	5.95	3	1.19
Loka Abaya	17	6.75	11	4.37	5	1.98
Offa	16	6.35	10	3.97	2	0.79
Selti	15	5.95	12	4.76	4	1.59
Sodo Zuria	16	6.35	14	5.56	5	1.98
Total	120	47.62	100	39.68	32	12.70

Source: Own survey

Among those who responded that the PSNP payment was not enabling them to cover their entire food gap were asked when they expect to ensure food security and withdraw from the programme. Only 8.48% replied that they become food secure within 6 months, 15.02% of them need 6 months to one year, 34.68% need more than a year, 29.48% were not sure, 12.33% would not intended to withdraw (Table 10).

There seemed to be strong relationships between making own effort to withdraw from the programme and anticipated time to be food secure. In contrast, 45.98% of those who were able to cover more than 3 months of food gaps require more than a year to be food secure. However, 54.03% of those who consider themselves responsible for ensuring food security expected to withdraw from the programme within a year. Similarly, 82.46% of those who want to withdraw from the programme would take responsibility for ensuring food security. More than 96 % of those who indicated to be responsible to ensure food security and 97% of those who were willing to tackle problems if the programme terminated had made their own efforts to ensure food security (Table 10).

Table 10. When they expected to ensure Food Security

Districts	0-6 months		6 months-1 year		More than a year		Not sure		Do not	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Alaba	4	0.77	8	1.54	27	5.20	17	3.28	4	0.77
Aleta Wondo	7	1.35	13	2.50	24	4.62	20	3.85	6	1.16
Burji	7	1.35	13	2.50	22	4.24	19	3.67	6	1.16
Loma	5	0.96	7	1.35	22	4.24	21	4.05	10	1.93
Loka Abaya	5	0.96	13	2.50	24	4.62	13	2.50	11	2.11
Offa	4	0.77	10	1.93	21	4.05	16	3.08	11	2.11
Selti	4	0.77	8	1.54	18	3.47	27	5.20	9	1.73
Sodo Zuria	8	1.54	6	1.16	22	4.24	20	3.85	7	1.35
Total	44	8.48	78	15.02	180	34.68	153	29.48	64	12.33

Source: Own survey

Out of the total clients of Productive Safety Net Programme, 74.83% of them believe that the government has responsibility to cover the food need of food insecure people under Productive Safety Net Programme, while 25.17% responded that the government should not cover all food insecure people but only the aged and disabled.

4.8 Responsibility for Ensuring Food Security

To the question “Who is responsible to ensure food security?”, a wide array of response were obtained. Only 27.95% of the respondents considered themselves responsible to ensure food security, while 25.87% had indicated that the local community has a responsibility according to local tradition. In addition, 42.36% mentioned external body should be responsible, while 3.82% referred to heavenly bodies. Among those who mentioned external bodies as responsible, 56.71% identified government, 22.18% mentioned non-governmental organization and remaining had indicated both government and NGO’s. More than 70% of respondents didn’t consider themselves responsible to ensure food security (Table 11).

Table 11. Respondents view on responsibility for ensuring food security

Districts	My self		Local community		External bodies		Heavenly Bodies	
	N ₀	%	N ₀	%	N ₀	%	N ₀	%
Alaba	18	3.13	20	3.47	31	5.38	3	0.52
Aleta Wondo	12	2.08	17	2.95	37	6.42	6	1.04
Burji	11	1.91	24	4.17	33	5.73	4	0.69
Loma	16	2.78	16	2.78	37	6.42	3	0.52
Loka Abaya	26	4.51	16	2.78	28	4.86	2	0.35
Offa	26	4.51	15	2.26	30	5.21	1	0.17
Selti	24	4.17	22	3.82	23	3.99	3	0.52
Sodo Zuria	28	4.86	19	2.30	25	4.34	-	-
Total	161	27.95	149	25.87	244	42.36	22	3.82

Source: Own survey

Here it is easy to see the attitude of PSNP beneficiaries towards achieving food security. The majority of them didn't want to take responsibility for being food insecure. Without changing this attitude it is unlikely that they develop internal motivation to alleviate it. Second, they tend to point to other bodies to ensure food security. The result of these two perceptions contributes for reluctance to make their own efforts to ensure food security.

The data collected regarding their perception toward being covered under the programme, only 4.51% mentioned that they feel dependent, whereas 44.62% had indicated that they feel secured with regard to food. But 7.64% indicated that they were not sure while 38.02% won't say anything.

4.9 Fate of Beneficiaries in Case of the Programme Terminated

Among the beneficiaries of the programme, the majority (66.15%) believe that the programme would not be terminated, while 12.85% believe it may be terminated. Concerning what would happen if the programme is terminated, only 11.11% responded that they would face no problem, 9.72% mentioned that if they face some problems they would tackle it; 32.12% had indicated that they would consider migration to town as option; 39.76% believe that they would be a burden to the relatives while the remaining had indicated other options (Table 12)

Table 12. Respondents view on their fate if the programme is terminated

Districts	Face no problem		Tackle it		Migrate		Burden on relative		Other option	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Alaba	14	2.43	14	2.43	14	2.43	22	3.82	8	1.39
Aleta Wondo	12	2.08	4	0.69	16	2.78	32	5.56	8	1.39
Burji	2	0.35	6	1.04	34	5.59	30	5.20	-	-
Loma	1	0.17	6	1.04	34	5.59	25	4.34	6	1.04
Loka Abaya	11	1.91	6	1.04	23	3.99	24	4.17	8	1.39
Offa	6	1.04	4	0.69	20	3.47	36	6.25	6	1.04
Selti	8	1.39	8	1.39	24	4.17	32	5.56	-	-
Sodo Zuria	10	1.74	8	1.39	20	3.47	28	4.86	6	1.04
Total	64	11	56	9.72	185	32.11	227	39.41	42	7.29
	.11									

Source: Own survey

4.10 Perception towards Public Work

The study had also tried to identify the perception of recipients towards the public work and its payment. The majority, 67.53%, considered it as seasonal work for which they get paid; 14.75% considered it as work for the development the community; 8.33% considered it as means through which they get assistance and the remaining 9.90% provided other factors (Table 13).

