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Abstract
A better understanding of achievements of a given program at micro level is required for the organization of technical research and for shaping the direction of action to achieve aims of a given program. Consequently, this study is expected to generate ideas that would be useful to reveal the impacts of PSNP on household food security status. To this end, quasi-experimental comparisons were made using difference in difference (DID) method between graduate and non-graduate households. Data were collected from 200 sampled PSNP beneficiary households. Among the group, 114 graduated households and 86 non-graduate households were investigated. The result of the study revealed that, with respect to household food security status there is no statistical difference between households graduated from the program and households still enrolled in the program at 5% significant level. This is in contrary with the program implementation manual as households are expected to graduate from PSNP when they are food sufficient, which is defined as “when a household able to feed itself for 12 months a year, in the absence of program support as well as binge able to withstand modest shakes” (MARD, 2004). This is due to targeting, graduation and post-graduation related problem. Therefore, it is essential to establish appropriate and standard targeting and graduation criteria, which avoid quota graduation and targeting. It is also equally recommended to provide post-graduation support for graduate households during natural and manmade hazards.

Introduction
The essence of absolute poverty eradication has long been traced back to the history of humankind and civilization (Gordon, 2005). Due largely to this intention, in 1995, World Summit focusing on social development was held in Copenhagen. Following this Summit, 117 countries has had adopted a declaration and program of committed action to eradicate poverty (Gordon, 2005). Throughout the world progress continues in the fitting against hunger and food insecurity and for this progress has been made. According to FAO, IFAD and WFP (2014), the commitment to halve the percentage of hungry people, that is to reach the MDG 1c target, has been almost met at the global level. The share of undernourished people has decreased from 18.6% in 1990/92 to 10.9% in 2014/16, which were 216 million declines globally. However, in addressing these target difference were observed across regions, sub-regions and countries of the world. The prevalence of hunger reduced rapidly in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Asia and in Latin America while the slowest progress is recorded in southern Asia and sub-Saharan Africa.

In Ethiopia food security has been a big challenge since 1970s. Ethiopia is one of many African countries deeply affected by food insecurity, where 3 million populations livewithout secure access to food. That means that in a given year, almost 1 in 10 Ethiopians will struggle to have access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food for themselves and for their family. Nowadays, triggered by conflicts, floods and failed rains caused by El-Nino have sparked a sharp rise in the number of people going hungry in the different parts of the world, which becomes 8.2 million people according to CFSVA (2014).

To transform agriculture and ensure food and nutrition security food insecurity, in Ethiopia history, there have been many interventions with different ideologies. Nevertheless, one can ask is this worked. And what were the limitations of such a strategy?Currently, government developed several food security and nutritional polices and strategies. The target of this policy in agriculture in general and food security in particular can be classified in to four. These are, improving access to agricultural
input, increasing tenure security for small and large scale rural investment, building resiliency to promote graduation first from PSNP and then FSP and investment benefit and incentive (FSP, 2003).

Until 2005, the main response to poverty and hunger came through annual emergency appeals. Ethiopia had an emergency appeal for humanitarian assistance every year since the famine of 1984 (CFSVA, 2014). Ethiopia has been the largest recipient of food aid in Africa and one of the largest recipients in the world (Little 2008). On average, 700,000 metric tons (MT) of food aid per year have been delivered in Ethiopia since 1990 (Camilla et al. 2015). Similarly, on average between 1994 and 3003, 6166452 people received emergency food aid annually (CFSVA, 2014). However, later in 1990s, serious deficiencies with the emergency food aid system were increasingly clear. Despite, its ability to solve food security problem, there was a growing concern of the potentially negative effects of such large volumes of food aid on local food markets and create dependence syndrome among the beneficiaries (FSP, 2003). In 2005, to combat the persistent problem of food insecurity and to move away from the previous system of annual emergency appeals, the Ethiopian government and a consortium of donors (including the World Bank, U.S. Agency for International Development, Canadian International Development Agency, and several European donors) launched a new social protection program called the Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) (Guush, et. al, 2013).

The PSNP has two components (public works and direct support) and have four major goals (Support the rural transformation process; Prevent long-term consequences of short-term food inaccessibility; Encourage households to engage in production and investment; and Promote market development by increasing household purchasing power) (FSP, 2003). It operates in Afar, Amhara, Dire Dawa, Harare, Oromiya, SNNP, Somali and Tigray Regions (Guush, et. al, 2013). It provides cash and/or food transfers to chronically food insecure households in ways designed to prevent asset depletion at the household level while creating assets at the community level with an annual budget of nearly US$ 500 million; the PSNP is a huge program, reaching more than 7 million Ethiopians (and Hayalu, 2014). The PSNP is currently the largest operating social protection program in sub-Saharan Africa outside of South Africa. It differs from previous food-for-work programs, in that it focuses continuously on selected households over several years and till they graduate from the program.

