

CHF International Ethiopia

Impact Assessment of Gurage Livelihoods and Agricultural Development (GLAD) Program

Final Report

Akalu Paulos,
Independent Consultant

June 2005
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deepest appreciation for a number of people whose contributions were vital in making this piece of work a success. First and foremost, my thanks go to Ms Julie Burch, the Program Director of CHF International in Ethiopia, for facilitating all the support needed to carry out the impact survey and for her encouragement, patience and valuable comments all along the work. Dr. Beyene Kebede also deserves similar regards in this respect. All other administrative staff of CHF also deserve due thanks for their support in different ways.

Mekdes Feleke, was so great in coordinating the survey at the field level and during the recruitment and training of enumerators for the survey. Her ideas in enriching the questionnaire and in the Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), and later, at data entry were very much valuable. As such, she deserves my special thanks.

This study would never have been completed smoothly without the all rounded support of Dr. Shimelis from Greener Ethiopia.

My thanks also go to the project participants and non-participants in the study Woredas, who volunteered to respond to the questionnaire, to those who were involved in the FGDs and key informant interviews and to the enumerators who carefully administered the questionnaire.

Local authorities and experts in various line departments in Meskan and Silti Woredas deserve my regards who were very cooperative in sharing information and facilitating the conduct of the survey despite the hectic pre- and post-election period that coincided with the survey

Last but not least, I would like to thank Ato Solomon, the Field Office of CHF/GLAD in Butajira for his technical support and hospitality.

Abbreviations

| | |
|--------|--|
| BDS | Business Development Services |
| CHF | Community, Habitat, Finance |
| FGD | Focus Group Discussion |
| GE | Greener Ethiopia |
| GLAD | Guraghe Livelihoods and Agricultural Development |
| KII | Key Informant Interview |
| MPT | Multi Purpose Tree |
| NGO | Non Governmental Organization |
| N/R | No Response |
| SAC | Saving and Credit |
| SNNPRS | Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State |
| SPSS | Statistical Package for Social Scientists |

Table of Contents

| | Pages |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| Acknowledgement | ii |
| Abbreviations | iii |
| Table of Contents | iv |
| 1. Executive Summary | 1 |
| 2. Background | 2 |
| 3. Objectives | 2 |
| 4. Methodology | 2 |
| 5. Limitations of the survey | 3 |
| 6. Findings | 4 |
| 7. Conclusions | 23 |
| 8. Recommendations | 24 |
| Annexes | 26 |
| References | 40 |

1. Executive Summary

The CHF International Ethiopia-Gurage Livelihoods and Agricultural Development (GLAD) program is a program designed to strengthen the livelihoods of rural populations in Ethiopia and thereby increase their resilience in times of severe economic and climatic disaster.

The program started in Meskan and Kebena Woredas of the Guraghe Zone and in Silti Woreda of Silti Zone in the Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State in May 2004 in partnership with Greener Ethiopia, a local Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) with prior experience of implementing livelihoods programs in the three Woredas.

The major project interventions in the three Woredas included support in the following areas: poultry, beekeeping, livestock, fruit and vegetables, multi-purpose trees, small-scale irrigation, and savings and credit.

The survey was carried out to assess the impact of the interventions on the target beneficiaries. It employed a combination of qualitative and quantitative methodology, mainly a questionnaire administered to 369 households of which 54 were non-participants in the GLAD project, and qualitative methods including Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews with GLAD participants, non-participants and local authorities in Silti and Meskan Woredas.

Although the program had a life span of only one year, the findings indicate that project participants, particularly those targeted by the poultry program, have begun to benefit financially, nutritionally and in building assets.

The findings also indicate that there is sufficient level of interest and enthusiasm generated among participant and non-participant households in the area towards self reliance as a result of the interventions and the trainings provided by the program.

The future prospects of the various interventions for substantial livelihood improvement and diversification has been indicated by both participant and non-participants of the project.

Particularly, the project interventions have created opportunities for the emergence of community based organizations (CBOs) in the form of Savings and Credit associations that can be further strengthened to build local capacity for development.

The study recommends that the interventions need to expand to non-participant households as they have significant potential for improving livelihoods, to strengthen follow up on the use of project inputs by participant households, and to harness the opportunity the project has provided for strengthening community associations and business development services.

2. Background

The CHF International Ethiopia-Gurage Livelihoods and Agricultural Development (GLAD) program is a program designed to strengthen the livelihoods of rural populations in Ethiopia and thereby increase their resilience in times of severe economic and climatic disaster.

In Silti and Gurage Zones of the Southern Nations, Nationalities and People's Regional State (SNNPRS), the program is designed to benefit 18,000 beneficiaries in Silti, Meskan and Kebena Woerdas. Particularly, the primary goal of the project in these Woredas is to enable 900 direct beneficiary households to generate income, build assets, and diversify livelihoods.

Within this broader goal, the objectives of the project are: 1) to increase household income and resilience through diversification of income source and increased productivity of existing income generating activities; and 2) to improve agricultural, water and environmental management practices to combat effects of natural disaster.

In order to meet the above stated objectives, CHF International, in partnership with Greener Ethiopia (GE), a local Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) with ongoing experience in the Woredas, has been providing project inputs and technical assistance to the targeted households and communities since May 2004.

The major project interventions included support in the following areas: poultry, beekeeping, livestock, fruit and vegetables, multi-purpose trees, small-scale irrigation, and savings and credit.

3. Objective of the Impact Survey

The objective of the survey is to determine the impacts and assess the effectiveness of CHF's livelihood interventions amongst GLAD beneficiaries in decreasing dependency on external food/cash contributions and increasing household income.

In addition, the impact survey will help shape the focus of the market study CHF is planning to undertake in the project area.

4. Survey Methodology

The survey employed both quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative method involved conducting a sample household survey of 400 households, of which 50 households constitute non-GLAD participants.

For the sample survey, purposeful sampling method was used to select GLAD participants allowing for selection of participants by type of intervention they are involved in and providing for selection of vulnerable groups such as women, youth and

older persons. Accordingly, 350 participants households were purposefully selected from Silti, Meskan and Kebena Woredas.

Regarding the non-GLAD participants, 25 households, who have similar livelihoods condition to that of the participant households were purposefully selected in Silti and Meskan Woredas. To avoid biases, non-participant households who live at reasonable distance from participant households were selected.

Seventeen enumerators with above 10+2 education level and who are from the project area were recruited and trained for two days on impact assessment methodologies and on how to administer an impact assessment questionnaire. The participants were also taken through all the questions that were designed for the survey during the training session, and were allowed to practice in administering the questionnaire amongst their colleagues and on selected pilot households.

Following the conduct of the pilot survey and holding discussion on the issues that emerged from the pre test, the questionnaire was administered on the selected households.

Subsequently, four Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were held in the Silti and Meskan Woredas (with local authorities and community groups) to triangulate and substantiate information obtained from the quantitative survey. In addition, Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with two non-participant individuals was held to gain further insight on the performance of the project and its impact on the beneficiaries.

The information collected through the quantitative survey was coded and analysed using the SPSS software package.

5. Limitations of the Survey

This impact survey was conducted just a year after the implementation of the project, when it is too early to assess the impact of the project intervention, as most of the project inputs were received by the project participants within a time range of 4-5 months before the study and in some cases were not even received at the time of the survey.

As a result, for a number of the questions asked in the questionnaire, project participants were not certain in their responses to the questions, which meant that there were many questions with “no responses”. The abundance of such responses presents a challenge in drawing meaningful analysis thereby reducing the quality.

Although it was planned to administer the questionnaire on 350 participant households and 50 non- participant households, in reality, 308 participant households and 54 non-participant households were targeted. The response rate is thus about 91 percent, which is reasonable enough to arrive at a fair conclusion.

6. Findings/Data Analysis

This section of the report sets out to present the results of the survey analysed using the SPSS software package by tables followed by brief narrative comments.

Table 1. Respondents' Profile

| Characteristics | Number | % |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Participation the project: | | |
| Participant | 308 | 84.0 |
| Non-participant | 54 | 15.0 |
| N/R | 5 | 1.0 |
| Total | 367 | 100.0 |
| Woreda of the HH | | |
| Silti | 159 | 43.0 |
| Meskan | 187 | 51.0 |
| Kebena | 18 | 5.0 |
| N/R | 2 | 1.0 |
| Total | 366 | 100.0 |
| Sex of the respondent | | |
| Male | 174 | 47 |
| Female | 195 | 53 |
| Total | 369 | 100.0 |
| Age of the respondent | | |
| 16-25 | 65 | 18.0 |
| 26-35 | 145 | 39.0 |
| 36-45 | 94 | 25.0 |
| 46-60 | 54 | 15.0 |
| >60 | 4 | 1.0 |
| N/R | 7 | 2.0 |
| Total | 369 | 100.0 |
| Respondent's ethnic group | | |
| Silti | 163 | 44.0 |
| Guraghe | 164 | 44.0 |
| Mareko | 19 | 5.0 |
| Other | 5 | 2.0 |
| N/R | 18 | 5.0 |
| Total | 369 | 100.0 |
| Respondents' religion | | |
| Muslim | 271 | 73.0 |
| Orthodox Christian | 95 | 26.0 |
| N/R | 3 | 1.0 |
| Total | 369 | 100.0 |

| | | |
|--|------------|--------------|
| Respondents' marital status | | |
| Married | 311 | 84.0 |
| Single | 37 | 10.0 |
| Separated | 2 | 1.0 |
| Divorced | 1 | 0.0 |
| Other | 7 | 2.0 |
| N/R | 11 | 3.0 |
| Total | 369 | 100.0 |
| Respondent's level of education | | |
| Illiterate | 199 | 54.0 |
| Primary | 142 | 38.0 |
| Secondary | 10 | 3.0 |
| Other | 3 | 1.0 |
| N/R | 15 | 4.0 |
| Total | 369 | 100 |

As can be seen from Table 1, about 84 percent of respondents are participants of the GLAD projects. The Table also shows that about 54 percent of the participants are unable to read and write, which will be regarded as a desired condition for the development of new skills and knowledge and enhancing the benefits of the GLAD projects to the participants. It is also clear from the Table that the project has made an effort to fairly balance the number of female and male beneficiaries participating in the project. About 84 percent of the respondents are married and have children, which shows that the benefits of the project are deliberately designed to reach households with more than one family member.