Table 13. Perception of respondents toward public work

Districts	Seasonal work		Work for the development of the community		Means of receiving assistance		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Alaba	53	9.20	9	1.56	5	0.87	5	0.87
Aleta Wondo	46	7.99	13	2.26	5	0.87	8	1.39
Burji	48	8.33	16	2.78	2	0.35	6	1.04
Loma	48	8.33	11	1.91	7	1.22	6	1.04
Loka Abaya	51	8.85	10	1.74	2	0.35	9	1.56
Offa	47	8.16	10	1.74	8	1.39	7	1.22
Selti	45	7.81	9	1.56	11	1.91	7	1.22
Sodo Zuria	51	8.85	7	1.22	5	0.87	9	1.56
Total	389	67.53	85	14.76	45	7.81	57	9.90

Source: Own survey

4.1.11 Coverage of Family Package Programme

According to the guideline, all chronically food insecure households should be covered under the Productive Safety Net Programme in which they receive cash and/or grain in return to public work they supposed to undertake. Since assistances provided under Productive Safety Net Programme cannot ensure food security on sustainable basis, all the beneficiaries of the programme are supposed to be covered under Family Package Programme. Under this programme, beneficiaries should be provided with a full range of backward and forward linkage, which includes subsidized credit, technical advice, inputs, and marketing facilities. It aimed at helping the beneficiaries to start income generating activities and create some kind of asset. It supports households to grow their own household economy. This helps chronically food insecure households to rise up from the platform provided by Productive Safety Net Programme, and enable them to move towards full food security (PSNP Manual, 2008). The income generating activities could be on farm, growing cash crop, permanent fruit trees or vegetables, animal husbandry, poultry, trade or other own business.

All Productive Safety Net Programme beneficiaries except those who were entitled to unconditional transfer due to physical and/or mental illness or old age are supposed to be covered under Family Package Programme. However, this study revealed that only 346 of the sample beneficiaries (60.07%) were covered under FPP and had started income generating activities. Regarding inter district variation the coverage

ranges from the highest, 84.89%, at Aleta Wondo district and the lowest, 38.89% ,at Selti district(Table 14).

Table 14. Coverage under Family Package Programme

District	Sample beneficiaries	Sample beneficiaries covered by FPP	Percentage
Aleta Wondo	72	61	84.89
Offa	72	58	80.56
Loka Abaya	72	46	63.89
Alaba	72	43	59.72
Sodo Zuria	72	42	58.33
Loma	72	37	51.38
Burji	72	31	43.05
Selti	72	28	38.89

Source: Own survey

4.12 Income Generating Activities Undertaken by Respondents

Regarding distributions of sample beneficiaries to income generating activities, 43.06% of them engaged in on farm activities, 25.43% engaged in animal husbandry, 13.29% in poultry, 11.27% engaged in petty trade and 6.94% in other types of activities. As indicated above 69.50% of sample beneficiaries engaged in either farming or animal husbandry by including poultry to this figure, 81.79% of sample beneficiaries engaged in Agriculture.

In observing income generating activities, inter- district variations were identified. For instance, more than half of Aleta Wondo beneficiaries and half of Loka Abaya beneficiaries engaged in framing while only 21.3% of Sodo Zuria district beneficiaries engaged in framing. In Aleta Wondo district majority of them were engaged in on farm activities which include coffee and fruit production (Table 15).

With regard to animal husbandry similar variation had been observed, as 13.79% of Offa and 57.14% of Sodo Zuria districts beneficiaries practice animal husbandry.

In poultry production the highest percentage (21.62%) was registered in Loma district while the least found in Silti where only 2 individuals engaged in poultry.

Out of the total sample beneficiaries who engaged in petty trade, 23.07% were found in Offa while 2.56% found in Sodo Zuria districts. Concerning other small businesses Alaba district has the largest figure. None Aleta wondo, Loma, and Siliti districts beneficiaries undertake other small business (Table 15).

Table 15. Income generating activities

Districts	Farming		Animal husbandry		Poultry		Trade		Other activities		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Alaba	16	4.62	9	2.60	4	1.16	6	1.73	8	2.31	43	12.43
Aleta Wondo	34	9.83	13	3.76	6	1.73	8	2.31	-	-	61	17.63
Burji	13	3.76	7	2.02	6	1.73	3	0.87	2	0.58	31	8.96
Loma	16	4.62	11	3.18	8	2.31	2	0.58	-	-	37	10.69
Loka Abaya	23	6.65	10	2.89	8	2.31	2	0.58	3	0.87	46	13.29
Offa	26	7.51	8	2.31	7	2.02	9	2.60	8	2.31	58	16.76
Sodo Zuria	9	2.60	24	6.94	5	1.45	1	0.30	3	0.87	42	12.14
Selti	12	3.67	6	1.73	2	0.58	8	2.31	-	-	28	8.09
Total	149	43.06	88	25.43	46	13.29	39	11.27	24	6.94	346	100%

Source: Own survey

Moreover, data obtained from district staffs and annual report indicated that all of those graduated from Productive Safety Net Programme were beneficiaries of Family Package Programme. Data obtained has clearly indicated that the number of PSNP beneficiaries who were covered under FPP are showing increasing trend in the last three years.

4.13 Backward and Forward Linkages

The success of any income generating activity greatly depends on well-organized and appropriate backward and forward linkages. Backward linkage refers to all inputs which are vital to produce goods and services while, forward linkage mainly refers to marketing the product. It is very vital to assess the backward and forward linkages provided to the beneficiaries of Family Package Programme.

4.13.1 Backward Linkages

In order to be viable and produce good quality products and services, income generating activities require a timely, adequate, and efficient credit and inputs services.

Credit, which is indispensable to start any business, should be provided in simple and easy procedure, and with reasonable interest. In this regard, the study revealed that the delivery of credit was not fast, flexible and sufficient..

According to the guideline the maximum amount of credit that a beneficiary of FPP can borrow under programme is 4000 Ethiopian birr. However, the study revealed that out of the total sample beneficiaries of FPP only 26.88% borrowed more than

3000 birr; 13.29% borrowed between 2000 and 3000 birr; 40.75% received between 1000 and 2000 birr and 19.08% had borrowed 1000 and less Ethiopian birr. Among them 13.29% received only 500 birr (Table 16).