Households graduated from PSNP when they are food sufficient, which is defined as “when a household able to feed itself for 12 months a year, in the absence of program support as well as binge able to withstand modest shakes” (Guush, et. al, 2013). For example from the total number of 7.64 million participants in Ethiopia between 2008 and 2012, the total numbers of households graduated are about 495,995 PSNP (ibid). A number of studies have been done to examine the factors affecting household graduation from PSNP. This include a study by Desalegn (2017), Berihun and Hayalu (2014) and Yibrah (2013). In addition, studies were done to evaluate the impact of productive PSNP. This includes the study on the impact of PSNP on household Asset building by Aman (2013) and Tadele (2011); on farmers’ investments in sustainable land management by Tadele (2011), and Zenebe and Aad (2017); on household welfare and labour supply by Habtamu (2011) and on household resilience by Hermela and Meseret (2015).

However, limited studies have been done to evaluate the impact of PSNP on food security. These includes the study by Aman (2013), EmwodewandMenberu (2016) and Mulugeta (2014). In all these studies a propensity score matching technique, which compares participants and non-participants of the program, were employed to examine the extent of the program impact on food security. The use of this approach in this case is problematic as it is impossible to find a right mach. This is due to the fact that households are included in the program based on their food security status. Therefore, in this study Difference-In-Differences (DID) methods, which compares group (first difference) before and after a project (second difference) was used.

1.1 The Linkage of Ethiopia’s Food Security Program, PSNP and Household Graduation

In Ethiopia there was “a New Coalition for Food Security” after the food crisis of 2002, which renews the government of Ethiopia’s commitment to the Food Security Program (FSP) (FDRE, 2004). This food security program distinguishes between chronic and transitory food insecurity. It has three main components, which together are designed to attain household food security. These are: (i) the
Productive Safety Net Program, with two sub-components (Public Works and Direct Support), which bridges food gaps with cash or food transfers while building community assets; (ii) Household Extension Packages, which support a range of non-farm livelihood activities; (iii) Voluntary Resettlement Program, which relocates people from the most vulnerable highland communities to more productive land (Devereux et al., 2008).

Graduation from FSP in Ethiopia has two components. The first is graduation from the PSNP and the second is graduation from the Food security Program. A “Graduation Guidance Note” describes graduation from PSNP as a transition from “chronically food insecure” to “food sufficient”, defined as follows: “A household graduated when, in the absence of receiving PSNP transfers, it can meet its food needs for all 12 months and is able to withstand modest Shocks” (MoARD, 2007). However, in the guideline it is also indicated that the graduated households will remain in the PSNP for one more additional year and will continue to receive PSNP transfer for the full year after they are evaluated to graduate (ibid). After graduation, however, households are still entitled to receive support in terms of credit and extension, and to participate in other development interventions to further develop their productive assets until they finally become entirely independent from the Food Security Program (MoARD, 2009). Figure 1 below shows the graduation process scheme of the PSNP in conjunction with credit and other supports from other food security programs.

---

**Figure 0-1: Linkages between PSNP, and other development interventions**

Source: Adopted from Food Security Programme 2010-2014 (MoARD, 2007)

In this study graduation from the PSNP was the focus of the analysis. Therefore, it is essential to see graduation criteria’s/bench marks of PSNP. As depicted in the table below, in Ethiopia PSNP uses different criteria’s, which varies across regions for graduation purpose. According to the guidance note, bench mark levels of assets for graduation are as follows: Oromiya, 19,187 birr per household; Tigray, 5,600 birr per capita; Amhara, 4,2000 birr per capita; and SNNPR, 2,998 birr per capita. Additionally, among the criteria’s for Graduation includes asset based criteria, time based criteria, consumption or nutrition based criteria and/or subjective or intangible criteria as defined by the perception of households within Participating communities have been used (Berhane et al., 2013).
Table: Food Security Graduation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Initial-IFPRI Benchmark*</th>
<th>Average-asset value according to FGON**</th>
<th>Benchmark as adopted in the RGON***</th>
<th>Asset Benchmark Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>4,800 Birr per capita</td>
<td>4,200 Birr per capita</td>
<td>4,200 Birr per capita</td>
<td>Livestock, crop production, perennial crops, income from income generating activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>10,000 Birr per capita</td>
<td>19,187 Birr per household</td>
<td>19,187 Birr per household</td>
<td>Livestock, crop production, perennial crops, income from income generating activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>4,000 Birr per capita</td>
<td>2,998 Birr per capita</td>
<td>75% or more based on regression</td>
<td>Land holdings, level of schooling, capital based on agricultural tools and livestock availability, family size and sex of household head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>4,300 Birr per capita</td>
<td>5,600 Birr per capita</td>
<td>5,600 Birr per capita</td>
<td>Productive assets and must have repaid 75% of outstanding loan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from the IDL group 2010

*Based on the 75% benchmark (a potential exclusion error of 25%) and a land holding of less than 1 ha.

