

*Full length Research paper*

# **The Contribution of Productive Safety Net and Family Package Programmes in Ensuring Food Security in the Southern Nations Nationalities and Peoples Region of Ethiopia**

**Wubneh Bekele\* and Tiratu Belay**

\* P.O.Box 419, Shashemene, Ethiopia

Hawassa University, Wondo Genet College of Forestry and Natural Resources, P.O.Box 128, Shashemene, Ethiopia.

Accepted 5<sup>th</sup>, June, 2021.

This study assessed the extent to which Productive Safety Net and Family Package Programmes (PSNP-FPP) help the beneficiaries in creating income generating assets; studied whether these programmes create dependency on the beneficiaries; and analyzed the efficiency of service delivery mechanisms of these programmes in the Southern Nations Nationalities and Peoples Region (SNNPR) of Ethiopia. Multi stage stratified sampling method was used. In the first stage of the sampling process, 8 districts were randomly selected, out of 72 districts found in the study region. In the second stage, from the selected 8 districts, all kebeles which were covered by PSNP and FPP were recorded. In the third stage, 3 kebeles from each district (24 kebeles in total) were drawn randomly. At last, from each selected kebeles 26 men and women headed households were selected purposively to accommodate both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of the programme. In addition to this, 1 project staff from each selected kebele was also selected. Both primary and secondary data were collected from beneficiary and non-beneficiary households of the programme, as well as from manuals, various documents, reports, and other relevant literature. The major tools of data collection used were interview, questionnaire and observation. After having the data organized, it was analyzed through descriptive statistics. To identify the cause and effect relationship, test the hypothesis and make generalization, inferential statistics was also applied. Finally, the result of the data analyzed was presented using tables. The 'before and after evaluation design with control group' were used in order to identify the real contributions of the programmes. The study revealed that farming, animal husbandry, poultry, trade and small business are the main income generating activities in which the beneficiaries of FPP were engaged in. Among these activities, farming took the lion's share, where more than half of FPP beneficiaries were engaged in. It was also found out that, among the sample FPP beneficiaries, only 61.85% created income generating assets. This implied that the rest failed to achieve food security. The study also showed that only 60.07% of the sample PSNP beneficiaries were covered under FPP, implying that the rest, i.e., 39.93% of sample beneficiaries which were not covered under FPP, did not achieve food security and remained dependent on the assistance provided under PSNP. In addition to these key findings, most of the service delivery mechanisms of these programmes were found to be inefficient. This implied that such delivery system discouraged the borrowers because they waste an unanticipated time and resources. Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that the programmes not only achieved little toward ensuring food security, but also perpetuate further poverty, food insecurity, and dependency.

**Key words:** Beneficiary, dependency, efficiency, FPPs, food Security, income generating assets, PSNPs, service delivery mechanisms.

## INTRODUCTION

### 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 reduce 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 also particularly vulnerable to food insecurity. According to Tekola (1997), 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. Over population, 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 impingements 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).

Besides, 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 later 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 (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.

### 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

---

\*Corresponding author: Email: wubneh7273@gmail.com

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 are 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 shown 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 the SNNPR of Ethiopia is one of the food insecure regions of the country, food security programme have been carried out in the region. According to the SNNPR's Food Security Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Bureau (SNNPR-FSDPPB), 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 (SNNPR-FSDPPB Report, 2006).

The PSNP 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 could not engage in public work due to old age or physical disability the payment is delivered unconditionally. On the other hand, FPP 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 was felt that these programmes have not fully achieved their objectives and have not been 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 weaknesses and strengths and find out ways and means to make these programmes achieve their objectives. Nevertheless, until recently no concrete study has been undertaken to identify the contribution, strengths and weaknesses of these programmes in order to improve their efficiency and effectiveness. This has laid the foundation for the inception of this study.

### Objectives of the study

The general objective of the study was to investigate the role and effectiveness of PSNP and FPP in ensuring food security in the SNNPR of Ethiopia.

The specific objectives of the study were to:

- Assess the extent to which these programmes help the beneficiaries in creating income generating assets;
- Study whether these programmes create dependency on the beneficiary; and
- Study the efficiency of service delivery mechanisms of these programmes.

### Hypothesis

The hypotheses framed for this study included:

- PSNP and FPP offered insufficient help to the beneficiaries in creating income generating asset;
- These programmes create dependency among the beneficiaries; and
- These programmes made little effort towards ensuring food security.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 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 beneficiary 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 PSNP and FPP 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 used for comparison. In addition to these one project staff from each selected kebeles was also selected.

### Data collection

Since the success of any research study depends on reliable and accurate data, both primary and secondary data were collected. The primary data was collected through intensive field survey. During the field survey, different data collection tools 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 back ground, socio economic back ground etc.

The second part of the interviews scheduled was designed to obtain data necessary to assess the contribution of the PSNP. The third part of the interview schedule was focused on those questions which help to identify the contribution of FPP. The fourth part of the interview schedule was focused on identifying the cumulative effects of the two programmes. Questions which were important to assess 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. While the questionnaires were used to collect data from the district food security task force, the observation were employed to assess the conditions of asset developed through public work, which is part of Production Safely Net Programme. In addition, secondary data were also collected from Federal PSNP 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.