Table 2 - Educational Levels of Respondents by Gender and Participation in the Project

| Educational Level | Participant | | | | Non-participant | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | Male | Female | Total | Percent | Male | Female | Total | Percent |
| Illiterate | 41 | 121 | 162 | 52 | 14 | 18 | 32 | 59 |
| Primary | 80 | 42 | 122 | 40 | 14 | 4 | 18 | 33 |
| Secondary | 7 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Other | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| N/R | 6 | 7 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Total | 136 | 172 | 308 | 100 | 32 | 22 | 54 | 100 |

Table 2 shows that about 52 percent of project participants (162) are illiterate of which the majority are women. This has an implication for CHF if it intends to engage in promoting savings and credit associations, since such interventions require some level of literacy amongst beneficiaries. However, equally significant percentage of project participants (40 percent) have primary level of education that will enable them to easily grasp the various trainings provided by the GLAD project.

Table 3 - Respondents' Sources of Income by Participation in the project and Gender

| Sources of Income | Before the Project | | | | After the Project | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------|------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|------------------|--------|
| | Participants | | Non-participants | | Participants | | Non-participants | |
| | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Farming | 135 | 171 | 31 | 22 | 135 | 169 | 28 | 19 |
| If farming, single annual crop | 25 | 55 | 10 | 11 | 25 | 54 | 9 | 9 |
| Multiple annual crops | 123 | 131 | 26 | 14 | 122 | 127 | 25 | 11 |
| Single perennial crop | 34 | 36 | 9 | 3 | 35 | 39 | 8 | 2 |
| Multiple perennial crops | 81 | 52 | 18 | 8 | 88 | 57 | 17 | 6 |
| Livestock | 87 | 109 | 18 | 14 | 89 | 119 | 15 | 10 |
| Petty trading | 41 | 85 | 4 | 12 | 40 | 82 | 2 | 9 |
| Casual labour employment | 30 | 21 | 8 | 4 | 29 | 15 | 8 | 4 |
| Remittances | 7 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 563 | 668 | 125 | 89 | 569 | 670 | 113 | 70 |

Table 3 reveals that farming accounts for the major source of income for both females and males before and after the project, and within farming, multiple annual crops stand as major sources of income both among beneficiaries and non beneficiaries of the project. Livestock and petty trading rank as second and third major sources of income.

Table 4 -Monthly Income from sale of single annual crops

| Income Class | Before the project | After the Project | % Change |
|--------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------|
| <50 birr | 152 | 135 | -11.2 |
| 50-100 birr | 42 | 51 | 21.4 |
| 101-150 birr | 10 | 9 | -10.0 |
| 151-200 birr | 2 | 2 | 0.0 |
| >200 birr | 2 | 2 | 0.0 |
| N/R | 154 | 163 | 5.8 |
| Total | 362 | 362 | 0.0 |

Table 5 -Monthly Income from sale of multiple annual crops

| Income Class | Before the project | After the Project | % Change |
|--------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------|
| <50 birr | 151 | 142 | -6.0 |
| 50-100 birr | 22 | 24 | 9.1 |
| 101-150 birr | 10 | 9 | -10.0 |
| 151-200 birr | 4 | 4 | 0.0 |
| >200 birr | 1 | 1 | 0.0 |
| N/R | 174 | 182 | 4.6 |
| Total | 362 | 362 | 0.0 |

Table 6 -Monthly Income from sale of single perennial crops

| Income Class | Before the project | After the Project | % Change |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| <50 birr | 74 | 69 | -6.8 |
| 50-100 birr | 6 | 9 | 50.0 |
| 101-150 birr | 1 | 1 | 0.0 |
| 151-200 birr | 1 | 1 | 0.0 |
| >200 birr | 1 | 1 | 0.0 |
| N/R | 279 | 281 | 0.7 |
| Total | 362 | 362 | 0.0 |

Table 7-Monthly Income from sale of Multiple Perennial crops

| Income Class | Before the project | After the Project | % Change |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| <50 birr | 88 | 81 | -8.0 |
| 50-100 birr | 20 | 21 | 5.0 |
| 101-150 birr | 3 | 3 | 0.0 |
| 151-200 birr | 1 | 2 | 100.0 |
| >200 birr | 1 | 1 | 0.0 |
| N/R | 249 | 254 | 2.0 |
| Total | 362 | 362 | 0.0 |

Table 8 -Monthly Income from sale of livestock and livestock products

| Income Class | Before the project | After the Project | % Change |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| <50 birr | 181 | 160 | -11.6 |
| 50-100 birr | 5 | 7 | 40.0 |
| 101-150 birr | 1 | 2 | 100.0 |
| 151-200 birr | 1 | 1 | 0.0 |
| >200 birr | 0 | 1 | 100.0 |
| N/R | 174 | 191 | 9.8 |
| Total | 362 | 362 | 0.0 |

Table 9 -Monthly Income from Petty trading

| Income Class | Before the project | After the Project | % Change |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| <50 birr | 143 | 131 | -8.4 |
| 50-100 birr | 17 | 17 | 0.0 |
| 101-150 birr | 1 | 2 | 100.0 |
| 151-200 birr | 1 | 1 | 0.0 |
| >200 birr | 3 | 3 | 0.0 |
| N/R | 197 | 208 | 5.6 |
| Total | 362 | 362 | 0.0 |

Table 10 -Monthly Income from Casual labour employment

| Income Class | Before the project | After the Project | % Change |
|--------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------|
| <50 birr | 55 | 49 | -10.9 |
| 50-100 birr | 7 | 11 | 57.1 |
| 101-150 birr | 4 | 4 | 0.0 |
| 151-200 birr | 1 | 2 | 100.0 |
| N/R | 295 | 296 | 0.3 |
| Total | 362 | 362 | 0.0 |

Table 11 -Monthly Income from remittances

| Income Class | Before the project | After the Project | % Change |
|--------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------|
| <50 birr | 12 | 10 | -16.7 |
| 50-100 birr | 7 | 7 | 0.0 |
| 101-150 birr | 1 | 1 | 0.0 |
| >200 birr | 2 | 2 | 0.0 |
| N/R | 339 | 342 | 0.9 |
| Total | 361 | 362 | 0.3 |

Tables 4-11 depict monthly incomes that project participants and non-participants earn from various sources of livelihoods before and after the project intervention. As can be noted from the Tables, there hasn't been a significant increase in income levels observed by participants after the project intervention. This has also been confirmed from the FGDs and KIIs held with community groups and Woreda government authorities. Even though there has been no significant increase in income as a result of the GLAD projects among most participants at the time of the study, both project participants and local authorities, who were involved in the survey have clearly indicated the significant prospect that GLAD projects will have towards increasing household income.

Particularly, poultry beneficiaries have been so enthusiastic that in a few months time, the chicks will be ready to lay eggs, which they would sell and benefit from the resultant income. In this regard it would be appropriate to quote a poultry beneficiary in Batilejano Kebele, in Meskan Woreda, who said:

"I am an early recipient of 30 one-day old chicks from the GLAD project. More than 25 of the chicks have survived, and a few of them have already started laying eggs. I now make, up to Eth. Birr 15 per week, which has helped me buy food to my family, and easily cover expenses for coffee, sugar and match-sticks. I am also able to buy feed for my chicken so that they continuously provide me with eggs. I am happy for being involved in the project and I still see a more bright future."

Similarly, beekeeping beneficiaries look very much forward to harvest honey by around end of September 2005, which they hope will enable them to cover for their children's schooling in the coming new academic year.

It must thus be recognized that, the fact that the interventions have not yet yielded a significant increase in income for the participants at the time of the survey does not mean the projects lack the potential to bring about positive impact on the beneficiary households.