Table 16. Credit recipients of sample beneficiaries of FPP

Districts	More than 3000 Eth. birr		3000-2000 Eth. birr		1000-2000 Eth. birr		Less than 1000 Eth. birr		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Alaba	8	2.31	2	0.58	19	5.49	14	4.05	43	12.43
Aleta Wondo	22	6.36	7	2.02	27	7.80	5	1.45	61	17.63
Burji	7	2.02	6	1.73	10	2.90	8	2.31	31	8.96
Loma	7	2.02	6	1.73	15	4.34	9	2.60	37	10.69
Loka Abaya	10	2.90	8	2.31	23	6.65	5	1.45	46	13.29
Offa	14	4.05	6	1.73	27	7.80	11	3.18	58	16.76
Sodo Zuria	15	4.34	7	2.02	10	2.90	10	2.90	42	12.14
Selti	10	2.90	4	1.16	10	2.90	4	1.16	28	8.09
Total	93	26.88	46	13.29	141	40.75	66	10.08	346	100%

Source: Own survey

4.13.2 Amount of Credit Delivered

The average credit delivered to sample beneficiaries was 2218.21 Ethiopia birr. Only 9.82% of sample beneficiaries received the maximum amount i.e 4000 Eth. birr, half of them were engaged in animal husbandry, 23.53 % in framings, 17.65% in trade and 8.82% in other small businesses. Only 36.70% of sample beneficiaries had received less than half of the maximum amount.

Among the districts, Aleta Wondo district held the lead beneficiaries with 36.06% beneficiaries received more than 3000 birr followed by Sodo Zuria and Silti with 35.71% each. In Loma, only 18.92% beneficiaries receive more than 3000 birr. Comparing the number of individual beneficiaries who had borrowed more than 3000 birr, Aleta Wondo received more than threefold of Loma. In Alaba, 32.56% of borrowers had received 1000 or less Ethiopian birr.

In observing the level of credits with income generating activities, the average credit given to those who were engaged in animal husbandry was as high as 3123 birr, followed by small business, farming and petty trade. Poultry production has received the least. The average credit received by those who were engaged in animal husbandry was more than double of those who were engaged in poultry. Among those who had borrowed more than 3000 Eth. Birr, 46.24% undertake animal husbandry, 34.40% farming, 12.90% small businesses, and 5.38% petty trade. No animal husbandry beneficiaries had received less than 2000, whereas, 95.65% of those who were engaged in poultry production received less than 2000 Ethiopian birr. None of them had received maximum amount. Animal husbandry, which

constitutes 25.43% of the total sample beneficiaries, employed 35.84% of the credit. In general 33.53% beneficiaries received more than 56% of the total credit disbursed (Table 17).

Table 17. Amount of credit delivered to beneficiaries in terms of activities

Types of activities	More than 3000 Eth.birr		2000-3000 Eth.birr		1000-2000 Eth.birr		Less than 1000 Eth.birr		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Farming	32	21.48	8	5.73	81	54.36	28	18.79	149	100
Animal husbandry	43	46.86	32	36.36	13	14.77	-	-	88	100
Poultry	1	2.17	1	2.17	28	60.87	16	34.78	46	100
Trade	12	30.77	2	5.13	17	43.59	8	20.51	39	100
Other	5	20.83	3	12.50	2	8.33	14	58.33	24	100

Source: Own survey

With regarding the sufficiency of the borrowed money for the intended income generating activities, 45.07% of the respondents reported that it was sufficiency while the remaining 54.91% of the respondents had not found it enough to cover their need. Concerning the distributions of respondents in terms of their income generating activities, this study had revealed that for majority of those engaged in on- farm activity the credit was adequate. However, for 72.72% of respondents who undertook animal husbandry practices the credit obtained was not sufficiency to start their businesses. Questions were also raised why they didn't borrow more money. It was stated that 16.31% of those who claimed

that the credit was insufficiency replied that they took the maximum amount, 37.53% of them had indicated that the ever increasing price has raised the cost for investment more than they had anticipate. In addition some had stated that they were forbidden to borrow the difference. The remaining respondents had indicated that they didn't knew they can borrow more than they had already received (Table 18)

Table 18. Sufficiency of the credit

Types of activities	Sufficient		Not Sufficient	
	No	%	No	%
Farming	89	59.73%	60	40.27%
Animal husbandry	24	27.27%	64	72.73%
Poultry	19	41.30%	27	46.70%
Trade	18	46.15%	21	53.85%
Other activities	6	25%	18	75%

Source: Own survey

The study had revealed that the credit delivery system was not fast and flexible. Almost all respondents express disappointments regarding credit disbursement mechanisms. Out of those who had received credit, 34.10% of them reported that it took more than 3 months to acquire credit, 47.11% them claimed that it took them between 2 and 3, months and 18.79%, had indicated that it took them more than one month. As stated above, no one had received credit within one month and 81.21% spent more than two months to receive credit. Out of those who had waited for more than two months, 63.70% of them spent three or more months. The time required to receive credit varies in terms of districts. In Alaba, 48.84% of beneficiaries spent more than three months whereas in Sodo Zuria, only 16.67% beneficiaries had waited more than three months. In Alaba, only 11.63% of beneficiaries had received credit within 2 months, the remaining, and 88.37% had to wait for two or more months.

No much difference has been observed in terms of income generating activities. It ranges from the highest, 36.46%, of those who were engaged in trade and the least, 30.68%, of animal husbandry beneficiaries spent more than 3 months. Only 12.50% of those who undertook small businesses had received credit within 2 months.

Among the respondents, 41% of them had indicated that they spent extra money due to delay of credit disbursement, as price of items had increases during the intervening period. Moreover, 27% of them had indicated that they had waited six to nine months without utilizing the credit they had received due price increase.

Concerning the interest rate which was around 3%, the majority of the respondents consider it as fair (Table 19).

Table 19. Respondents view on time gap to obtain credit

Districts	Time required to receive credit					
	More than 3 months		2-3 months		1-2 months	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Alaba	21	6.07	17	4.91	5	1.45
Aleta	23	6.65	31	8.96	7	2.02
Wondo						
Burji	14	4.05	13	3.76	4	1.16
Loma	14	4.05	15	4.34	8	2.31
Loka	12	3.47	20	5.78	14	4.05
Abaya						
Offa	18	5.20	30	8.67	10	2.90
Sodo	7	2.02	28	8.09	7	2.02
Zuria						
Selti	9	2.60	9	2.60	10	2.90
Total	118	34.10	163	47.11	65	18.79

Source: Own survey

4.13.3 Credit Repayments

With regard to credit repayment, the study had revealed that 67.63% didn't repay back the loan at all; 2.02% paid more than 75% of the credit; 4.62% had paid between 50% and 74 %; 15.31% paid between 25% and 49%; 10.40% paid less than 25% of the due amount.