### 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 result of the data analyzed were presented using table.

### Research Design

Since the main purpose of this research is studying the contributions of PSNP and FPP, the 'before and after evaluation design with control group' were used in order to identify the real contributions of the programmer. The collected data were summarized and compared with the date that was already collected by the implementers of the programme before they start implementing it. Any differences between them were recorded.

### Analysis and Interpretation of Data PSNP

Table 1: Personal related 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	37	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	28	25	16	29	27
Sodo Zuria	72	13	59	23	33	16	8	34	30

The data collected for this study revealed that shortage of land, frequent drought and infertile soil, large family size, shortage of labour and livestock are the major causes of food insecurity. The intensity of these causes, however, varies from one district to another as well as among different When age group. In general, 48.26% of the respondents identified lower land size as the major cause of food in security, 29.17% of them said frequent drought and infertile land, and 20.14% indicated lack of live stock and labour as the cause of their food insecurity.

Among the respondents' only 2.43% indicated large family size. In terms of district 73.61% of the

respondents in Sodo Zuria district and 70.83% 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% of respondents aged 35 and below mentioned shortage of land and 72% 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 2: Causes of Food insecurity**

District	Shortage of land	Frequent draught and infertile soil	Shortage of Labour and livestock	Large family size
Alaba	24	28	19	1
Aleta Wondo	37	18	15	2
Burji	33	22	15	2
Loma	24	25	22	1
Loka Abaya	19	30	22	1
Offa	51	12	6	3
Selti	37	19	14	2
Sodo Zuria	53	14	3	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>14</b>

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 ranges from 3 months to 9 months. Out of the total sample 22.04% respondents indicated that they had faced severe food shortage for seven to nine months in each year. Among them 2.95% respondents' food gap was nine months. While largest percentage in this group situated 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% of the respondents indicated that it was between 3 and 5 months, 6.94% of the respondents, most of them are children who lose their parents mentioned that they were not food insecure when their parent were alive

and covered under the program after the incident. The average food gap of the respondents was 4.76 months. 34.90% beneficiaries' indicated that their food gap was more than 6 months.

Non- beneficiaries were also asked to indicate their food gap. Accordingly 64.58% of them reported that they never been food insecure in five years. The rest indicated that they were food insecure once due to an 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.

Answering how they cover their food gap prior to the programme 91.25% sample beneficiaries said they had received food aid and 2.8% of them indicated that they had borrowed grain and pay back after the harvest.

**Table 3: Sample beneficiaries' Food gap prior to the programme**

District	Food gap in a year			
	7-9 months	5-7 months	3-5 months	Food secure
Alaba	23	20	21	8
Aleta Wondo	14	36	21	1
Burji	17	38	17	-
Loma	20	30	18	4
Loka Abaya	8	37	22	5
Offa	19	26	23	4
Selti	16	31	15	10
Sodo Zuria	10	41	13	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>40</b>

According to the guideline of PSNP to be covered under PSNP the beneficiaries' food gap should be three or more months.

Regarding the number of days the beneficiaries of the programme engaged in the public works, it was found that out of the total sample beneficiaries covered under this study only 21.26% engaged in public work for 25-30 days; 16.67% worked for 20-25 days; 32.47% worked for 15-20 days; 25.87% worked for 10-15days and 3.47% engaged for less than 10 days. Concerning districts` the least percentage registered 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 PSNP 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 days beneficiaries engaged in public work was 19.59 which is around 65.30% of the targeted 30 days. These adversely affect their ability to minimize their food gap.

**Table 4: Number of days that respondents engaged in public work**

Districts	25-30	20-25	15-20	10-15	Less than 10
Alaba	23	18	20	11	-
Aleta Wondo	10	12	28	22	-
Burji	16	8	26	20	2
Loma	16	14	26	10	6
Loka Abaya	15	11	24	17	5
Offa	17	12	22	16	5
Selti	14	9	21	28	-
Sodo Zuria	13	12	20	25	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>20</b>

This research also tried to identify the contribution of their payments toward improving their food insecurity status. In this regard all respondents answered positively. However, when they were asked the extent of its contribution 48.33% said very little, 23.41% of the respondents indicated that the payments is fairly contribute to minimize their food gap, 7.80% of the respondents indicated that their food gap is completely covered by the payments the rest of the respondent indicated that they cannot said. When they were asked how much months of their food gap of a single year covered by the payments 21.53% of them reported that

it covered more than 3 months of their food gap, 32.12% said it covered 2-3 months, 17.53% of them indicated that 1 to 2 months of their food gap was covered, and 26.04% of them indicated 1 month 2.86% replied that they cannot said. The average food gap covered by PSNP transfer as indicated by sample respondents was 2.57 months. Nobody covered more than 6 months of his/her food gap. While examining their answer and number of family covered under the programme, their prior food gap, and the amount of other asset, those who have more assets and less prior food gap provided more positive answer.