Table 12 - Respondents' Physical Asset ownership Before and After the project by participation in the project and Gender

| Physical Assets | Before the Project | | | | After the Project | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------|------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|------------------|--------|
| | Participants | | Non-participants | | Participants | | Non-participants | |
| | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Iron roofed house | 29 | 36 | 4 | 6 | 32 | 40 | 4 | 6 |
| Bed | 9 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| Spade | 56 | 46 | 8 | 6 | 59 | 43 | 4 | 3 |
| Hammer | 14 | 25 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 27 | 1 | 0 |
| Lamp | 126 | 146 | 23 | 21 | 124 | 144 | 15 | 16 |
| Tourch | 69 | 68 | 15 | 7 | 69 | 67 | 8 | 5 |
| Kerosene stove | 6 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| Jerry can | 103 | 126 | 22 | 20 | 108 | 136 | 15 | 15 |
| Household furniture | 106 | 135 | 26 | 17 | 107 | 138 | 18 | 14 |
| Farm tools/equipment | 113 | 122 | 22 | 13 | 115 | 120 | 17 | 10 |
| Radio/tape recorder | 54 | 71 | 10 | 7 | 57 | 75 | 8 | 5 |
| Chicken brooder | 2 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 52 | 2 | 2 |
| Grain store | 27 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 24 | 35 | 4 | 2 |
| Bee hive | 59 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 64 | 20 | 0 | 1 |
| Ox | 97 | 102 | 13 | 10 | 101 | 97 | 9 | 7 |
| Sheep | 32 | 42 | 7 | 7 | 37 | 45 | 6 | 6 |
| Goat | 39 | 23 | 3 | 3 | 38 | 23 | 2 | 2 |
| Donkey | 21 | 24 | 2 | 2 | 19 | 26 | 1 | 0 |
| Horse | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Mule | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Poultry | 83 | 79 | 16 | 5 | 84 | 135 | 10 | 4 |
| Land | 113 | 138 | 24 | 18 | 113 | 136 | 18 | 14 |

While Table 12 shows claims of possession of assets after the project situation amongst some project participants, it might seem difficult to attribute some of this benefits to the GLAD projects, since as revealed in the FGDs with beneficiaries and local authorities, GLAD interventions have not yet sufficiently yielded benefits on the target groups.

However, the fact that some beneficiaries who have received chicken from the project, succeeded to purchase small livestock such as sheep from the sales of eggs, and the expression by many of the poultry beneficiaries to benefit likewise, accentuates the assets building potential of the project interventions.

Table 13 - Respondents by Type of Intervention and Gender

| Project interventions | Gender | | Total | % |
|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Male | Female | | |
| Poultry | 1 | 100 | 101 | 33 |
| Bee keeping | 41 | 2 | 43 | 14 |
| Livestock | 1 | 14 | 15 | 5 |
| Vegetable and fruits | 13 | 1 | 14 | 4 |
| Multipurpose trees | 17 | 4 | 21 | 7 |
| Small Scale Irrigation | 7 | 3 | 10 | 3 |
| Saving and credit | 2 | 5 | 7 | 2 |
| Combination | 40 | 37 | 77 | 25 |
| N/R | 14 | 6 | 20 | 6 |
| Total | 136 | 172 | 308 | 100 |

Table 13 shows that the major single interventions of the project are poultry and bee keeping in which participants are predominantly females and males respectively. This practice appears commensurate to the gender roles in this particular area where poultry is exclusively regarded as women's domain while bee keeping is considered as men's. **Since women are the main actors in providing food for the family, the fact that they are targeted in the poultry project will have a clear contribution to household food security.**

Moreover, as poultry is quick in generating cash income, women being targeted in the intervention have a potential for earning independent income over which they will have full control. Such a move is also expected to result in changing women's position both at the household and community level.

Table 14 - Respondents Experience in the Intervention they are involved and Gender

| Have you had prior experience in the intervention you are involved in? | Gender | | | | | |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| | Male | % | Female | % | Total | % |
| Yes | 107 | 49 | 110 | 51 | 217 | 100 |
| No | 21 | 32 | 44 | 68 | 65 | 100 |
| N/R | 8 | 31 | 18 | 69 | 26 | 100 |
| Total | 136 | 44 | 172 | 56 | 308 | 100 |

Table 14 shows that about 217 (70 percent) of the project participants have prior experience in the interventions they are engaged in. This indicates the likelihood of success of the project as the participants who had previous experience would be able to overcome problems that they might face during implementation, and feel at ease to carry out their duties.

Table 15- Length of experience by type of intervention

| Length of experience | Project intervention | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|------------|
| | Poultry | Bee K. | Livestock | Veg. & I | MPT | SSI | SAC | Comb. | Total |
| <5 years | 61 | 16 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 30 | 135 |
| 5-10 years | 15 | 16 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 69 |
| 11-20 years | 7 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 22 |
| >20 years | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 |
| Total | 86 | 39 | 11 | 17 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 57 | 237 |

Table 15 shows that a good number of project participants have 5-10 years of experience in the major project intervention areas introduced by GLAD/CHF. As can be noted from the discussion under Table 14, this has enabled them to easily learn the activities at entry and subsequently build their confidence during the implementation stage. However, it can also be seen that while Savings and Credit (SAC) is one of GLAD's intervention, there is no experience amongst beneficiaries around the intervention. If CHF has a future plan to promote business development services (BDS) as part of extension of GLAD or as a new component, building the capacity of participants, SAC is a potential area that needs sufficient attention.

Table 16 - Availability of Support from CHF/GLAD by Gender

| Have you received technical support from CHF | Sex of the respondent | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----|--------|-----|-------|-----|
| | Male | % | Female | % | Total | % |
| Yes | 107 | 79 | 110 | 64 | 217 | 71 |
| No | 21 | 15 | 44 | 26 | 65 | 21 |
| N/R | 8 | 6 | 18 | 10 | 26 | 8 |
| Total | 136 | 100 | 172 | 100 | 308 | 100 |

While Table 16 shows that the majority, 217 (71 percent) of the 308 project participants have received technical support from CHF/GLAD in general, it can also be seen that proportionally, more males have obtained technical support than female participants.

Table 17 – Types of Technical Support provided by Participation in the Project

| Types of Support | Participation | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|------------|------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Participants | | Non Participants | | Total | |
| | Number | % | Number | % | Number | % |
| Training | 138 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 40 |
| Advice | 62 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 18 |
| Demonstration | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 |
| Experience exchange | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 |
| Other | 9 | 3 | 10 | 29 | 19 | 6 |
| N/R | 79 | 25 | 25 | 71 | 104 | 30 |
| Total | 308 | 100 | 35 | 100 | 343 | 100 |

Table 17 shows that training accounts for a higher proportion of the major type of support provided for project participants followed by advice. During the FGDs and KIIs projects participants claimed that besides the immediate benefits of managing the interventions the training has helped them in building their confidence within their own households and the wider community. Although demonstrations and experience exchange could be valuable strategies in terms of increasing knowledge and changing attitude and practice of participants, the responses revealed that they are the least provided types of support by the project, requiring sufficient emphasis if the project is to continue in the future.

Table 18 – Adequacy of support provided by participation in the project

| Level of adequacy | Participation | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|------------|------------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| | Participants | | Non Participants | | Total | |
| | Number | % | Number | % | Number | % |
| Very adequate | 44 | 14 | 2 | 4 | 46 | 13 |
| Adequate | 142 | 46 | 7 | 13 | 149 | 41 |
| Somewhat adequate | 69 | 22 | 7 | 13 | 76 | 21 |
| Not adequate | 36 | 12 | 6 | 11 | 42 | 12 |
| N/R | 17 | 6 | 32 | 59 | 49 | 13 |
| Total | 308 | 100 | 54 | 15 | 362 | 100 |

As Table 18 shows, the majority of participants rate the technical support provided as “adequate” (46 percent) and “somewhat adequate” (22 percent), while a smaller proportion of participants (12 percent) perceive that the support was not adequate. However, during the FGDs and KIIs, discussions participants stated that the support from CHF as well as the local authorities have declined over time.

Table 19- Usefulness of support provided by gender and participation in the project

| Level of usefulness | Gender | | | | | | Project Participants | |
|---------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------------|------------|
| | Male | % | Female | % | Total | % | Number | % |
| Very useful | 42 | 24 | 35 | 18 | 77 | 21 | 71 | 23 |
| Useful | 65 | 37 | 101 | 52 | 166 | 45 | 158 | 51 |
| Somewhat useful | 33 | 19 | 25 | 13 | 58 | 16 | 46 | 15 |
| Less useful | 3 | 2 | 11 | 6 | 14 | 4 | 14 | 5 |
| Not useful | 9 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| N/R | 22 | 13 | 21 | 10 | 43 | 11 | 15 | 5 |
| Total | 174 | 100 | 195 | 100 | 369 | 100 | 308 | 100 |

As can be seen from Table 19 the majority of the respondents consider the support provided by the project as useful. It is also clear from the table that females rate the support provided more favourably than their male counterparts. This can have a positive bearing on the project, since those who claimed the technical support to be useful will be more likely to use them to improve their livelihoods.

Table 20 Impact of participation on working hour by participation in the project and gender

| How has your involvement in the project affected your daily working hour? | Participants | | | | | | Non-participants | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----|--------|-----|-------|-----|------------------|-----|--------|-----|-------|-----|
| | Male | % | Female | % | Total | % | Male | % | Female | % | Total | % |
| Increased it very much | 62 | 46 | 71 | 41 | 133 | 43 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 14 | 6 | 11 |
| No change | 50 | 37 | 78 | 45 | 128 | 42 | 5 | 16 | 4 | 18 | 9 | 17 |
| Reduced it | 17 | 12 | 16 | 10 | 33 | 11 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 18 | 5 | 9 |
| N/R | 7 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 14 | 4 | 23 | 72 | 11 | 50 | 34 | 63 |
| Total | 136 | 100 | 172 | 100 | 308 | 100 | 32 | 100 | 22 | 100 | 54 | 100 |

Table 20 shows that the majority of participant women’s (45 percent) daily working hour has not been affected by being involved in the project. It can also be noted from the Table that over all involvement in the project has increased participants’ daily working hour “very much”. It is therefore, important, to take account of this factor in future project design so as to minimize potential adverse effects on individuals as well as households.