** Federal Graduation Guidance Note

*** Regional Graduation Guidance Note

Source: Adapted From Berhane et al., (2013)

1.2 Research Method

1.2.1 Description of the study area and Selection of Communities

Data and information for this study were collected from a total of 200 rural households from two districts depicted on the map and selected from nine PSNP beneficiary districts in North Gondar Zone: Dabatand wogera. These two districts were selected based on high number of PSNP participants. From these districts, for the study six communities and 200 households were selected using probability and non-probability sampling methods. The study uses household as a unit of analysis. According to Barlett (1986, p. 3), the farm household is the core component of human cultural and economic organisation and provides a framework for many socio-economic activities. A household is described as a group of people who share the same domestic economy or eat from the same bowl (Barlett 1989, p. 6).

![Study Map (2017)](image)

1.2.2 Data Sources and Collection Methods

For this study the researcher used both primary and secondary data. The primary data were collected from a sample of rural household heads through a structured questionnaire prepared for the study. In addition, Key informant interview were used. Secondary sources included published and unpublished information sources were used. Data about the study area like level of agricultural production and number of PSNP graduates were collected.
1.2.3 Concept and measurement of Food Security/ insecurity

There is a consistent general idea by the experts in the literature that the concept of food security is puzzling with over 400 different indicators and 250 definitions (Hoddinott 1999). Therefore, any measure of food security has some degrees of subjectivity (Boardman, 2002). The most common of these definitions includes the definition given by WB and USAID. World Bank define food security as “access by all peoples at all time to sufficient food for active and health life” (World Bank, 1986). In food security measurement the required food for active and health life is the question to be addressed. However, due to the varieties of definition and indicators there are different approaches for food security measurement. These indicators used for measuring food security are classified in two to: process and outcome indicators (Maxwell and Frankenberger, 1992).

In this study, household level food access was used to measure food security. The basic aim of choosing household level analysis is to identify those households that are food insecure and those whose food security is at risk (Riley and Mock, 1995). Therefore, to determine the response variable, household food security status (HFS), a Household Food Balance Model (HFBM) was used. The same approach were used by other researchers including Ramakrishna and Assefa (2002), Haile et al. (2006) and Shiferaw et al. (2005). The model helps to quantify the net available grain food by each of the sampled rural households in the study area in the period. The HFBM model was expressed as follow:

\[ Q_i = (P_i + b_i + f_i + r_i) - (L_i + s_i + m_i + e_i + g_i + d_i) \]  

In this model, the index \( i \) runs from 1, 2, …, 200 (the sample size).

Where; \( Q_i \) represents net grain food available for household \( i \); \( P_i \) total grain produced by household \( i \); \( b_i \) is total grain purchased by household \( i \); \( f_i \) is total grain obtained through food-for-work by household \( i \); \( r_i \) is total relief grain food received by household \( i \); \( L_i \) is post-harvest crop losses to household \( i \); \( s_i \) is total crop utilized for seed by household \( i \); \( m_i \) is total marketed output by household \( i \); \( e_i \) grain used for social events by household \( i \); \( g_i \) grains given out to relatives by household \( i \); and \( d_i \) repayment of grain borrowed by household \( i \).

2 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

2.1 Description of respondents

This section highlights the demographic and social characteristics of the sample households in the study area. The issues discussed here are only those expected to have certain relationships with food availability, productive safety-net participation, income, consumption and expenditure including age and sex composition, education etc. Accordingly, food secure and food insecure sample households were compared in terms of these variables.

Total sample sizes of the study were 200. As depicted in the table blow from 200 sample households, 60% and 40% was from Dabat and Wogera district respectively. From these sample households 89% and 11% was male and female headed households respectively. The majority of the respondents (87%) were married, while the rest 13% were either single (2.5%), divorced (5%) or widows (5.5%) (Table 3). Of those married, about 1% was polygamous, while most of them (98%) reported having only one wife.