**Table 5: Contributions of PSNP payments toward minimizing food gaps**

District	Contribution of PSNP payment				
	More than 3 months	2-3 months	1-2months	1 month	Can't say
Alaba	23	28	9	10	2
Aleta Wondo	10	21	13	25	3
Burji	12	19	10	31	-
Loma	17	24	13	12	6
Loka Abaya	18	24	16	12	2
Offa	16	20	12	23	1
Selti	14	26	14	17	1
Sodo Zuria	14	23	14	20	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>16</b>

Concerning the fairness of the payment in relation to the public work they undertake, majority of the respondents that means 52.78% replied it is fair, 37.15% say it is not the rest mentioned they cannot say. For the question which type of the community work they prefer to undertake 15.45% replied they don't like any of them, 11.81% prefer construction of school, 39.93% prefer environmental protection related activities, 6.25% like all kind of works, 21.70% prefer farm related activity, and the rest said construction of roads.

Regarding the impacts of the day and the labour spent on the public work on beneficiaries own activities, the respondents answers were greatly varied. Majority of those who engaged in non-farm activities and those who have also actively engaged in income generating activities using the money borrowed from the Family Package component reported that it has a great impact on their activity as the schedule for public works are not suitable to their activities. Accordingly 14.24% of them said it greatly affects their activities, 34.72% indicated it affect 19.62% not much; 31.60 doesn't affect.

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. To identify this various questions were asked to the beneficiaries. One of it was forwarded to find especial efforts made by their own to be food secure and being out of the programme. Accordingly it was revealed that among the PSNP clients only 35.76% made efforts by their own to be food secure.

Concerning district variation significant 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 made better efforts to be food secure than the older. Surprisingly the data clearly showed that the percentage of women headed households who has made efforts of one kind or another to be food secure is more than their male counterpart.

**Table 6: Effort Made by respondents to ensure food security**

Districts	Beneficiaries who made own efforts		Beneficiaries who didn't made own efforts	
	In number	In percent	In number	In percent
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

Those who never try to be out of the programme also asked to explain why they didn't, among them 1.78% respondents reported their inability due to old age or permanent physical disability, 37.4% indicated lack of resources, 60.82% mentioned several other reasons. Those who made their own effort also asked the kind of activities they have been undertaken, among them 56.64% most of them male, indicated that they have been working hard on their farm using modern inputs like fertilizer, 17.62% majority of them young, engaged in off-farm activities, 10.18% involved in fattening of cattle, 15.56% 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% respondents households who are incapable of undertaking economic activities, the rest were supposed to make their own endeavor, unfortunately they didn't.

The clients of PSNP were also asked how long they want to cover under the program. Among them 39.06% said till they ensure complete food security, 43.75% replied as long as they are allowed, 7.29% of them are not sure and the rest indicated that they want to be out of the programme now.

The latter two groups were also asked why, 57.73% of those who said as long as they are allowed indicated that they lose noting rather again some from being covered under the program so they don't want to be out, others indicated that they might be insecure in the

**Table 7: How long respondents want to be covered under PSNP**

District	Till ensure food security	As long as allowed	Not sure	Want to out now
Alaba	27	29	6	10
Aleta Wondo	32	34	4	2
Burji	28	34	5	5
Loma	35	28	2	7
Loka Abaya	28	33	5	6
Offa	31	28	3	10
Selti	22	31	11	8
Sodo Zuria	22	35	6	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>225 39.06%</b>	<b>252 43.75%</b>	<b>42 7.29%</b>	<b>57 9.90%</b>

future. For the question why they want to be out, those who expressed their wish to be out indicated that they don't like to be assisted any more. They indicated that because of the last assistances they are in the position

to ensure food security in sustainable base and the time spent in public work worth more than they can earn from the public work.

**Table 8: Why they want to stay as long as they are allowed**

District	Loss nothing	Fear of being food insecure again
Alaba	18	11
Aleta Wondo	20	14
Burji	19	15
Loma	13	15
Loka Abaya	21	12
Offa	16	12
Selti	19	12
Sodo Zuria	19	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>107</b>

It is easy to identify two issues from the answer of those who said they want to stay as long as they are allowed. One of it is fear of being food insecure again; such beneficiaries should be encouraged to expand their income generating activities with well organized backward and forward linkages.

For those who said they have nothing to lose as a beneficiaries; efforts should be taken to make them engaged in economic activities which have a better return compare to the payment they have got from undertaking public work.

Regarding when they expected to ensure food security and being out of the programme, 15.45% replied they

became food security within 6 months, 17.53% replied they need 6 months to one year, 24.48% replied they need more than a year, 31.42% said they are not sure, 11.11% said they won't. Those who hope to ensure food security indicated that the growth of their income and production due to the credit they borrowed from the FPP to invest in their farm, livestock, and other off-farm activities as reason. Among those who said they are not sure and will not ensure food security, 30.15% expressed that it is because the farm and other income generating activities they had started were bankrupt and 52.81% didn't start even one though they are able to do so.