Table 21 The extent of project interventions competing for land and financial resources by participation and gender

| How has your involvement in the project competed for your financial or land resources? | Participants | | | | | | Non-participants | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----|--------|-----|-------|-----|------------------|-----|--------|-----|-------|-----|
| | Male | % | Female | % | Total | % | Male | % | Female | % | Total | % |
| Competed very much | 10 | 7 | 19 | 11 | 29 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| No change | 52 | 38 | 53 | 31 | 105 | 34 | 4 | 13 | 3 | 14 | 7 | 13 |
| Competed less | 66 | 49 | 94 | 55 | 160 | 52 | 9 | 28 | 8 | 36 | 17 | 31 |
| N/R | 8 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 14 | 5 | 18 | 56 | 11 | 50 | 29 | 54 |
| Total | 136 | 100 | 172 | 100 | 308 | 100 | 32 | 100 | 22 | 100 | 54 | 100 |

Table 21 reveals that project interventions had little impact in terms of competing for land or financial resources of project participants. This can be a positive outcome that would motivate project participants to continue to implement, expand and replicate the interventions. Since the interventions have the potential to yield additional benefits without competing for resources this could also be a motivating factor for non-participant households to replicate the interventions.

Table 22 Empowerment by the project by gender

| Has the intervention empowered you in the following Ways? | Sex of the respondent | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|------|--------|------|--------|------|
| | Male | | Female | | Total | |
| | Number | % | Number | % | Number | % |
| New business opportunities | 100 | 27 | 108 | 29 | 208 | 56 |
| Improved life style | 97 | 26 | 124 | 34 | 221 | 60 |
| Gained new skills and knowledge | 103 | 28 | 115 | 31 | 218 | 59 |
| Productive employment | 92 | 24.9 | 95 | 25.7 | 187 | 50.7 |
| Job opportunities for family members | 50 | 14 | 55 | 15 | 105 | 29 |
| Increased access to credit | 82 | 22 | 84 | 23 | 166 | 45 |
| Business confidence | 52 | 14 | 66 | 18 | 118 | 32 |
| Increased feeling of responsibility | 89 | 24 | 100 | 27 | 189 | 51 |
| Gained increased awareness | 138 | 38 | 163 | 44 | 301 | 82 |
| Gained independent income | 133 | 36 | 152 | 41 | 285 | 77 |
| Built self confidence | 104 | 28 | 128 | 35 | 232 | 63 |
| See the future as bright | 128 | 35 | 154 | 42 | 282 | 76 |
| Gained respect in the community | 142 | 39 | 163 | 44 | 305 | 83 |
| Gained respect in the household | 120 | 33 | 122 | 33 | 242 | 66 |
| Improved social network | 121 | 33 | 133 | 36 | 254 | 69 |
| Improved ability to cope with shocks | 118 | 32 | 135 | 37 | 253 | 69 |
| Got motivated | 113 | 31 | 118 | 32 | 231 | 63 |
| More time to family | 128 | 35 | 135 | 37 | 263 | 72 |

Interestingly, Table 22 shows that the project has significantly impacted on the respondents in most of the empowerment indicators that are listed in the Table. The fact that the project has seen the seeds of empowerment in such short a time span indicates the degree of emphasis the project has placed on those aspects, that have a long-term bearing in the improvement of the livelihoods and self-reliance of project participants in the area.

Knowledge about the areas where the participants have made the most gains, helps the GLAD project to make appropriate targeting for the future and to follow up participants so that the gains they have made are sustained in the long-term.

Table 23 Food intake amongst project participants before and after the project

| Response before | Response after | | | | Total before |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| | Worse | Same as before | Better | Much better | |
| Very inadequate | 2 | 40 | 18 | 0 | 60 |
| Inadequate | 7 | 74 | 32 | 1 | 114 |
| Adequate | 2 | 68 | 62 | 2 | 134 |
| Very adequate | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Total after | 11 | 185 | 113 | 3 | 312 |
| Percent | 4 | 59 | 36 | 1 | 100 |

A significant number of participants, 113 (36 percent) claimed that their food intake has improved in the after project situation. According to some project participants involved in the FGDs, particularly those of poultry intervention beneficiaries, they have started to earn more cash income and were able to improve their food intake after involvement in the project.

Table 24 - Ability of beneficiaries to pay for their own health, clothing, education needs and extended family support

| Needs | Period | Response | | | | | |
|-----------|----------|----------|-------------|-----------|------------|--------|-----|
| | | Never | Very Rarely | Sometimes | Very Often | Always | N/A |
| Health | Before | 12 | 158 | 149 | 37 | 5 | 8 |
| | After | 10 | 123 | 165 | 44 | 7 | 20 |
| | Change % | -17 | -22 | 11 | 19 | 40 | 150 |
| Clothing | Before | 1 | 154 | 162 | 30 | 4 | 18 |
| | After | 0 | 124 | 172 | 36 | 5 | 32 |
| | Change % | -100 | -19 | 6 | 20 | 25 | 78 |
| Education | Before | 67 | 44 | 70 | 73 | 24 | 91 |
| | After | 65 | 39 | 76 | 73 | 25 | 90 |
| | Change % | -3 | -11 | 9 | 0 | 4 | -1 |
| Total | Before | 80 | 356 | 381 | 140 | 33 | 117 |
| | After | 75 | 286 | 413 | 153 | 37 | 142 |
| | Change % | -6 | -20 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 21 |

The figures in Table 24 reveal that in almost all the basic needs, there has been improvement in meeting the needs after being involved in the project, even though the number of people with such responses were not significantly higher than those in the “before-project” situation.

Further analysis of the survey results indicates that project participants who reported “never” and “very rarely” afforded to pay for their own health care, education and clothing reduced after involvement in the project.

Table 25 - Ability of beneficiaries to pay for their families' health, clothing, education needs and extended family support

| Needs | Period | Response | | | | | |
|-----------|----------|----------|-------------|-----------|------------|--------|-----|
| | | Never | Very Rarely | Sometimes | Very Often | Always | N/A |
| Health | Before | 9 | 154 | 151 | 32 | 5 | 17 |
| | After | 8 | 126 | 166 | 35 | 5 | 27 |
| | Change % | -11 | -18 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 59 |
| Clothing | Before | 8 | 177 | 129 | 28 | 2 | 25 |
| | After | 2 | 154 | 143 | 30 | 2 | 35 |
| | Change % | -75 | -13 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 40 |
| Education | Before | 41 | 68 | 94 | 61 | 29 | 64 |
| | After | 40 | 62 | 100 | 66 | 29 | 66 |
| | Change % | 36 | -9 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 3 |
| Total | Before | 58 | 399 | 374 | 141 | 36 | 106 |
| | After | 50 | 342 | 409 | 151 | 36 | 128 |
| | Change % | -16 | -14 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 21 |

As in Table 24, participant's ability to pay for their families' health, clothing and education needs increased after their involvement in the project than the situation before. Again the fact that changes are not exaggeratingly high after the project situation is the result of the pilot nature of the GLAD projects. This however shows the inherent potential that the project interventions have in meeting the basic needs of the people involved in the project.

Table 26 - Beneficiaries' membership in community organizations before and after involvement in the project

| Community Organization | Before | After | Change % |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Iddir | 340 | 353 | 9 |
| Equb | 50 | 54 | 8 |
| Religious Mehaber | 108 | 111 | 3 |
| Saving and Credit Association | 30 | 85 | 183 |
| Business Association | 8 | 11 | 38 |

Another important, but often ignored, dimension of livelihood improvement impacts of projects on their target group is the ability to influence community members in mainstream community life. Often, the poor are tacitly excluded from mainstream community life and have no influence over matters that affect their lives. However, it goes without saying that, when the economic conditions of people is improved, it is highly likely that their social position also improve enabling them to assume new and active roles in their communities, which they are part of. The new roles, in turn, through increased social interaction and influence, will create new opportunities for people to take advantage of.

In this regard, rate of participation of project participants in community organizations has shown a modest improvement after involvement in the project. Particularly participation in business associations after the project situation has been remarkably high (183 percent change), showing the high potential that the projects have in providing business opportunities amongst participants of the project.

Table 27- Resilience of beneficiaries after intervention by gender

| Has the intervention reduced your dependency on relief and other outside assistance for: | Project Participants | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|----------|---------------|----------|
| | Male | % | Female | % |
| Food | 57 | 42 | 86 | 50 |
| Shelter | 36 | 27 | 27 | 16 |
| Clothing | 43 | 32 | 59 | 34 |
| Education | 46 | 34 | 56 | 33 |
| Health | 46 | 34 | 59 | 34 |
| Debt repayment | 14 | 10 | 28 | 16 |

The Table above shows that the project has contributed to the reduction of dependency on relief and other kinds of external assistance amongst beneficiaries. Both among women and men participants of the project, a reduction of dependency on food relief stands out as

significant. The fact that dependence on others for debt repayment is low indicates that the financial income generating aspects of the project is not realized at the moment of the survey although it was indicated in community FGDs that the GLAD project interventions have high potential for improving financial income in the long-term.