No one had paid the full amount on time. No beneficiary of Alaba, Loma, Loka Abaya and Silti districts had paid more than 75%. However, most had paid varied amount. Among those who had paid more than 75% of the amount to be repaid, 42.86% were residents of Sodo Zuria district.

The total amount repaid was 74900 Ethiopian birr which was 9.76% of the total credit delivered. On average Sodo Zuria district beneficiaries had paid 962.50 birr which is much higher than the general average which was 216.47 birr.

Data has indicated that beneficiaries who borrowed higher amount tend to pay back larger amount of their credit. All those who paid back more than 75% were those who had borrowed more than 3000 birr. However, in terms of starting repayment, small borrowers had better records. Among those who had started paying back, 48% were those who had borrowed 1000 or less. However, no one in this category had paid back more than 60% of the loan. Those who had borrowed 500 or less didn't pay more than 30% of the loan (Table 20).

Table 20. Credit Repayment Status

Credit repaid in percent	No of respondent	%
75-99%	7	2.02%
50-74%	16	4.62%
25-49%	53	15.31%
Less than 25%	36	10.40%

Source: Own survey

4.13.4 Delivery of Inputs

For those engaged in farming activities, inputs like fertilizer, highbred seeds, and pesticides should arrive on time with the right quality and quantity. Efficient extension service should also be provided. For those who were engaged in animal husbandry and poultry production inputs such as cross-bred animals, fodder, extension, and veterinary services should be available. For petty trade and other small businesses entrepreneurship and management training are especially important. In addition to such inputs, skill training should be provided for all income generating activities.

In these regard, the study assessed the availability and timely provision of inputs for income generating activities undertaken under FPP. Accordingly it was revealed that provisions of inputs were accompanied by problems such as non- availability, delay, and unaffordable prices.

Regarding the farming sector, only 65.77%, 69.12%, and 63.08% of the respondents had received fertilizer, highbred seeds, and pesticides on time, respectively. Only 35.57% received all the three types of inputs on time. However, only 58.49% enjoyed frequent extension service. This shows that only 20.80% of respondents who were engaged in farming sector got appropriate inputs on time (Table 21).

Table 21. Delivery of inputs to farming

Types of inputs	Beneficiaries who got inputs on time	Beneficiaries who didn't get inputs on time	Beneficiaries who didn't get inputs at all	Total
	No %	No %	No %	No %
Fertilizers	98 65.77	30 20.13	21 14.09	149 100
Hybrid seeds	103 69.13	21 14.09	25 16.78	149 100
Pesticide	94 63.09	28 18.79	27 14.77	149 100

Source: Own survey

With regard to inputs for animal husbandry and poultry production, only 36.36% and 63.04% sample beneficiaries received hybrid animals and only 19.32% and 19.57% got Veterinary services at the time required, respectively (Table 22).

Table 22. Delivery of Inputs for Animal husbandry and Poultry

Inputs	Animal husbandry		Poultry	
	No	%	No	%
Animal	32	36.36	19	63.04
Veterinary services	17	19.32	9	19.57
Fodder	-	-	-	-

Source: Own survey

Respondents were asked the extent to which the inputs delivered to them meet the need of their income generating activities. Out of the total beneficiaries, 12.14% of them affirmed to great extent, 15.02% respond to some extent, 56.65% replied not at all and 16.18% had no comment.

The most pressing problem concerning delivery of inputs as perceived by the respondents were delay of delivery, non-availability, poor quality, and increasing price. The majority of the respondents, (60.12%) identified delay of delivery while 6.07% and 10.40% of the respondents had indicated increasing price and poor quality, respectively. As to the major problem with regard to inputs, 23.41% of them mostly those engaged in non-farm activity stated non- availability of inputs.

When they were asked to express their views concerning the causes of problems related to inputs, 19.65% mentioned reluctance of authority, 58.09% mentioned transportation, and 23.69% were not sure.

Regarding extension services, 12.5% of animal husbandry beneficiaries were visited by extension workers more than twice, 30.68% were visited twice, and 32.95% were visited once, and the remaining didn't have extension visits. Similarly, out of the total respondents who were engaged in poultry production, 6.70% were visited by extension workers more than twice, 15.22% were visited twice, 32.61% were visited once and the remaining were not got the opportunity. None involved in Animal husbandry and poultry production received fodder or training (Table 23).

Table 23. Visitation by extension agent

Type of activities	Visit by <i>Extension worker</i>									
	More than twice		Twice		Once		None		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Farming	56	37.56	47	31.54	26	17.14	20	13.14	149	100
Animal husbandry	11	12.52	27	30.68	29	32.95	21	23.86	88	100
Poultry	4	8.70	7	15.22	15	30.61	20	43.48	46	100

Source: Own survey

Concerning skill and entrepreneurship training, the entire respondents replied they had neither received skill nor entrepreneurship training.

4.14 Forward Linkages

4.14.1 Marketing

No income generating activity would sustain without selling its goods or services. To yield the desired outcome, income generating activities operated by the poor required full ranges of marketing facility. In these regard, it is vital to assess the marketing facilities provided to farmers. The study revealed that almost all beneficiaries, engaged in all the activities, in all the eight districts haven't received any marketing services. In general 85.34% of those who were engaged in crop production reported that they sell their product on their own and 14.33% had indicated that they sell it through their cooperatives. Those who were engaged in livestock and poultry production replied that they had received no marketing services. There is no milk cooperative in the study areas.

4.14.2 Problems of Marketing as Perceived by Respondents

Regarding marketing, respondents identified incapability to reserve products until prices rise, price fluctuations, lack of transport facilities and market information as major problems. However, 17.63% of the respondents, consider transportation as the major problem, 23.12% of respondents consider price fluctuations as the major obstacle. Lack of marketing information was the least chosen problem of market by all districts. Among the list, capacity to store products until prices rise holds the first place (41.33%). Those who mentioned other problem constitute 2.89 %(Table 24).