The educational status of sample household heads was very low. Out of 200 respondents, 136 (68%) were illiterate, and about 58 (29%) were can read and write but do not attend any formal education. Most of the sample farmers have learnt only through non-formal education. The rest 6 (3%) attend formal education up to grade eight. About 36% of the food secure households and 26% of food insecure households had formal education of grade 1-7, respectively.

Since the main motive of the study was to assess food security status among graduated and enrolled PSNP beneficiaries, in the sample an attempt was also made to conceder level of productive safety-net participation. Thus, the sample has 57% and 43% of graduate and enrolled beneficiaries of PSNP respectively.
Table 2:1 Description of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex Of Household Head</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Head</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Status</td>
<td>Can Read And</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-4 Grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-8 Grade</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Dabat</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wogera</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Status Of PSNP</td>
<td>Graduated</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agro Ecologic zone</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowland</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey (2017)

2.2 Household Food security status

The HFBM was used to quantify the net available grain food by each of the 200 sampled rural households in the study area in the period covering November 2016 to November 2017. The model was used by Ramakrishna and Assefa (2002), Haile et al. (2006), Shiferaw et al.(2005) and others for similar types of research. In order to assess the sufficiency of available energy to meet the dietary needs of household members a household's energy availability was compared with a requirement that is based on recommended minimum food energy. Hence, following FDRE FDRE (1996), 2,100 kilo calories per person per day was used as a measure of calories required (i.e., demand) to enable an adult to live a healthy and moderately active life (Braun et al., 1990). However, the correct energy requirement is the subject of much debate because any individual's energy need is based not only on age and sex but also on body weight, body composition, disease state, genetic traits, pregnancy and lactation status and activity level. However, data on these characteristics were not collected in the survey.

Therefore, comparison between the available (supply) and required (i.e., demand) grain food was made. A household whose daily per capita caloric available (supply) is less than his/her demand was regarded as food insecure, while a household who did not experience a calorie deficit during the year under study was regarded as food secure.

Figure 2-1 Food security status of sample households

Source: Field Survey (2017)
Based on the HFBM and as indicated above in the diagram, among the respondent’s two thirds of the sample were food insecure whereas only one third, which is 25% were found to be food secured during the specified period (2016/17). As depicted from above, the study area could be regarded as food insecure given that the fact that 75% of the household were unable to meet the recommended calorie intake of 2100 kilo calorie per day per adult equivalent. From this 75%, 41% from the total household are extremely food insecure with less than 1500 kilocalories availability per day per person. This classification among the food insecure categories is to show the extent of food insecurity as used by Shiferawet al. (2004). Therefore, in these study areas there is a probability that two households is food insecure out of three households. The sample respondents raised that among others and high population density, which lead to very fragmented and low land ownership as main reasons for food insecurity in the study area. Other includes change in weather condition, low productivity and low credit access.

2.3 Impacts of PSNP on Household Food Security Status

According to the PIM (program implementation manual) households graduated from PSNP when they are food sufficient, which is defined as “when a household able to feed itself for 12 months a year, in the absence of program support as well as binge able to withstand modest shakes”(MoARD, 2007). Therefore, it is logical to expect high level of food security status from graduate households and the rivers for enrolled households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Security Status Of The Household</th>
<th>Current Status of PSNP Participation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduated</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food secure</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insecure</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Filed Survey (2017)

To evaluate the link between food security status and PSNP before and after cooperation was made between graduate and still enrolled households. Thus, using proportional random sampling techniques, the sample had 57% graduate and 43% still enrolled beneficiaries. As shown in the table, 52.3% and 47.7% of households who are graduated and still enrolled in PSNP respectively are food insecure. The rest, which is 70.6 % who had been graduated and 29.4 % of enrolled PSNP beneficiaries are food secure. However, there are households, which had been graduated but still food insecure. It accounts 52.3% of graduated households. In addition, the small Chi-Square statistic (5.156) and its significance level (p< 0.23) that is greater than acceptable significance level indicate that it is very likely that food security status and status in PSNP participation (either graduated or current enrolled) are independent of each other.

For this many reasons can be mentioned. As it was reviled by survey and FGD this similarity between graduate and enrolled household food security status is due to the following five main reasons:

**Early maturity**: It is argued that due to government over ambitious quota set for household graduation most of the graduated households were graduated early. The district food security expert informed that for the last three years the food security status of the households had greatly improved and many of the PSNP beneficiaries are on the edge of graduation. This could be the reason that the government of Ethiopia is too ambitious. To achieve its over ambitious objective quota was given to graduate the whole beneficiaries within three years. As a result, the district officials forced the kebele officials to accomplish according to the quota given. Some of them believed it is for political motive of quota based graduation. As a result, the respondents
reveal that emphasis was given to quota fulfilment rather than benchmark graduation. Similar result were also found by Berhane et al., (2011) and Hayalu (2014).