Table 28 - Relief Assistance received after the project by Participation in the project

| Have you received food and non-food assistance over the last 12 months? | Participants | | | | | | Non-participants | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----|--------|-----|-------|-----|------------------|-----|--------|-----|-------|-----|
| | Male | % | Female | % | Total | % | Male | % | Female | % | Total | % |
| Yes | 62 | 46 | 72 | 42 | 134 | 44 | 11 | 34 | 10 | 45 | 21 | 39 |
| No | 36 | 26 | 24 | 14 | 60 | 19 | 7 | 22 | 3 | 14 | 10 | 18 |
| N/R | 38 | 28 | 76 | 44 | 114 | 37 | 14 | 44 | 9 | 41 | 23 | 43 |
| Total | 136 | 100 | 172 | 100 | 308 | 100 | 32 | 100 | 22 | 100 | 54 | 100 |

Table 28 reveals that, there is not much difference between participants and non-participants in terms of receiving food and non-food relief. As discussed in earlier parts of this survey, it is not surprising to observe that some beneficiaries still depend on food aid, since the interventions of CHF have not yet adequately born fruits for a number of the project participants. However, these responses slightly deviate from what was collected during the FGDs where discussants stated that, relief assistance has declined for CHF beneficiaries after their involvement in the projects.

Table 29- Respondents' involvement in business activities by participation and gender

| Are you involved in Business activities? | Participants | | | | Non-Participants | | | |
|--|--------------|--------|-------|-----|------------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | Male | Female | Total | % | Male | Female | Total | % |
| Yes | 65 | 117 | 182 | 59 | 11 | 16 | 27 | 51 |
| No | 54 | 39 | 93 | 30 | 14 | 5 | 19 | 36 |
| N/R | 17 | 15 | 32 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 13 |
| Total | 136 | 171 | 307 | 100 | 31 | 22 | 53 | 100 |

Table 29 shows that about 68 percent (117) of women project participants are involved in business activities. About 47 percent of project participants are also involved in business. Unlike other rural areas, women in the GLAD project areas have a high tendency for business. This could be associated to their proximity to urban areas as well as the entrepreneurship tradition of the people from the Gurage area. The fact that this was the trend has also been confirmed during FGDs that were conducted with the various stakeholders. This is thus an opportunity for CHF to build momentum with a view of introducing business development services in the area in the future.

Table 30 - Reasons for being engaged in business activities by participation and gender

| Reasons | Participants | | | | Non-participants | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|-----|------------------|-----------|-----------|-----|
| | Male | Female | Total | % | Male | Female | Total | % |
| Cover domestic expenses | 43 | 94 | 137 | 44 | 8 | 12 | 20 | 38 |
| No other alternative | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pays well | 12 | 5 | 17 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Family business | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 17 | 11 | 28 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| N/R | 61 | 59 | 120 | 39 | 19 | 7 | 26 | 50 |
| Total | 136 | 172 | 308 | 100 | 32 | 20 | 52 | 100 |

The Table above reveals that the major reason for going into business for both female and male project participants is covering domestic expenses (44 percent). The second significant reason given for being involved in business is the profitability of business/“pays well”. This is an indication that engagement in small business is a major livelihood diversification strategy in rural areas, particularly in the CHF GLAD project areas. This is a clear signal for CHF to further explore the potential that small businesses have in improving livelihoods in the area.

Table 31- Products sold by respondents by participation in the project

| Products | Participants | | | Non-participants | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-------|----------|------------------|-------|----------|
| | Before | After | Change % | Before | After | Change % |
| Egg | 92 | 100 | 9 | 18 | 13 | -28 |
| Honey | 39 | 39 | 0 | 2 | 2 | -100 |
| Butter | 90 | 90 | 0 | 22 | 15 | -32 |
| Fruit | 21 | 20 | -5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vegetables | 29 | 29 | 0 | 5 | 4 | -20 |
| Chicken | 85 | 93 | 9 | 18 | 12 | -33 |
| Goats | 16 | 12 | -25 | 3 | 1 | -67 |
| Sheep | 16 | 19 | 19 | 5 | 3 | -40 |
| Heifer | 10 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | -100 |
| Seedlings (tree, fruit, etc.) | 19 | 18 | -5 | 5 | 4 | -20 |

The Table above shows that the change in the after the project situation for project participants is limited to the intervention that have yielded some products such as egg, for which non-project participants registered negative results. It is clear that although, participants have not seen significant impact from the other project interventions at the time of the study, they have expressed the potential for a promising outcome within a few months time. The fact that there are negative trends along all the item lines for the non-participants also shows how the participants are better off from the non-participants by virtue of their participation in the projects.

Table 32- Frequency of GLAD products taken to the market by participation and gender

| How often do you take your GLAD products to the market? | Participants | | | | Non-participants | | | |
|---|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | Male | Female | Total | % | Male | Female | Total | % |
| Daily | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Weekly | 22 | 35 | 57 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Monthly | 10 | 7 | 17 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 28 | 51 | 79 | 26 | 9 | 7 | 16 | 31 |
| N/R | 74 | 76 | 150 | 49 | 23 | 14 | 37 | 69 |
| Total | 134 | 170 | 304 | 100 | 32 | 21 | 53 | 100 |

Table 32 shows that majority of project participants (57 percent) bring their GLAD products to the market on a weekly basis, and that more females go to markets as compared to males. This is a confirmation that women have a more entrepreneurial quality than men in the GLAD project sites. This again provides useful information to all concerned as to who to target and focus in terms of providing Business Development Services (BDS) in the area.

Table 33- Quantity of Product sold by Respondents before and after the project by Participation in the project

| Product | Participants | | | | | | Non-participants | | | | | |
|------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|------------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | Before | | | After | | | Before | | | After | | |
| | Small | Mediu | Large | Small | Mediur | Larg | Small | Mediun | Large | Small | Mediun | Large |
| Egg | 47 | 41 | 4 | 38 | 40 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Honey | 15 | 15 | 1 | 9 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Butter | 48 | 36 | 0 | 21 | 23 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Fruit | 5 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vegetables | 7 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Chicken | 33 | 36 | 6 | 26 | 38 | 8 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 0 |
| Goats | 6 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Sheep | 5 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Heifer | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Seedlings | 7 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |

The Table above shows that there is not much difference on volume of sale of the various GLAD inputs before and after the project situation. But the slight indication in the increased volume of sale in eggs and chicken after the project situation for participants, shows that in those interventions that have already began to yield, project participants are benefiting from the increased volume of sale.

Table 34- Type of Customers by Participation in the Project and Gender

| Who do you sell your products to? | Participants | | | | Non-participants | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | Male | Female | Total | % | Male | Female | Total | % |
| Middlemen at farm gate | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Retailers | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Whole sellers | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| By the road side | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Anybody in the open market | 122 | 139 | 261 | 86 | 28 | 20 | 48 | 94 |
| N/R | 8 | 23 | 31 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Total | 135 | 167 | 302 | 100 | 31 | 20 | 51 | 100 |

As is the case for most small-scale producers in rural areas, Table 34 shows that both project participants (86 percent) and non-participants (94 percent) have no regular or specialized customers for their products. Most of them indicated that they sell their products to anybody in the open market. Such mechanisms put small-scale producers in vulnerable situation at times of demand decline for their products, as open market buyers have no contractual relations with their suppliers on the open market. The factors that determine good profit margins to the GLAD products and participants have to be explored further for any future business development services in the area.

Table 35 - Means of transportation used by participation in the project and gender

| Means of transportation | Participants | | | | Non-participants | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | Male | Female | Total | % | Male | Female | Total | % |
| Own back | 65 | 113 | 178 | 58 | 18 | 17 | 35 | 65 |
| Back of animals | 55 | 37 | 92 | 30 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 28 |
| Public transport | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Freight transport | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 5 | 7 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| N/R | 6 | 15 | 21 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| Total | 136 | 172 | 308 | 100 | 32 | 22 | 54 | 100 |

As Table 35 reveals, the major means of transport for commodities are the backs of people for both participating (58 percent) and non-participating (65 percent) individuals. It also shows that women are particularly solely dependent on their own back and animals' while men have other options to use although the variation is not so much significant.

Table 36- Time taken by respondents to reach a destination market by participation in the project and gender

| Time | Participants | | | | Non-participants | | | |
|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | Male | Female | Total | % | Male | Female | Total | % |
| <1hour | 70 | 107 | 177 | 58 | 22 | 18 | 40 | 75 |
| 1-3hour | 53 | 49 | 102 | 34 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 19 |
| 3-6hours | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6+hours | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| N/R | 8 | 12 | 20 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| Total | 132 | 171 | 303 | 100 | 32 | 21 | 53 | 100 |

Table 36 shows that for the majority of the project participants 177 (58 percent), the time required to reach a destination market is less than one hour. The findings also reveal that about 102 (34 percent) of the project participants need between 1-3 hours to reach their destination market. Given that most participants use their own or animals' back to transport commodities to markets, the likelihood of transporting big volumes and increasing their profit margin is meager.