**Table 9: When they expected to ensure Food Security**

District	0- 6 months	6 months-1 year	More than a year	Not sure	Will not
Alaba	13	10	23	21	5
Aleta Wondo	11	13	23	20	5
Burji	16	12	19	21	4
Loma	8	15	14	25	10
Loka Abaya	8	16	16	20	12
Offa	9	15	17	20	11
Selti	14	10	14	28	6
Sodo Zuria	10	10	15	26	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>89 15.45%</b>	<b>101 17.53%</b>	<b>141 24.48%</b>	<b>181 31.42%</b>	<b>64 11.11%</b>



Data also revealed that all of the previous years' graduates are those who are successful in income generating activities. This implies that the impact of FPP has been encouraging. So that even those who bankrupt after starting business should get additional credit and technical advice as well as skill and entrepreneur training.

Out of the total clients of PSNP 74.81% of them believe that the government has responsibility to cover all those who are food insecure under PSNP, 20.47% of respondents said that the government should cover not all food insecure but the aged and disabled.

For the question "Who is responsible to ensure food security, a wide varieties of answer were replied. Only 27.95% of the respondents responded that they themselves are responsible to ensure food security, 25.87% said that the local community also has responsibility according to the local tradition, 42.36% mentioned external body, and 3.82% said God. Among those who mentioned external bodies also responsible to ensuring food security 56.71% identified government, 22.18% mentioned non-governmental organization and rest indicated both government and NGO's. More than 70% respondents didn't consider themselves responsible to ensure food security.

**Table 10: Responsibility of ensuring food security**

Districts	My self	Local community	External bodies	God
Alaba	18	20	31	3
Aleta Wondo	12	17	37	6
Burji	11	24	33	4
Loma	16	16	37	3
Loka Abaya	26	16	28	2
Offa	26	15	30	1
Selti	24	22	23	3
Sodo Zuria	28	19	25	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>22</b>

Here it is easy to see how harsh the attitude of PSNP beneficiaries towards achieving food security. Majority of them didn't take responsibility for being food insecure. Without this it is unlike that they develop internal motivation to alleviate it. Second they tend to point to other for ensuring food security. The result of these two perceptions contributes for not making their own efforts. As indicated above only 35.75% of them made their own efforts. Regarding the kind of measure they might have took, if they are not covered under the PSNP in spite of their food insecurity situation, only 19.68% replied they struggle to survive with the asset they have, 15.62% believe that God wouldn't let them starved, 24.84% will insist assistance from relatives and neighbors 13.43% reported they will have no other option than starving, 26.40% said that, me or one or two

of my children will migrate to cities to help the rest of the family. The data collected regarding their perception toward being covered under the programme, only 4.51% mentioned that they feel dependent, 44.62% indicated that they feel secured with regard to food, 7.64% indicated they are not sure while 38.02% said that they feel nothing. Among the beneficiaries of the programme majority of them that means 66.09% believe that the programme will not be terminated, the rest believe it may be terminated. Concerning what would happen if the programme is terminated now only 11.11% said that they face no problem, 9.72% said even if they face some problems they would tackle it, 32.12% take migration to town as option; 39.76% believe they will be a burden for the relative, the rest indicated other options.

**Table 11: What would happen if the programme is terminated**

Districts	Face no problem	Tackle it	Migrate	Burden	other
Alaba	14	14	14	22	8
Aleta Wondo	12	4	16	32	8
Burji	2	6	34	30	-
Loma	1	6	34	25	6
Loka Abaya	11	6	23	24	8
Offa	6	4	20	36	6
Selti	8	8	24	32	-
Sodo Zuria	10	8	20	28	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>42</b>

The study also tried to identify their perception towards the public work. 67.53% of them 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 rest 9.90% provided various answer.

**Table 12: Perception towards public work**

Districts	Seasonal work	Work for the development the community	Means of receiving Assistance	Other
Alaba	53	9	5	5
Aleta Wondo	46	13	5	8
Burji	48	16	2	6
Loma	48	11	7	6
Loka Abaya	51	10	2	9
Offa	47	10	8	7
Selti	45	9	11	7
Sodo Zuria	51	7	5	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>57</b>

## FPP

According to the guideline all chronically food insecure households should be covered under PSNP in which they receive cash and/or grain in return to public work they suppose to undertake. Since assistances provided under PSNP cannot ensure food security on sustainable base, all the beneficiaries of the programme also supposed to cover under FPP. Under this programme beneficiaries should 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 PSNP, and enable them to move towards full food security (PSNP Manual, 2008). The income generating activities could be on farm such as growing cash crop, permanent fruit trees or vegetables, animal husbandry, poultry, trade or other own business.

Though all PSNP beneficiaries except those who entitle unconditional transfer due to physical and/or mental illness or old age are suppose to be covered under FPP, this study revealed that only 346 of the sample beneficiaries that means 60.07% of the sample beneficiaries were covered under FPP and start income generating activities. Regarding inter district variation the coverage ranges from the highest 84.89% which is found in Aleta Wondo district and the lowest 38.89% which is recorded in Selti district.