Table 24. Respondents view on problems of market

Districts	Transportation		Price fluctuation		Lack of market information		Economic incapability		Other problems	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Alaba	8	2.31	5	1.45	8	2.31	22	6.36	-	-
Aleta Wondo	5	1.45	7	2.02	9	2.60	37	10.69	3	0.87
Burji	16	4.62	9	2.60	-	-	6	1.73	-	-
Loma	11	3.18	17	4.91	7	2.02	1	0.30	1	0.30
Loka Abaya	7	2.02	8	2.31	9	2.60	22	6.36	-	-
Offa	7	2.02	14	4.05	6	1.73	31	8.92	-	-
Sodo Zuria	4	1.16	14	4.62	2	0.58	22	6.36	-	-
Selti	3	0.87	6	1.73	11	3.18	2	0.58	6	1.73
Total	61	17.63	80	23.12	52	15.03	143	41.33	10	2.89

Source: Own survey

With regard to the questions concerning inputs and marketing problems, 75.43% of the respondents believed that it is the responsibility of programme authority to solve the problems or deliver inputs and receive the outputs. Only 7.80% had believed that procuring inputs and marketing products as their own responsibility.

4.15 Performances of Income Generating Activities

The average income earned by sample beneficiaries due to the new income generating activities was 1272 Birr. However 25.43% had earned more than Birr 2000 while 38.15% didn't earn any (Table 25). Among those who earn more than Birr 2000, 32.95% of them had earn more than Birr 3500 and among those who had earned less than 500, 28.57% of them earn less than Birr 250. The income earned was not evenly distributed. A wide variation was observed among beneficiaries, districts, and activities. The top 46 sample beneficiaries earned more than 30% of the total income and 38.18% of the sample beneficiaries didn't earn any. Average income of Birr 2998 and 391 were earned by those groups who obtained more than 2000 Birr and less than 500 Birr, respectively.

On average Sodo Zuria district beneficiaries had earned the highest while Loma district beneficiaries had earned the least. Among those who had earned more than Birr 2000, Sodo Zuria district held the highest with 37.21% while Offa district registered the least with 18.97%. More than half of Sodo Zuria district beneficiaries had earned more than Birr 1500 whereas only 27.59% of Offa had earned the same amount. At Loke Abaye, which is the largest (47.83%) and 28.57% of Silti districts beneficiaries had earned none out of the income generating activities.

Table 25. Income earned due to the income generating activities

Districts	More than 2000 Eth.brr		1500-2000 Eth.brr		1000-1500 Eth.brr		500-1000 Eth.brr		Less than 500 Eth.brr		Nothing	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Alaba	10	2.90	6	1.73	3	0.87	2	0.58	4	1.16	18	5.20
Aleta Wondo	13	3.76	7	2.02	8	2.31	6	1.73	3	0.87	24	6.94
Burji	8	2.31	6	1.73	4	1.16	3	0.87	-	-	10	2.90
Loma	9	2.60	7	2.02	4	1.16	4	1.16	2	0.58	11	3.18
Loka Abaya	11	3.18	7	2.02	3	0.87	2	0.58	1	0.30	22	6.36
Offa	11	3.18	5	1.45	10	2.90	4	1.16	3	0.87	25	7.23
Sodo Zuria	16	4.62	9	2.60	3	0.87	-	-	-	-	14	4.05
Selti	10	2.90	5	1.45	3	0.87	1	0.30	1	0.30	8	2.31
Total	88	25.43%	52		38		22		14		132	

		15.09%	10.98%	6.36%	4.05%	38.15%
--	--	--------	--------	-------	-------	--------

Source: Own survey

Farming held the first place followed by animal husbandry, small business, trade, and poultry. In general, 33.56% of those who were engaged in farming and 31.82% of those in animal husbandry got more than Birr 2000. Among the business activities, 49.66% of those who were engaged in farming had earned more than Birr 1500 while 52.17% of those in poultry got less than Birr 1500(Table 26).

Table 26. Income earned in income generating activities

Types of activities	More than 2000 Eth.birr		1500-2000 Eth.birr		1000-1500 Eth.birr		500-1000 Eth.birr		Less than 500 Eth.birr		Nothing	Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	No	
Farming	50	33.56	24	16.11	19	12.75	2	1.34	1	0.67	53	35.57	149
Animal husbandry	28	31.82	14	15.91	4	4.55	4	4.55	1	1.14	37	42.05	88
Poultry	-	-	5	10.87	8	17.39	9	19.57	7	15.22	17	36.96	46
Trade	5	12.82	7	17.95	5	12.82	3	7.69	3	7.69	16	41.03	39
Other	5	20.83	2	8.33	2	8.33	4	16.67	2	8.33	9	37.50	24

Source: Own survey

Regarding the present status of income generating activities, the study had revealed that only 21.39% of the income generating activities were expanding, 22.83% had shown no improvement, 17.63% were declining and remaining stopped operation. In terms of activities, animal husbandry had shown better performances with regards to expansion followed by farming, small business, trade, and poultry. Among those who had shown no improvement, 84.81% of them had expressed that their business would decline soon. Among those who had a declining business 19.67% indicated that their business will revive sooner or later while the remaining lost hope in the revival of their businesses. The study had also revealed that among farm activities, productions of cash crops were expanding better than the other farm activities. In observing at the status of assets of non-beneficiaries, 22.22% were declining, 11.11% were closed the remaining were flourishing.

Table 27. Present status of income the income generating activities

District	Expanding		Show No improve		Declining		Closed	
Alaba	8	2.31	11	3.18	7	2.02	18	5.20
Aleta Wondo	11	3.18	17	4.91	9	2.60	24	6.97
Burji	6	1.73	7	2.02	8	2.31	10	2.90
Loma	10	2.90	6	1.73	10	2.90	11	3.18
Loka Abaya	8	2.31	10	2.90	6	1.73	22	6.36
Offa	11	3.18	10	2.90	12	3.47	25	7.23
Sodo Zuria	14	4.05	9	2.60	4	1.16	14	4.05
Selti	6	1.73	9	2.60	5	1.45	8	2.31
Total	74	21.39	79	22.83	61	17.63	132	38.15

Source: Own survey

The study had revealed that the additional income was used for repayment of credit, educating their children, buying additional food, household materials and maintain, and buying inputs and expanding the existing business. Out of the total sample beneficiaries, 10.75% used major part of their income for educating children, 41.59% utilized it for expand their business and buying inputs, 7.48% for repayment of credit , 33.18% utilized it to buy additional foods, 7% invest in household materials.