Table 37 - Major market problems in the project areas by participation and gender

| Problems | Participants | | | | Non-participants | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|----|--------|----|------------------|----|--------|----|
| | Male | % | Female | % | Male | % | Female | % |
| Lack of price information | 95 | 70 | 103 | 60 | 21 | 66 | 14 | 64 |
| Lack of information to client demand | 78 | 57 | 97 | 56 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 55 |
| Poor product quality | 80 | 60 | 96 | 56 | 15 | 47 | 15 | 68 |
| Lack of access to financial credit | 84 | 62 | 107 | 62 | 22 | 69 | 12 | 55 |
| Long distance to market | 58 | 43 | 79 | 46 | 14 | 44 | 7 | 32 |
| Lack of transport | 53 | 39 | 64 | 37 | 13 | 41 | 8 | 36 |
| Low product volume | 117 | 86 | 137 | 80 | 17 | 53 | 20 | 91 |
| Lack of working space | 55 | 40 | 57 | 33 | 10 | 31 | 11 | 50 |

According to Table 37, low product volume (86 percent of male participants and 80 percent of female participants), lack of access to financial credit and lack of price information rank between 1-3 for project participants respectively. The Table also reveals working space is the least among market related problems in the area. These responses have a strong implication for CHF, if it has any plan for business development services in the area as it indicates on which of the market problems to focus.

Table 38 Current and intended future use of earnings amongst project participants by gender

| Area of expenditure | Current | | | | Future | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------|----|--------|----|--------|----|--------|----|
| | Male | % | Female | % | Male | % | Female | % |
| Support family/partner | 19 | 14 | 38 | 22 | 73 | 54 | 91 | 53 |
| Social obligation/leisure | 21 | 15 | 47 | 23 | 81 | 60 | 94 | 55 |
| Savings (bank/equb) | 9 | 7 | 33 | 19 | 92 | 68 | 114 | 66 |
| Business expansion | 17 | 13 | 39 | 23 | 98 | 72 | 122 | 80 |
| House construction/renovation | 17 | 13 | 47 | 27 | 125 | 92 | 125 | 73 |
| School fee and materials | 17 | 13 | 56 | 33 | 101 | 74 | 124 | 72 |
| Clothing expenses | 20 | 15 | 52 | 30 | 100 | 74 | 120 | 70 |
| Tax and fertilizer expenses | 15 | 11 | 46 | 27 | 112 | 82 | 118 | 69 |
| Household furniture | 25 | 18 | 57 | 33 | 98 | 72 | 117 | 68 |
| Daily food consumption | 1 | 1 | 76 | 44 | 105 | 77 | 123 | 72 |
| Wedding parties | 6 | 4 | 18 | 11 | 62 | 46 | 75 | 44 |
| Household energy | 22 | 16 | 46 | 27 | 87 | 64 | 104 | 61 |

Table 38 reveals that as of current, earnings by females go mostly to cover expenses for daily food consumption (44 percent), while this is the least expenditure item for males (1 percent). It also reveals that in the future most females intend to use their earnings to expand business (80 percent), while most men intend to use theirs to construct/renovate their houses (92 percent).

In general, there is a general increase in intent to use earnings in each of the expenditure areas in the future as their realize more benefits from the project. This shows that participants have high expectations that the project will bear more benefits to them in the future.

Table 39 - Future potential of the project in improving livelihoods by participation in the project

| Areas of Livelihoods | Participants | | | | Non-participants | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|------|-----|----------|------------------|------|-----|----------|
| | Very High | High | Low | Very Low | Very High | High | Low | Very Low |
| Household assets | 71 | 131 | 44 | 12 | 8 | 26 | 9 | 1 |
| Household income | 69 | 150 | 39 | 6 | 9 | 22 | 10 | 1 |
| Diversifying income | 63 | 160 | 48 | 4 | 9 | 23 | 9 | 0 |
| Diversifying skills | 58 | 134 | 38 | 12 | 10 | 24 | 8 | 0 |
| Employment on farm | 24 | 100 | 63 | 9 | 3 | 11 | 13 | 2 |
| Off farm employment | 23 | 89 | 66 | 12 | 1 | 11 | 15 | 0 |
| Access to food | 69 | 147 | 42 | 4 | 10 | 24 | 8 | 1 |
| Social network | 69 | 125 | 23 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 5 | 1 |

It is interesting to note from Table 39 that the majority of the project participants believe that the projects they are involved in are in the range of very high to high in terms of their potential to improve the livelihood status of the participants in the future.

7. Conclusions

It is early to make conclusive remarks on the full impact of the CHF/GLAD projects on the livelihoods of the project participants given the short life span of the project. However, the following assertions can be made from the quantitative survey result and the FGDs and KIIs conducted with various stakeholders during the assessment.

As expressed by both project participants and local authority members in the various FGDS, in general, the CHF/GLAD interventions have raised hopes and expectations for a bright future, motivated participants for working hard, and had “*sown the seeds for self-reliance*” among the beneficiaries.

There are clear indications that involvement in poultry production has potential in improving and diversifying beneficiaries’ household income and consumption. Although chickens of late recipients have not yet begun laying eggs, early recipients have benefited from the sales of eggs and egg consumption at the household level (cover expenses for coffee, tea, sugar, buy exercise books for children, etc.). In few instances, some households have acquired sheep from revenues of egg and cockerel sales.

Chicks were provided to beneficiary households in sufficient quantity by the project, taking into consideration the potential loss that might happen until the chicks mature enough to lay eggs. This has enabled many of the households to retain most of the chicks, although they lost some due to diseases. The approach has also impressed the Woreda authorities who stated that they have never witnessed any other NGO providing chicks in such quantity to guaranty continued survival in the face of uncertainty. They also expressed that the approach has aroused sufficient interest to emulate the CHF example in livelihood projects implemented by the government itself.

Despite the benefits gained from the chicks, concerns expressed by the beneficiaries include the problem of providing enough feed to guarantee continued supply of eggs, the destruction of vegetation and crops at own homesteads and at that of neighbours because of lack of fencing to guard the chicks.

Beneficiaries who received seedlings of multi-purpose trees (particularly fruit trees and coffee seedlings) expressed that although it will take 4-5 years for the trees to bear fruit, they have a high potential to raise household income based on the experiences they had from owning fruit trees in the past. It was interesting to hear a key informant saying, “*I was able to raise about Birr 200 per year only from a single papaya tree*”.

Some participants in MPTs, however, expressed their concern that the number of MPTs provided by the project is so few to have a substantial impact in improving income.

Participants in modern honeybee production expressed that the task is simpler once sufficient training is provided and less demanding in terms of labour and provision of feed, when compared to chicken, although the income generated from honey is fairly comparable to that of chicken.

On the other hand, revenue generated from honey is controlled by males/husbands in the household, and it is less likely to be used for the improvement of the welfare of the whole family.

There is a general increased level of motivation and change of attitude of participants as the trainings received at start of projects have made them aware that their livelihoods conditions can change if they use their knowledge and skills gained from the trainings.

Most of the women project participants are organized into associations together with non-participant women in the project sites. These associations have the potential to develop into saving and credit cooperatives, opening avenues for future development into business associations. However, these associations lack strong organizational support either from GLAD or Woreda Cooperatives Promotion office.

Not the least, the positive impact the project is having on beneficiaries can also be inferred from the strong desire and demands non-participants are expressing to join the project, the efforts they put in to emulate from participant households, such as buying chicks from participant households.

Free relief provision for GLAD participants has been scaled down/ceased by Woreda authorities except as part of the new Safety Net Program that is linked to participation in public works. This measure by itself is a recognition of the impact GLAD projects are going to have on participants and an indication of a positive attitude change showing a departure from dependence on relief and a sign of belief that people can improve their livelihoods if they are supported on ways other than emergency relief.

It has also influenced attitudes of beneficiary households in that they now have to focus their energy and available resources to improve their livelihood rather than desperately waiting for relief aid.

8. Recommendations

- 8.1 Beneficiaries are organized into savings and credit groups, mainly as women's associations. But the support they are getting from Woreda Cooperatives Promotion office or from GLAD is negligible.

Although both the quantitative and qualitative surveys of this study reveal that project participants are very enthusiastic to be engaged in business activities, have some background business/trading experiences, and also have some savings of their own and some capital injection from CHF, they are not productively using these resources.

CHF has to thus provide its own technical assistance in business development services and create linkages to Woreda Cooperatives Promotion office and other cooperatives promoting organizations to properly guide the beneficiaries into profitable businesses. In this regard, CHF has to facilitate strong linkages and experience exchange foras with the Woreda Women's Fund, Self-Help

International, Omo Microfinance, Meklit Microfinance, and Action Aid, who are active in the project area.

- 8.2 There have been off-farm income generating project experiences in the GLAD Woredas that have been tried by other non-governmental organizations and Woreda Rural Development and Agricultural offices. Such projects include: sisage products, grass products, pottery and silk products.

The potentials of these projects have to be further explored by the market survey and products identified for pilot production.

- 8.3 While petty trading is widely practiced among participant and non participant women in the project sites in particular and in the Woredas in general, they are characterized by low profit margin, low product quality, lack of specialization, lack of price information, lack of information on client demand, low product volume and lack of financial capital.

CHF has thus a potential niche to provide business development services in the areas of business training, leadership/management development, cooperatives development, market information provision and injecting capital for business for organized groups.

- 8.4 While there is reservation on the part of CHF to invest on grain marketing as a potential income generating activity, FGDs with communities and Woreda level revealed that grain marketing has great potential particularly at lean seasons, since prices rise due to shortage of supply at the local level.