**Table 13: Coverage of FPP**

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

Concerning 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 trade and 6.94% in other types of activities. Observing income generating activities in terms of districts, majority of Sodo Zuria district sample beneficiaries (57.14%) engaged in animal husbandry. In that district

11.90% of sample beneficiaries involved in poultry, 21.42% in on farm 2.38% in trade and the remaining undertake varieties of other activities. In Aleta Wondo district majority of them engaged in on farm activities which include coffee and fruit.

Moreover data obtain from district staffs and annual report indicated that all of those graduated from PSNP were the beneficiaries of FPP. Data obtain were also

Table 14: Income generating activities

Districts	Farming	Animal husbandry	Poultry	Trade	Other activities	Total
Alaba	16	9	4	6	8	43
Aleta Wondo	34	13	6	8	-	61
Burji	13	7	6	3	2	31
Loma	16	11	8	2	-	37
Loka Abaya	23	10	8	2	3	46
Offa	26	8	7	9	8	58
Sodo Zuria	9	24	5	1	3	42
Selti	12	6	2	8	-	28

clearly indicated that the number of PSNP who cover under FPP are showing increasing trend in the last three years.

### Backward and forward linkages

The success of any income generating activity greatly depends on a well organized and appropriate backward and forward linkage. Backward linkage refers to all inputs which are vital to produce goods and service while forward linkage mainly refers to marketing the product. In the high of these, it is very vital to assess the backward forward and linkages provided for the beneficiaries of FPP.

### Backward linkages

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

Credit which is indispensable to start a 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 enough.

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; 36.42% borrowed between 2000 and 3000 Birr; 23.41% received between 1000 and 2000 Birr and the rest that means 13.29% borrowed less than one thousand.

Table 15: Credit delivered to sample beneficiaries of FPP

District	More than 3000 Birr	3000-2000 Birr	1000-2000 Birr	Less than 1000 Birr	Total
Alaba	9	12	13	9	43
Aleta Wondo	23	20	14	4	61
Burji	8	6	9	8	31
Loma	9	21	3	4	37
Loka Abaya	7	21	9	9	46
Offa	12	20	17	9	58
Sodo Zuria	17	19	6	-	43
Selti	8	7	10	3	28
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>346</b>

The average credit delivered to sample beneficiaries was 2217.63 Birr. Only 9.82% of sample beneficiaries took the maximum amount, i.e., 4000 Eth. Birr, half of them engaged in animal husbandry .36.70% of sample beneficiaries' receive less than half of the maximum amount. Among those who took more than 3000 Birr 55.91% of them reside in Sodo Zuria, Offa and Aleta Wondo districts.

Observing the amounts of credit with income generating activities, the average credit of those who engaged in animal husbandry is high whereas those engaged in poultry is very low. The average credit received by those who engaged in animal husbandry was more than

double of those who engaged in poultry. When we see district variation the highest average were found in Aleta Wondo district. No animal husbandry beneficiaries took less than 2000. 91.30% of those who engaged in poultry took less than 2000 no one of them took maximum amount. Animal husbandry which constitutes 25.43% of the total sample beneficiaries took 35.84% of the credit.

Regarding whether the borrowed money enough for the intended income generating activities, 45.07% of the respondents reported that it was enough the rest 54.91% of the respondents found it was not. Concerning the distributions of respondents in terms of

**Table 16: Credit delivered in terms of activities**

Types of activities	More than 3000	2000-3000	1000-2000	Less than1000
Farming	32	8	81	28
Animal husbandry	43	32	13	-
Poultry	1	1	28	16
Trade	12	2	17	8
Other	5	3	2	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>22</b>

their income generating activities, this study revealed that for majority of those engaged in on farm activity the credit was enough. However for 72% of respondents who undertake animal husbandry the credit they had was not enough to start their activities in the manner they like it. Questions were also raised during the study why they didn't borrow more money. It was identified

that 16.31% of those who said the credit was not enough replied that they took the maximum amount, 37.53% indicated that the ever increasing price has made investment more than they anticipate and they were forbidden to borrow the difference to adjust with it, the rest of the respondents indicated that they didn't know they can borrow more than they took.

**Table 17: Sufficiency of the credit**

District	Sufficient		Not Sufficient	
	In number	In percentage	In number	In percentage
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%

The study 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, 47.10% them said it took between 2 and 3 months and 18.78%, indicated that it took more than one month. 63.87% beneficiaries spent more than two months to receive credit. Among them

41% respondents indicated that they spent extra expenditure due to delay of credit as price increase during the intervening period, 27% of them indicated that they spent six to nine months without using the credit they had received due to delayed caused price increase. No sample beneficiaries receive credit within a month. Concerning the interest rate which is around 3%, majority of the respondents consider it as fair.

**Table 18: Time took to receive credit**

District	Time took to receive credit		
	More than 3 months	2-3 months	1-2months
Alaba	21	17	5
Aleta Wondo	23	31	7
Burji	14	13	4
Loma	14	15	8
Loka Abaya	12	20	14
Offa	18	30	10
Sodo Zuria	7	28	7
Selti	9	9	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>65</b>

Concerning credit repayment the study revealed that it was unsatisfactory. Out of the total sample beneficiaries 67.63% didn't pay the credit at all; 2.02% pay more than 75%; 4.62% pay between 50 and 74 %; 15.31% pay between 25 and 49%; 10.40% pay less than 25%.