Family Package Programme basically was intended to help beneficiaries to create some kind of income generating assets. The extent to which the programme had enabled in creating income generating asset varied. In this regard, only 60.07% of sample beneficiaries had borrowed money to start income generating activities. Among them only 64.85 % had created some kind of assets. Permanent fruit trees, coffee planting, oxen, milk cows, goats, sheep, chicken, small shops, and tools were the major types of assets owned due to FPP. Concerning the level of assets it was revealed that 13 hectares of Permanent fruit tree, 3 hectares of coffee, 78 oxen, 103 milk cows, 26 goats, 22 sheep, 460 chickens, 23 small shops, and 15 tools were owned. Asset creation was not evenly distributed. For instance, in animal husbandry 14.77% of sample beneficiaries hold 59.22% of the asset owned. Poultry shows better distribution of assets.

The data had clearly indicated that on farm activities had shown better achievement in enabling asset creation followed by poultry, small business, trade, and animal husbandry. In farming 51 oxen, 20 cows, 3 hectares of coffee, 10 hectares fruit trees, 4 goats, 2 sheep, and 32 chicken were obtained. However, these assets were not evenly distributed. For instance 8 beneficiaries held 23 oxen, 6 of them owned one milk cow each. Among those who were engaged in farming, 3 individuals had indicated that they only had chicken.

In animals husbandry 70 milk cow, 10 oxen, 12 goats, 13 sheep 41 chickens, and 2 hectares permanent fruit trees were obtained. Uneven distribution of assets was observed among those who were engaged in animal husbandry. The top ten beneficiaries held 34 or 48.57% of total milk cows, 80% of oxen and 75% of permanent fruit trees owned by beneficiaries of this sector. In contrast, the assets of the bottom 4 beneficiaries were 4 goats, 6 sheep, and 7 chicken.

Those who were engaged in poultry owned 350 chicken, 6 oxen, 4 goats and 5 milk cow .Out of the total beneficiaries of this sector, six beneficiaries held only three chicken each while one beneficiary owned 21.

In petty trade, 23 small shops, 7 oxen, 3 milk cows, 2 goats, 6 sheep, and 23 chickens were owned. Those who were engaged in small business owned 15 tool, 5 oxen, 5 milk cows, goats, 1 sheep, and 14 chickens.

As indicated above some beneficiaries had borrowed money to start a particular income generating activity, however, when their activity became profitable they were not restricted to that particular activity rather they bought assets which enabled them to generate more income.

Table 29 Asset created from the credit received

Types of activities	Asset created in number	Asset created in percent
Farming	96	27.75
Animal husbandry	51	14.73
Poultry	29	8.36
Trade	23	6.65
Other	15	4.34
Total	214	64.85

Source: Own survey

Concerning the income of beneficiaries, it was revealed that they earn around 4534 birr on average per year. The highest average income was registered at Aleta Wondo district while the lowest at Burji district. Regarding income generating activities, those engaged in farm activities earned the highest while those engaged in poultry got the lowest. Comparing the average annual income of Family Package Programme with those who were involved only in Productive Safety Net the former exceed the later by more 1200 birr. Moreover comparing these beneficiaries with non-beneficiaries of the two programmes, the annual average income of the later exceed by around 1000 birr. However, in observing the annual

rate, the income of beneficiaries had increased by 21.03% while the non- beneficiaries' annual average income as reported had increased by 8.01%. Comparing the average annual income rate of non- beneficiaries with those who were involved only in Productive Safety Net the former exceed the later only by 1.21%.

References

Altherton Martain(1993),We must change the way we do business, Christian Social Action.

Amanda R. and Mickey L. (2008), History of Food Security in International Development, Christian Childern's funds, Honduras.

Cynthia P. Green (1993), Too Many People: Not Enough Food, Form for Applied Research and Public Policies.

Bryon Mc Donald (2010), Food security, Polity press, London.

Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), 2008 Study Guide on Development, Freedom from Hunger Campaign, Rome.

Fred Sai (1994), Hope and Warning, vol 3, courtesy Banson London.

George Kent (2205), Food and Nutritional security, George TownUniversity press.

Getachew Dirriba (1995), Economy at Cross roads; Famine and Food Security in Ethiopia , commercials printers.

Ghosh, pradipk K. (1984), The third world Development-A Basic need approach.

Jhone P.and T. Miller (1992), Hand Book on African Hunger, Mary Knoll Justice, Washington.

Koc, M.R Macroe and Bronson (2008), Inter Disciplinary Perspective in Food Studies, Toronto, Mc Grow Hill Ryerson.

Kurt J. (1993), Famine, Genocide, and Refugees, Monterial Institute for Genocide and Human Right Studies, Montreal.

Lester R.Brown(1994),Facing Food Security, WashingtonUniversity Press, Washington.

Lori ,L.Reid (2007), The Consequences of Food Insecurity for Child Wellbeing, FloridaStateUniversity.

Lynn, L.E (1998), Programme evaluation, sage, London.

Malthreyi K. (2007), Gender, Food Security, and Rural Livelihood, Stree Press.

Micheal Glantz (1991), Desertification, National Centre for Atmospheric Research

Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (2003), Productive Safety Net Programme Implementation Manual, Addis Abeba July 2003.

Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (2010), Productive Safety Net Programme Implementation Manual,Addis Abeba July 2003.

One World Guide (2008),Global Food Security, University of East London, London.

Rebeca Shiff and B.Muss(2007),Alternative Food Movement, Murdoch University, Western Australia.

Robert S. Chen (1993), Hunger out Look: peril or promise.

Robert W.Kates(1993),Ending Death from Famine, The New England Journal of Medicine, Massachusetts Medical Society.

Sharon Pauling(1994),Foreign Aids in Need of Fixing, Christian Social Action.

Sheldon Richman (1993), Forget the Myth of Over Population, Insight the news.

SNNP State Agriculture and Rural Development Bureau (2006), Family based production and Income enhancement Package Implementation Manual, Hawassa.

SNNP State Food security Bureau (2003), Family Package Programme Implementation Manual, Hawassa.

The New Coalition (2003), Food Security Programme in Ethiopia,Volume 1 November 2003 Addis Abeba.

Tom Bethell(1993),Exporting Famine, The American Spectator.