CHF could thus inject finance for individual or organized women's groups to serve as seed money for grain purchase and store construction and increase the impact on increasing and diversifying household income. The market survey should sufficiently explore the potential for grain marketing for women in the area.

- 8.5 Follow up technical support and trainings generally declined when compared to the initial phase of the project by GLAD and Woreda level line offices. For example, FGDs revealed that many honeybee beneficiaries in Silti Woreda did not start using their modern beehives fearing that the colonies would disappear in the process of transferring them from the traditional into the modern hives.

Similarly, a number of chick recipients have not built houses for their chicks with the money they were provided with when receiving the chicks. In the former case, the benefit that would have been harnessed from a modern beehive is undermined, and in the latter, the problem of destruction of crops and vegetable by the roaming chicks could have been avoided.

Thus sufficient follow up and monitoring of the appropriate use of project input has to be made so that intended outcomes and impacts of the projects are ensured.

Annex 1

Questionnaire for CHF GLAD Impact Survey

I. Respondent's Profile

1. Name:
 - 1.1. Are you a participant in the project?
 - 1) Yes 2) No
2. Woreda:
3. Kebele
4. Age
 - 1) <16 2) 16-25 3) 26-35 4) 36-45 5) 46-60 6) >60
5. Sex
 - 1) Male 2) Female
6. If female, is the respondent
 - 1) Pregnant 2) Lactating 3) Other, Specify _____
7. Ethnic group
 - 1) Silti 2) Guraghe 3) Mareko 5) Other, Specify_____
8. Religion
 - 1) Muslim 2) Orthodox Christian 3) Other, Specify_____
9. Marital Status
 - 1) Married 2) Single 3) Separated 4) Divorced 5) Other, Specify_____
10. Level of education
 - 1) Illiterate 2) Primary 3) Secondary 5) Tertiary 6) Other, Specify_____
11. Do you have children or other dependents who are living with you?
 - 1) Yes 2) No 3) No response

| 12. Number of dependents | Male | Female |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1-3 | | |
| 4-6 | | |
| 7-9 | | |
| 10-12 | | |
| 13+ | | |

II Livelihood Condition: Sources of livelihood

| 13. What were/are the sources of your livelihood? | Before the Project | | After the Project | |
|--|---------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Farming | | | | |
| If farming, what crops do you grow? | | | | |
| 1) Single annual crop | | | | |
| 2) Multiple annual crops | | | | |
| 3) Single perennial crops | | | | |
| 4) Multiple perennial crops | | | | |
| Livestock | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Petty trading | | | | |
| Casual labour employment | | | | |
| Remittances | | | | |
| Other | | | | |

III. Livelihood Condition: Household Income

| 14. Average monthly household income from sale of single annual crops? | Before the project | After the project |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <50 Birr | | |
| 50-100 Birr | | |
| 100-150 Birr | | |
| 151-200 Birr | | |
| >200 Birr | | |
| No response | | |

| 15. Average monthly household income from sale of multiple annual crops? | Before the project | After the project |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <50 Birr | | |
| 50-100 Birr | | |
| 100-150 Birr | | |
| 151-200 Birr | | |
| >200 Birr | | |
| No response | | |

| 16. Average monthly household income from sale of single perennial crops? | Before the project | After the project |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <50 Birr | | |
| 50-100 Birr | | |
| 100-150 Birr | | |
| 151-200 Birr | | |
| >200 Birr | | |
| No response | | |

| 17. Average monthly household income from sale of multiple perennial crops? | Before the project | After the project |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <50 Birr | | |
| 50-100 Birr | | |
| 100-150 Birr | | |
| 151-200 Birr | | |
| >200 Birr | | |
| No response | | |

| 18. Average monthly household income from sale of | Before the | After the |
|--|-------------------|------------------|
|--|-------------------|------------------|

| livestock and livestock products? | project | project |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| <50 Birr | | |
| 50-100 Birr | | |
| 100-150 Birr | | |
| 151-200 Birr | | |
| >200 Birr | | |
| No response | | |

| 19. Average monthly household income from petty trading? | Before the project | After the project |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <50 Birr | | |
| 50-100 Birr | | |
| 100-150 Birr | | |
| 151-200 Birr | | |
| >200 Birr | | |
| No response | | |

| 20. Average monthly household income from casual labour employment? | Before the project | After the project |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <50 Birr | | |
| 50-100 Birr | | |
| 100-150 Birr | | |
| 151-200 Birr | | |
| >200 Birr | | |
| No response | | |

| 21. Average monthly household income from remittances? | Before the project | After the project |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <50 Birr | | |
| 50-100 Birr | | |
| 100-150 Birr | | |
| 151-200 Birr | | |
| >200 Birr | | |
| No response | | |

II Livelihood Condition: Physical assets ownership

| 22. Did/do you own following physical assets assets? | Monetary value in Birr | Before the project | | After the project | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------|
| | | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Iron roofed house | | | | | |
| Bed | | | | | |
| Spade | | | | | |
| Hammer | | | | | |
| Lamp | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Tourch | | | | | |
| Kerosene stove | | | | | |
| Jerry can | | | | | |
| Household furniture | | | | | |
| Farm tools/equipment | | | | | |
| Radio/tape recorder | | | | | |
| Chicken brooder | | | | | |
| Grain store | | | | | |
| Bee hive | | | | | |
| Ox | | | | | |
| Sheep | | | | | |
| Goat | | | | | |
| Donkey | | | | | |
| Horse | | | | | |
| Mule | | | | | |
| Poultry | | | | | |
| Land | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | |

IV. Involvement in the Project and Livelihood Impacts

23. In which of the following project interventions are you involved?

- 1) Poultry 2) Beekeeping 3) Livestock 4) Vegetable and fruits
 5) Multipurpose trees 6) Small scale irrigation 7) Saving and credit
 8) Combination, specify ____

24. How much did you contribute toward accessing these items?

- 1) None 2) < 10 Birr 3) 10-25 Birr 4) 26- 40 birr 5) >40 Birr

25. Have you had prior experience in the intervention you are involved in?

- 1) Yes 2) No

26.1. If yes, how long has your experience been?

- 1) 1-5 years 2) 6-10 years 3) 16-20 Years 4) >20 years

27. Are you receiving technical support from CHF/GLAD so that you gain out of the intervention you are involved in?

- 1)Yes 2) No

28. In what form are you getting the support?

- 1) Training 2) Advice 3) Demonstration 4) Experience exchange 5) Other,
 Specify__

29. Is the support you are getting:

- 1) Very adequate 2) Adequate 3) Somewhat adequate 4) Not adequate

30. How useful is the support you are getting from GE/CHF?

- 1) Very useful 2) Useful 3) Somewhat useful 4) Less useful 5) Not useful

31. How has your involvement in the GLAD project affected your daily working hours in comparison to before joining the project?

- 1) Increased it very much 2) No change 3) Reduced it 4) No response

32. Does your involvement in GLAD projects affected your resources in terms of land and money in comparison to before joining the project?

- 1) Competed very much 2) No change 3) Competed less 4) No response

| 33. Has the intervention empowered you in the following ways? | Yes | No |
|--|------------|-----------|
| New business opportunities | | |
| Improved life style | | |
| Gained new technical skills and knowledge | | |
| Communication/marketing skills | | |
| Productive employment | | |
| Job opportunities for family members | | |
| Increased access to credit | | |
| Business confidence | | |
| Increased feeling of responsibility | | |
| Gained increased awareness | | |
| Gained independent income | | |
| Built self-confidence | | |
| See the future as bright | | |
| Gained respect in the community | | |
| Gained respect in the household | | |
| Improved social network | | |
| Improved ability to cope with shocks | | |
| Got motivated | | |
| More time to family | | |

Food intake among project participants before and after involvement in the project

| 34. What was the situation of your food intake? | Before the project | After the project |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Very inadequate | | |

| | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| Inadequate | | |
| Adequate | | |
| Very adequate | | |

Ability of beneficiaries to pay for their own health, clothing, education needs and extended family support

| 35. How often were you able to pay for your own needs of the following? | Period | Response | | | | | |
|---|--------|----------|-------------|-----------|------------|--------|----|
| | | Never | Very rarely | Sometimes | Very often | Always | NA |
| Health | Before | | | | | | |
| | After | | | | | | |
| Clothing | Before | | | | | | |
| | After | | | | | | |
| Education | Before | | | | | | |
| | After | | | | | | |
| Ext. Family | Before | | | | | | |
| | After | | | | | | |

Ability of beneficiaries to pay for their families' health, clothing, education needs and extended family support

| 36. How often were you able to pay for your families' needs of the following? | Period | Response | | | | | |
|---|--------|----------|-------------|-----------|------------|--------|----|
| | | Never | Very rarely | Sometimes | Very often | Always | NA |
| Health | Before | | | | | | |
| | After | | | | | | |
| Clothing | Before | | | | | | |
| | After | | | | | | |
| Education | Before | | | | | | |
| | After | | | | | | |
| Ext. Family | Before | | | | | | |
| | After | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| 37. Has your food intake after the project become | |
| Worse than before the project | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Same as before the project | |
| Better than before the project | |
| Much better than before the project | |
| No response | |