The total amount repaid was 81440 Birr which is 10.61% of the total credit delivered. The highest borrower tends to repay larger percentage than lower borrower.

**Table 19: Credit repaid**

Credit repaid in percent	Respondent in number	Respondent in percent
75-99%	7	2.02%
50-74%	16	4.62%
25-49%	53	15.31%
Less than 25%	36	10.40%

For those engaged in on farm activities, inputs like fertilizer, highbred seeds, and pesticides should arrive on time with right quality and quantity. Efficient extension service should also be provided. For those who engaged in animal husbandry and poultry inputs such as highbred animals, fodder, extension, and veterinary service should be available on time with right quality. For trade and other small owned business 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 price.

Regarding on farm sector only 65.77%, 69.12%, and 63.08% respondents received fertilizer, highbred seeds, and pesticides on time respectively. Only 35.58% get all the three types of inputs on time. However, out of them, only 58.49% get frequent extension service. This figure shows that only 20.80% of respondents who engaged in farming sector get appropriate inputs on time.

**Table 20: Delivery of Inputs for farming**

Types of inputs	Beneficiaries who get inputs on time	Beneficiaries who didn't get inputs on time	Beneficiaries who didn't get inputs at all	Total
Fertilizers	98	30	21	149
Hybrid seeds	103	21	25	149
Pesticide	94	23	22	149

Concerning inputs for animal husbandry and poultry only 36.36% and 73.91% sample beneficiaries get

hybrid animals and only 19.32% and 19.57% get veterinary services at the time required respectively.

**Table 21: Delivery of Inputs for Animal husbandry and Poultry**

Inputs	Animal husbandry	Poultry
Animal	32	19
Veterinary service	17	9
Fodder	-	-

Regarding extension service 12.5% of animal husbandry beneficiaries visited by extension worker more than twice, 30.68% visited twice, 32.95% visited once the rest didn't get extension service. Similarly out of the total respondents who engaged in poultry 6.70% visited by extension worker more than twice, 15.22% visited twice, 32.61% visited once the rest didn't get

extension service. No husbandry and poultry respondents get fodder or training.

Concerning skill and entrepreneur training the entire respondents replied they received neither skill nor entrepreneur training.

To summarize delivery of inputs the respondents were asked the extent to which the inputs delivered to them

Table 22: Extension service

Type of activities	Visit by <i>Extension worker</i>			
	More than twice	twice	Once	none
Farming	56	47	26	20
Animal husbandry	11	27	29	21
Poultry	4	7	15	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>61</b>

meet the need of their income generating activities. Out of the total beneficiaries 12.14% of them said to great extent, 15.02% said 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 are delay of delivery, non-availability, poor quality, and increasing price. Majority of the respondents that means 60.12 identified delay of delivery while 6.07% and 10.40% of the respondents indicated increasing price and poor quality respectively as the major problem with regard to inputs. 23.41% of them mostly those engaged in non-farm activity said non-availability of input.

When they asked to express their opinion concerning the causes of problems related to inputs 19.65% said reluctant of authority, 58.09% mentioned transportation, and 23.69% said they are not sure.

### Forward linkages Marketing

No income generating activity would sustain without selling its good 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 marketing facilities provided. The study revealed that almost all beneficiaries, engaged in all the activities in all the eight districts haven't received marketing services. 85.34% those who engaged in crop production replied that they sell their product by their own and 14.33% indicated that they sell it through their cooperatives. Those who engage in livestock production and poultry replied that they had received no marketing services. There is no single milk cooperative in the study areas.

Regarding marketing the respondents identified that economic inability to reserve products till prices will be good, price fluctuations, lack transport facilities and market information as major problems. 17.63% of the respondents, majority of them reside in Burji district, consider transportation as the major problem, 23.12% respondents majority of them reside in Loma district consider price fluctuations as the major problem. Lack of marketing information was the least chosen problem of market by all districts. Among the list economic inability to keep products till prices will be good hold the first place with 41.33%. Those who mentioned other problem constitute 2.89%.

Table 23: Problem of market

District	Transportation	Price fluctuation	Lack of market information	Economic inability	other
Alaba	8	5	8	21	-
Aleta Wondo	5	7	9	38	3
Burji	16	9	-	6	-
Loma	11	17	7	1	1
Loka Abaya	7	8	9	22	-
Offa	7	14	6	31	-
Sodo Zuria	4	6	2	22	-
Selti	3	6	11	2	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>10</b>

Regarding the question asked concerning inputs and marketing problems it was found that 75.43% of the respondents believed that the programme authority should either solve the problems or deliver inputs and receive the outputs. Only 7.80% consider procuring inputs and selling products as their own responsibility.