UNDP, (1995), Human Development Report, OxfordUniversity press

World Health Organization, (1995) world Health Report, WHO Geneva

World Bank (2003), World Development Report, Ox ford

World Bank (2003), World Development Report, Ox ford

Y. Tekolla (1997), The Puzzling paradox of African Food Crisis, UN economic commission for Africa

Appendix I

Interview Schedule for beneficiaries

Persona Information

Name

Sex

Address

1. What are the causes of food security?

2. How long have you been covered under PSNP?

a. for 3 years b. between 3 and 4 years c. for 5 years d. for more than 5 years

3. In what kinds of works have you been engaged before you were covered under PSNP?

a. in agriculture b. in animal husbandry c. in non-agricultural activities d. I don't have a work

4. For how many months per year were you engaged in community work as beneficiary of PSNP?

5. How much have you got paid per day?
6. Is the salary you got enough comparing with the community work you have performed?
- a. enough b. not enough c. more than enough
7. Do you like the community work you have performed?
- a. yes b. no c. can't say
8. To what extent the community work have undertaken took the time you have to spend on your own activities?
- a. to a great extent b. to some extent c. hardly any
9. Is the community work you have performed under PSNP directly affects your productivity level?
- a. yes b. no
10. Your payment as beneficiary of PSNP ensures food security?
- a. yes b. no
11. Do you think the activities undertaken under PSNP help in creating durable community assets?
12. How many members of your families covered under PSNP?
13. Have you ever tried to be food secure and being out of PSNP?
- a. yes b. no
14. What kinds of efforts have you made by your own to be out of PSNP?
15. Do you believe that the government has responsibility to cover all those who are food insecure?
- a. yes b. no
16. In your opinion who is responsible to ensure food security?

a. I am b. NGO,s c. government d. others

17. What kinds of measures do you take if you are not covered by PSNP?

18. For how long do you want to be covered under PSNP?

19. What do you feel for being covered under PSNP?

a. dependent b. secured (in terms of food) c. nothing d .I am not sure

20. What would happen if PSNP is terminated?

21. What is the community attitude toward the benefits of the programme?

22. How do you see the public works you have undertaken?

a. as a work in which I got salary for living b. as a work through which I got assistance to ensure food security c. as temporary work through which I got assistance

23. Are you covered under FPP?

a. yes b. no

24. How long have you been covered under FPP?

a. for 3 years b. between 3 and 5 years c. for 5 years d. for more than 5 years

25. How much money have you borrowed?

26. What kinds of income generating activities you have started with the credit?

a. I bought cattle b. expand my farm c .off farm activities d. other

27. Is the money you have borrowed enough for you new income generating activity?

a. yes b. no

28. How much additional income do you get from your activity per year?

a. more than 2000 birr b. between 1000 and 2000 birr c. between 500 and 1000

d. I get nothing

29. In what way do you spend the additional income?

30. Is the income you have been getting from the new income generating activity helps you to ensure food security?

a. yes b. no

31. Do you think all the beneficiaries of the programme are food insecure?

a. yes b. no

32. Is the interest of the loan fair enough?

a. yes b. no

33. Is the loan disbursement mechanism fair enough?

a. yes b. no

34. What percent of the credit have been paid by you so far?

a. 100% b. 75%-99% c. 50%-74% d. less than 50% e. I didn't pay

35. If you didn't pay your credit, why?

36. Have you get enough inputs to your income generating activity?

a. yes b. no

37. What kinds of difficulties have you faced in getting inputs or marketing your product?

38. What kinds of trainings have you get before you start income generating activity?

a. skill trainings b. entrepreneur trainings c. management trainings d. all e. other f. I didn't get any

39. In what way do you prefer to have credit?

- a. in cash b. in kind

40. Do you have a chance to choose the kind of activity you want to engage?

- a. yes b. no

41. What is the current state of your income generating activity?

- a. it is expanding b. it is declining c. show no improvements d. it is closed

42. How do you get inputs for your activity?

- a. it is provided by government b. it is provided NGO's c. I arrange by my self

43. Do you think provision of inputs is government's responsibility?

- a. yes b. no

44. How do you sell your product?

- a. I sell to government agency b. I sell to NGO's c. I sell cooperatives d. I sell in the market

45. Do you think the government has to receive your product?

- a. yes b. no

46. What kind of measure do you take if you face inputs and marketing problems?

47 Do you have any asset which is created due to this programme?

Appendix II

Questionnaires to Project Staff

1. Personal information

- . Name
- . Address
- . Responsibility in the project
- . Educational qualification
- . Work experience

2. How long have you been working in this project?

a. more than 5 years b. 4-5 years c. 3-4 years c. 2-3 years d. 1-2 years e. less than a year

3. What are the objectives of PSNP and FPP?

4. Who is responsible for the implementation of the programmes ?

- a. working groups b. head of agricultural bureau c. project manager
 - d. others(mention)
- 5 Are there adequate personnel available for the programmes?
- a. yes b. no
6. Are the staffs posted for the programmes qualified?
- a. yes b. no
7. What are the procedures for implementation?
8. To what extent that the implementation of the programmes suitable for local condition?
- a. to great extent b. to some extent c. not suitable
9. Do you think that implementation procedure need modification to make it more suitable for local condition?
- a. yes b. no
10. Are the procedures of implementation flexible to adapt to local situation?
- a. very flexible b. fairly flexible c. les flexible s d. not flexible
11. What are the major problems you have encountered in implementation of programmes?
12. How do you select the beneficiaries of the programmes?
13. Do all the beneficiaries eligible?
- a. yes b. no
14. What kinds of works have been given priority in selecting works under PSNP?
15. Does the community participate in prioritization, planning and implementing the community works under PSNP?

16. To what extent the works undertaken are relevant to local needs?
 - a. to great extent b. to some extent c. not relevant
17. What are the current states of the assets created under PSNP?
 - a. flourishing b. show no improvement c. declining
18. What are the procedures for disbursement of credit?
19. Do you think that the procedures followed for credit disbursement easy, flexible, and simple?
 - a. yes b. no
20. How much credit have you been provided so far?
21. How much of it have been repaid so far?
22. What are the major problems in disbursement and repaying credit?
23. How often do you provide inputs on time?
 - a. always b. sometimes c. rarely
24. What are the major problems you have been facing in providing inputs?
25. What kinds of mechanisms do you employ to closely follow the activities of the beneficiaries to make their income generating activities viable and profitable?

A STUDY ON THE CONTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTIVE
SAFETY NET AND FAMILY PACKAGE PROGRAMME OF
SNNPR STATE IN ENSURING FOOD SECURITY.