Beneficiaries' membership in community organizations before and after involvement in the project

| 38. Community organization | Before | After |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Iddir | | |
| Equb | | |
| Religious mehaber | | |
| Saving and credit association | | |
| Business associations | | |
| Other | | |
| None | | |

III. Resilience of beneficiaries

| 39. Has the intervention reduced your dependency on relief and other outside assistance for: | Yes | No |
|--|------------|-----------|
| Food | | |
| Shelter | | |
| Clothing | | |
| Education | | |
| Health | | |
| Debt repayment | | |
| Other | | |

40. Have you received food and non-food assistance over the last 12 months?

- 1) Yes 2) No

| 41. If yes to Q# 40 What was the amount of food assistance you received in the last 12 months | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----|
| Type of food item | Months | Quantity | | | | | |
| | | <11kg | 11-15kg | 16-20kg | 21-25kg | 26-30kg | 31+ |
| | June'04 | | | | | | |
| | July'04 | | | | | | |
| | Aug.'04 | | | | | | |
| | Sep.'04 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Oct.'04 | | | | | | |
| | Oct.'04 | | | | | | |
| | Nov.'04 | | | | | | |
| | Dec.'04 | | | | | | |
| | Jan.'05 | | | | | | |
| | Feb.'05 | | | | | | |
| | Mar.'05 | | | | | | |
| | Apr.'05 | | | | | | |
| | May.'05 | | | | | | |

| 42. If yes to Q# 40 What was the amount of non-food assistance you received in the last 12 months | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----|
| Type of non-food item | Months | Quantity (based on response) | | | | | |
| | | <11kg | 11-15kg | 16-20kg | 21-25kg | 26-30kg | 31+ |
| | June'04 | | | | | | |
| | July'04 | | | | | | |
| | Aug.'04 | | | | | | |
| | Sep.'04 | | | | | | |
| | Oct.'04 | | | | | | |
| | Oct.'04 | | | | | | |
| | Nov.'04 | | | | | | |
| | Dec.'04 | | | | | | |
| | Jan.'05 | | | | | | |
| | Feb.'05 | | | | | | |
| | Mar.'05 | | | | | | |
| | Apr.'05 | | | | | | |
| | May.'05 | | | | | | |

IV. Marketing activities of beneficiaries

43. Are you involved in business activities?

1) Yes 2) No

44. What are your reasons for being engaged in the business?

1) cover domestic expenses 2) no other alternative 3) Pays well 4) Family business 5) other

| 45. Did you sell the following items? | Before the Project | After the Project |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Egg | | |
| Honey | | |
| Butter | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Fruit | | |
| Vegetables | | |
| Chicken | | |
| Goat | | |
| Sheep | | |
| Heifer | | |
| Seedlings (vegetable, fruit, trees, etc) | | |
| No response | | |

46. How often do you take your GLAD products to the market?

- 1) Daily 2) Weekly 3) Monthly 4) Other

| 47. In what quantity do you sale the following products each time you go to the market? | Before the project | | | After the project | | |
|---|--------------------|--------|-------|-------------------|--------|-------|
| | Small | Medium | Large | Small | Medium | Large |
| Egg | | | | | | |
| Honey | | | | | | |
| Butter | | | | | | |
| Fruit | | | | | | |
| Vegetables | | | | | | |
| Chicken | | | | | | |
| Goat | | | | | | |
| Sheep | | | | | | |
| Heifer | | | | | | |
| Seedlings (vegetable, fruit, trees, etc) | | | | | | |
| No response | | | | | | |

48. Who do you sell your products to?

- 1) middle men at the farm gate 2) retailers 3) whole sellers 4) shops/kiosks 5) by the road side 6) anybody in the open market stall

49. Which is the best sale season for your product?

- 1) Sept- Nov. 2) Dec.-Feb. 3) Mar.-May 4) June-Aug

50. What is the means of transport you use?

- 1) own back 2) back of animals 3) public transport 4) freight transport 5) Other

51. How far is the destination market from your residence?

- 1) <1hour 2) 2-3 hours 3) 4-6 hours 4) + 6 hours

| | |
|---|--|
| 52. What are the major marketing problems in your area? | |
| Lack of price information | |
| Lack of information to client demand | |
| Poor product quality | |

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Lack of access to financial credit | |
| Long distance to market | |
| Lack of transport | |
| Low product volume | |
| Lack of working space | |

| 53. How are you currently using or planning to use your earnings from the livelihoods activities you are involved in? | Current | Future |
|--|----------------|---------------|
| Support family/partner | | |
| Social obligation/leisure | | |
| Savings (equb/bank) | | |
| Business expansion | | |
| House construction/renovation | | |
| School fee and materials | | |
| Clothing expenses | | |
| Tax and fertilizer expenses | | |
| Household furniture | | |
| Daily food consumption | | |
| Wedding parties | | |
| Household energy | | |
| No response | | |

V. Future potential of project interventions

| 54. What potentials do the interventions have for increasing the following | Very high | High | Low | Very low |
|---|------------------|-------------|------------|-----------------|
| Household assets | | | | |
| Household income | | | | |
| Diversifying income | | | | |
| Diversifying skills | | | | |
| Employment on farm | | | | |
| Off farm employment | | | | |
| Access to food | | | | |
| Social network | | | | |

Annex III

FGD Checklist of Questions for Glad Project Participants

1. Which of the interventions have a short-term/immediate impact on your livelihood? How? Why?
2. Which of the interventions have long-term impact on your livelihood? How? Why?
3. In what ways have the interventions contributed to your livelihood's improvement?
4. What are the unintended impacts of the interventions?
5. What are the intended impacts of the intervention?
6. What are the positive impacts of the interventions?
7. What are the negative impacts of the interventions?
8. What are the intangible impacts of the interventions?
9. What opportunities exist to improve livelihoods in this area?
10. What support are you getting from local authorities in making the project a success?
11. How are you influencing local authorities' decisions in favor of the project?
12. What support were you getting from CHF and how adequate were these supports?
13. What should be the way forward?

Annex IV

FGD Checklist of Questions for Local Authorities

1. How are the projects changing local people's access to institutions and their influence over them?
2. How are local authorities' attitudes and behaviours changing in favor of project participants?
3. What support are the Woredas giving to the project beneficiaries so that the impact of the project be maximized?
4. What are the policy, structural, or institutional bottlenecks for the project at the Woreda level? How do these influence household opportunities?
5. How are these policies, institutions affecting the sustainability of the project interventions?

Annex V
Checklist of questions for Key Informants

1. How significant are the impact of the intervention on participants when compared to non-participants?
2. In what ways are the interventions changing the livelihoods of project participants? Independence from relief? Increased income? Improved health? Improved expenditure for food?
3. How effectively are participants using the project inputs they are provided from CHF International?
4. What are the attitudes of non-participants towards participating farmers?
5. What are the attitudes of local authorities towards participating farmers?

Annex VI
Persons Contacted

| SN | Name | Event | Organization | Woreda | Date |
|----|--------------------|-------|--|--------|----------|
| 1 | Ato Adane | KII | Community Member | Meskan | 23/05/05 |
| 2 | Ato Feleke Lemma | FGD | Finance and Economic Development Office | Meskan | 24/05/05 |
| 3 | Ato Belachew Dagne | FGD | Finance and Economic Development Office | Meskan | 24/05/05 |
| 4 | Ato Jemal Ahmed | FGD | Agriculture and Rural Development Office | Meskan | 24/05/05 |
| 5 | Ato Abebe Aregay | FGD | Cooperatives Promotion Office | Meskan | 24/05/05 |
| 6 | Ato Mohammed Mussa | FGD | Agriculture and Rural Development Office | Meskan | 24/05/05 |
| 7 | Ato Amerga Mengi | FGD | Agriculture and Rural Development Office | Meskan | 24/05/05 |
| 8 | Ato Yeneneh | KII | Agriculture and Rural Development Office | Silti | 25/05/05 |
| 9 | Ato Mitiku Mersha | FGD | Agriculture and Rural Development Office | Silti | 25/05/05 |
| 10 | Ato Kedir Detamo | FGD | Agriculture and Rural Development Office | Silti | 25/05/05 |
| 11 | Ato Bahredin Mussa | FGD | Finance and Economic Development Office | Silti | 25/05/05 |
| 12 | Ato Girma Mengi | FGD | Cooperatives Promotion Office | Silti | 25/05/05 |

References

1. Ashley, C. and Hussein, K. (2000), Developing Methodologies for Livelihood Impact Assessment: Experiences of the East African Wildlife Foundation. ODI Working Paper.
2. CHF International Ethiopia (2004), **GLAD Entry Proposal**.
3. CHF International Ethiopia (2004), **GLAD Monthly Report, December 2004**.
4. CHF International Ethiopia (2004), **1st GLAD Quarterly Report, May-July 2004**.
5. CHF International Ethiopia (2004), **2nd GLAD Quarterly Report, July-September 2004**.
6. CHF International Ethiopia (2005), **GLAD Monthly Report, January 2005**.
7. CHF International Ethiopia (2005), **GLAD Monthly Report, February 2005**.
8. CHF International Ethiopia (2005), **Quarterly GLAD Report, January-March 2005**.
9. Hulme, D. (1997), **Impact Assessment Methodologies for Microfinance: A Review**. University of Manchester, England.
10. Mosley, P. (2000), **Poverty Oriented Banking: The Use of Control Group in Impact Assessment**. Working Paper 19, University of Reading