### Performances of Income Generating Activities

The average income earned by sample beneficiaries due to the new income generating activities is 1272 Birr. 25.43% earn more than 2000; 15.03% earned between 1500 and 2000; 10.99% earned between 1000 and 1500; 6.36% earned between 500 and 1000 4.05% earned less than 500 and 38.18% didn't earn any. The income earned was not evenly distributed. A wide variation was observed in terms of beneficiaries, Loma

**Table 24: Income earned due to the income generating activities**

District	More than 2000	1500-2000	1000-1500	500-1000	Less than 500	nothing
Alaba	10	6	3	2	4	18
Aleta Wondo	13	7	8	6	3	24
Burji	8	6	4	3	-	10
Loma	9	7	4	4	2	11
Loka Abaya	11	7	3	2	1	22
Offa	11	5	10	4	3	25
Sodo Zuria	16	9	3	-	-	14
Selti	10	5	3	1	1	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>132</b>

districts, and activities. The top 46 sample beneficiaries earned more than 30% of the total income and 38.18% sample beneficiaries didn't earn any. More than 59% of district beneficiaries didn't earn any. On average Sodo Zuria district beneficiaries earned the highest while Loma district beneficiaries earned the least. Concerning

individual activity, on farm activity showed the highest average income. The average incomes of those who engaged in poultry constitute the least. All beneficiaries who engaged in poultry earned less than 2000 and around 41% of sample beneficiaries who engaged in trade didn't earn any.

**Table 25: Income earned in terms of activities**

Types of activities	More than 2000	1500-2000	1000-1500	500-1000	Less than 500	nothing
Farming	50	24	19	2	1	53
Animal husbandry	28	14	4	4	1	37
Poultry	-	5	8	9	7	17
Trade	5	7	5	3	3	16
Other	5	2	2	4	2	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>132</b>

Regarding the present status of income generating activities, the study revealed that only 21.39% of the income generating activities are expanding, 22.83% of income generating activities show no improvement; 17.63% income generating activities are declining and rest are closed now. In terms of activities animal husbandry shows better performances with regards to expansion followed by farming, small business, trade, and poultry. Among those who hold business which show no improvement 84.81% of them expressed that

their business is going to decline soon. Among those who have declining business 19.67% indicated that their business will revive sooner or later while the rest said that they lose hope in the revival their business. The study also revealed among farm activities those involve cash crops are expanding better than the other on farm activities. Looking at the status of assets none beneficiaries sample 22.22% were declining, 11.11% closed the rest are flourishing.

**Table 26: Present status of income the income generating activities**

District	Expanding	Show No improve	Declining	Closed
Alaba	8	10	7	18
Aleta Wondo	11	17	9	24
Burji	6	8	8	9
Loma	10	6	10	11
Loka Abaya	8	10	6	22
Offa	11	10	12	25
Sodo Zuria	14	9	4	15
Selti	6	9	5	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>132</b>

The study also revealed that repayment of credit, educating children, buying additional food, household materials and maintain, buying inputs and expanding the existing business were the major ways for which the additionally earned income was invested. Out of the

total income earned 8.82% used for educating children, 22.10% utilized for expand their business and buying inputs, 18.50% for repayment of credit, 30.34% used to buy additional foods, 16.10% invest for household material, and rest utilized it for other purposes.

Table 27: How the income spent

Purpose	In Figure	In Percent
Food	133540	30.34%
Inputs and expanding business	97263	22.10%
Repayment of credit	81440	18.50%
education	38836	8.82%
Household material and maintain	70895	16.10%
other	18138	4.12%

Since FPP basically intended to help the beneficiaries to create some kind of income generating asset, it is indispensable to observe the extent to which the programme enable the beneficiaries in creating income generating asset. In this regard only 60.07% of sample beneficiaries borrowed money to start income generating activities. Out of them only 64.85 % create some kind to asset which means 37.15% of sample beneficiaries generate the remaining 62.36% have no asset at all. Permanent fruit tree, coffee, ox, milk cows,

goats, sheep, hens, small shops, and tools were the major types of assets owned due to FPP. Concerning the amounts of assets it was revealed that 13 hectares Permanent fruit tree, 3 hectares coffee , 78 ox, 103 milk cows, 26 goats ,22 sheep, 460 hens, 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.

Table 28: Asset created out of the credit

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
<b>Total</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>64.85</b>

Concerning the income of beneficiaries, it was revealed that they earn around 4534 Birr on

The data clearly indicated that on farm activities show better achievement in enabling asset creation followed by, poultry, small business, trade, and animal husbandry. Concerning assets of non beneficiaries it was revealed that their assets were increased by 14.48% no sample beneficiaries who didn't covered under FPP create assets.

average. The highest average income was registered at Aleta wondo district while the lowest at Burji district. Regarding income generating activities, those engaged in on farm activities earned the highest average while those engaged in poultry got the lowest. Comparing the average annual income of FPP with those who have involved in PSNP but not covered under Family Package the former exceed the later by more 1200Birr. Moreover comparing these beneficiaries with non beneficiaries of the two programmes the annual average income of the later exceed by around 1000 Birr. However, observing annual rate, the income of beneficiaries increased by 21.03% while the non beneficiaries' annual average income as reported was increase by 8.01%. Comparing the average annual income rate of non beneficiaries with those who have involved in PSNP but not covered under Family Package the former exceed the later only by 1.21%.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which PSNP and FPP help the beneficiaries in creating income generating assets; study whether these programmes create dependency on the beneficiaries; and analyze the efficiency of service delivery mechanisms of these programmes in the Southern Nations Nationalities and Peoples Region (SNNPR) of Ethiopia.