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL
DEVELOPMENT, SCHOOL OF CONTINUING
EDUCATION IGNOU IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENT FOR M.A DEGREE IN RURAL
DEVELOPMENT.

PREPARED BY: WUBNEH BEKELE GEBEREMARIAM

ENROLMENT NUMBER: MARD 069124964

ADVISOR: DR. MENGISTU HULLUKA

APRIL 2011

Declaration

I hereby declare that the dissertation entitled "A Study on The Contribution of Productive Safety Net and Family Package Programme of SNNP State in Ensuring Food Security" submitted by me for partial fulfillment of M.A in Rural Development to Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU), New Delhi is my own original work and has not been submitted earlier to IGNOU or any other institutions for fulfillment of requirement of any course or study. I also declare that no chapter of this manuscript in whole or in part is lifted or incorporated in this report from my earlier work done by me or others.

Place: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Enrollment Number: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

E-Mail: _____

Telephone: _____

Certification

This is to certify that Mr. Wubneh Bekele Geberemariam student of M.A (RD) from Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU), was working under my supervision and guidance for his project work for the course MRDP-001. His project work entitled “A Study on the Contribution of Productive Safety Net and Family Package Programme of SNNP State in Ensuring Food Security” which he is submitting is genuine and original work.

Place: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Adviser Name: Dr. Mengistu Hulluka

Acknowledgements

So many people influenced this research paper that it would be impossible to mention all, but I must say special thanks to my adviser Dr. Mengistu Hulleka for his extraordinary advice and suggestion.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude and thanks to my mother W/r Attalelech G. Tsadike whose financial and material support goes beyond what I can inscribe on paper, it will remain engraved in my heart.

I am also deeply indebted to my father Ato Bekele G. Mariam. I wish you were with us in moment like this.

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my sister Mullu and my brothers Ase, Dere, Buze, Kecho and Zola.

Thank you all indeed

Wubneh

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE

	1. Introduction	1
1	1.1 Background of the study	
4	1.2 Statement of the problem	
6	1.3 Important terms used in the study	
	1.3.1 Food security	6
8	1.3.2 Food insecurity	
8	1.3.3 Hunger	
9	1.3.4 Contribution	
9	1.3.5 Ensuring food security	

9	1.3.6 Productive safety net programme
9	1.3.7 Family package programme
10	1.4 Objectives of the study
10	1.5 Hypothesis
11	1.6 Scope and Limitation of the study

CHAPTER TWO

12	2. Review of Related Literature
12	2.1 Origin and Concept of food security
20	2.2 Factors affecting food security
20	2.2.1 Population growth, Environmental degradation and Food security
	2.3 Approach to food security26
	2.4 Consequences of food insecurity36

CHAPTER THREE

41	3. Research Methodology
41	3.1 Research Design
41	3.2 Sampling

42 3.3 Data collection

43 3.4 Processing and Analysis of Data

CHAPTER FOUR

45 4. Result and Discussion

45 4.1 Household Characteristics

47 4.2 Causes of Food Insecurity

48 4.3 Beneficiaries Food Gap Priors to the Programme

50 4.4 Respondents Engagements in Public Service

52 4.5 Contribution of Public Works Payments in Reducing

Food Gap

55 4.6 Effort Made to Ensuring Food Security

57 4.7 Length of Time Respondents Wishes to Stay Under PSNP

63 4.8 Responsibility for Ensuring Food Security

64 4.9 Fate of Beneficiaries in Case of the Programme Terminated

66 4.10 Perception Towards Public Work

68	4.11 Coverage of Family Package Programme	
68	4.12 Income generating activities Undertaken by Respondents	
72	4.13 Backward and Forward Linkages	
	4.13.1 Backward Linkages	72
73	4.13.2 Amount of Credit Delivered	
78	4.13.3 Credit Repayment	
80	4.13.4 Delivery of Inputs	
84	4.15 Forward Linkages	
84	4.15.1 Marketing	
	4.2.2 Performance of the income generating activities	86

CHAPTER FIVE

94	5. Conclusion and Recommendations
94	5.1 Conclusion
100	5.2 Recommendations

List of Tables

Table Page

Table--1-----	7
Table--2-----	46
Table--3-----	48
Table--4-----	50
Table--5-----	52
Table--6-----	54
Table--7-----	56
Table--8-----	58
Table--9-----	59
Table--10-----	61
Table--11-----	63
Table--12-----	65
Table--13-----	67
Table--14-----	69
Table--15-----	71
Table--16-----	73
Table--17-----	74
Table--18-----	76
Table--19-----	78
Table--20-----	80
Table--21-----	81

Table--22-----	82
Table--23-----	83
Table--24-----	85
Table--25-----	87
Table--26-----	88
Table--27-----	89
Table--28-----	92

Acronyms

AH	Animal husbandry
BOP	Beneficiary oriented programme
DA	Development assistance

FEDR	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
FIS	Food insecurity
FPP	Family package programme
FS	Food security
FSP	Food security programme
HH	House holds
IGA	Income generating activities
KFSTF	Kebele food security task force
NCFS	New coalition for food security
PSNP	Productive safety net programme
PSNPM	Productive safety net programme manual
SNNP	South nation nationality and people

Abstract

This study identified that PSN and FP programmes contributed little toward ensuring sustainable food security. In some instances programmes perpetuate further food insecurity and dependence. The objectives of enabling beneficiaries enjoy a twelve months sufficient food were not attained. PSNP enabled beneficiaries to cover only 2.57 months of their food gap. Low outputs of public work projects were responsible for such under performance. Against the targeted 30 days, beneficiaries engaged in public works for less than 20 days.

Beneficiaries exhibited dependence attitude toward meeting food needs. Such attitude perpetuated by the inherent nature of PSNP (the programme assist beneficiaries for unlimited time) it also lacks strong mechanisms for assessing the status of the beneficiaries.

The coverage of FPP was unsatisfactory. Moreover, it didn't provide full-fledged backward and forward linkages. Some of the beneficiaries didn't received inputs at all; others received poor quality inputs but in most cases inputs didn't arrive on the time required.

Under FPP provision of marketing facilities, motivational, skills, entrepreneurial, and management training were denied.

Most of the incomes generating activities were declining or stopped operating. Beneficiaries of such income generating activities were unable to pay their loans and they face the risk of selling assets.