The study found out that farming, animal husbandry, poultry, trade and small business are the main income generating activities in which the beneficiaries of FPP were engaged in. Among these activities, farming took the lion's share, where more than half of FPP beneficiaries were engaged in. The numbers of clients who were engaged in trade and small business are insignificant. The results of this study also showed that, among the sample FPP beneficiaries, only 61.85% created income generating assets. This implied that the rest failed to achieve food security.

It was also found out that these income generating activities lacks appropriate backward and forward linkages.



A comparison between backward and forward linkages faced by beneficiaries of FPP and non-beneficiaries showed that there was no significant difference observed between the two. Beneficiaries didn't enjoy any privileges regarding backward and forward linkage. The basic source of such problems lies in the fact that there is no separate agency or body responsible for provision of such linkages or coordinating it. For instance, inputs are delivered by different agencies in isolated manner in similar condition for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. There is no agency which provides marketing linkages, as well. Most of sample beneficiaries want the engagement of government bodies in provision of subsidized inputs and solve all marketing problems they encounter.

The provision of credit, inputs, and marketing facilities which are indispensable for income generating activities were accompanied by various problems. The maximum amount of credit, which was set in 2005 as 4000 Birr was not sufficient. Moreover, though the prices of fertilizer, pesticide, hybrid animals, and seeds etc have been increased since then, the credit ceiling remained as it was set in 2005. Most of the sample beneficiaries found the credit not enough to start their activities as they planned. In addition to this, the credit delivery system was not fast and flexible. Majority of borrower spent three or more months to receive credit. Such delivery system discouraged and in some instances made borrower to spend an unanticipated time and resources.

It is obvious that clients of FPP operate their income generating activities with little capital. They must sale their products as fast as possible. However there were no marketing facilities provided for FPP clients. Those engaged in trade and small business were not provided with market place. There was no a single milk cooperative in the study areas. All milk products were sold in open market. Since milk is perishable product, they often use it for home consumption to avoid wastage. Though such tendency is good for the health of beneficiaries, it adversely affects the sustainability of their business.

Provision of inputs also exhibited problems such as delay, non-availability, and increasing prices. Only 35.58% of those sample beneficiaries who engaged in farming get fertilizer, pesticide, and hydride seeds on time. The situation becomes worse when extension service was observed as only 58.49% of those who get all the three inputs on time had appropriate extension service. So that one can say only 20.80% of sample beneficiaries who engaged in farming could get the expected results.

The study also showed that only 60.07% of the sample PSNP beneficiaries were covered under FPP, implying that the rest, i.e., 39.93% of sample beneficiaries which were not covered under FPP, did not achieve food

security and remained dependent on the assistance provided under PSNP.

In addition to these key findings, most of the service delivery mechanisms of these programmes were found to be inefficient. This implied that such delivery system discouraged the borrowers because they waste an unanticipated time and resources.

Generally, it can be concluded that these programmes (PSNP and FFP) did not achieve their objective of ensuring food security. Hence, they are found to perpetuate further poverty, food insecurity, and dependency. Therefore, it is recommended to improve the activities and policies or plans designed to implement these programmes so as to address problems attributed to food insecurity, dependency and poverty.

## REFERENCES

- Altherton M (1993). We must change the way we do business, Christian Social Action.
- Amanda R, Mickey L (2008) History of Food Security in International Development, Christian Children's funds, Honduras.
- Bryon Mc Donald (2010). Food security, Polity press, London.
- Cynthia P, Green (1993). Too Many People: Not Enough Food, Form for Applied Research and Public Policies.
- 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 Town University press.
- Getachew Dirriba (1995). Economy at Cross roads; Famine and Food Security in Ethiopia , commercials printers.
- Ghosh PK (1984). The third world Development-A Basic need approach.
- Jhone P, Miller T (1992). Hand Book on African Hunger, Mary Knoll Justice, Washington.
- Koc M, R Macroe, 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 RB (1994). Facing Food Security, Washington University Press, Washington.
- Lori , L Reid (2007). The Consequences of Food Insecurity for Child Wellbeing, Florida State University.
- Lynn LE (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). PSNP Implementation Manual, Addis Abeba July 2003.
- Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (2010). PSNP Implementation Manual, Addis Abeba July 2003.
- One World Guide (2008). Global Food Security, University of East London, London.
- Rebeca S, B Muss (2007). Alternative Food Movement, Murdoch University, Western Australia.
- Robert SC (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), FPP Implementation Manual, Hawassa.
- Tekolla (1997), The Puzzling paradox of African Food Crisis, UN economic commission for Africa
- 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, Oxford University press
- World Bank (2003), World Development Report, Oxford
- World Bank (2003), World Development Report, Oxford
- World Health Organization, (1995) world Health Report, WHO Geneva