**Form of support:** The program has two components: Food-for-Work (FFW) Program and Cash-for-Work (CFW). In Ethiopia Food-for-Work (FFW) Program had started during the Dergue regime and currently it broadens its scope to the drought prone areas of Ethiopia. The strong side of the FFW program is it increases household’s availability of food than accessess. On the other hand, CFW program enables households to have ability to buy food and it is one of the dominant forms of social protection in the area due to its ease of implementation, compared to other forms of social protection strategies (McCord and Slater, 2009). Therefore, the majority of the poor households had acquired daily average income in between 9 and 10 birr. Their daily income from CFW was 13 birr. This creates limited ability due to high inflation rate and the ability may be invested for other purpose.

**Corruption:** corruption of officials at the local level and fake reports of development agents for competition and promotion lead to premature graduation. Most graduates of the program stress that the implementation was not transparent and well explained. Although it is very vital in this kinds of program to identify the direct beneficiaries, in PSNP corrupted process begins early in Identifying the geographic region or households that need support of the safety net transfer. To check individuals’ satisfaction on the inclusion criteria, a question was asked to assess households familiarity to the criteria used in the selection of the safety nets beneficiaries. However, it was reviled that most of them were not informed and clear about the inclusion and the exclusion criteria’s. this results, poor targeting cannot differentiate the poor from the better-off households. Similar results were found by Hoddinott (2011), Farrington et al. (2007) and Jayne et al.(2000).

**Subjecitivity:** There is a solid understanding of the concept of graduation at regional and district levels. Household’s graduation was subjective to comparison of people who are entitled to community judgment in relation to the adopted criteria’s. the process of graduation was determined based on local perceptions that somebody has graduated (food sufficient). Graduation, to become food self-sufficiency and no longer in need of external assistance is a controversial issue in the study area. This may be due to the quota system. Similar results were found by Berahne et al. (2013).

**Lack of post-graduation support:** Post graduation support is needed for clients who exit the program and they are entitled to obtain support in the form of extension packages and credit for specific time. The understanding of implementing process of graduation from PSNP differs with in a community. Some of them believed it was time based, and others conceive it as specific value for graduation and for political motive of quota based graduation.

### 3 Conclusions And Recommendations

The governments of Ethiopia in successive eras had implemented different policies, strategies and programs to alleviate poverty and food insecurity. Appreciating the situations, the current government took diverse development measures to alleviate the multifaceted problems faced the rural poor households. PSNP as parts of FSP represents a major effort by Ethiopian government and the international donor community to assist millions of households to break out of households’ dependence on humanitarian assistance and to achieve food security. Ethiopia’s Productive Safety Net Program is the largest social protection program operating in sub-Saharan Africa except in South Africa. It operates in the rural parts of the country where food insecurity is prevalence. It provides transfers to the ultra-poor both in cash and in kind with cash priority principle. PSNP intends to improve food consumption of households, protecting asset level of beneficiaries and creating community level assets, among others.

Notwithstanding these efforts, there is an abiding question of how successful the program is going to be. Tis study and other many studies were revealed that these programs were suffered from serious limitations during planning and implementation. According to Desalegn (2017) and
Arenga (2012), it is clear indicated that graduation rates have fallen far behind expectations, with only 9% of recipients having graduated until 2009.

This study tried to evaluate the impact of PSNP on household food security. This paper has investigated a group of PSNP beneficiary households that were targeted. Among the group, 114 graduated households and 86 non-graduate households. The study used difference in difference methods to evaluate the impact.

The study showed that PSNP supports create no difference on household food security status measured in household food balance mode (HFBM). In the study it was found that about 52.3% of PSNP graduates were food insecure, while 47.7% still enroll beneficiaries were food insecure. This is in contrary with the program implementation manual as households are expected to graduate from PSNP when they are food sufficient, which is defined as “when a household able to feed itself for 12 months a year, in the absence of program support as well as binge able to withstand modest shakes” (WFP 2012). Moreover, the chi-square result reviled no deference among graduate and non-graduate households. As reviled in the study this similarity in food security status is due to graduation related and post-graduation problem.

Problems during beneficiary graduation include early maturity, where beneficiaries were graduated early. In contrary to the criteria set due to the government over ambitious quota set for household graduation most of the graduated households were graduated early. In addition, corruption of officials at the local level and fake reports DA’s for competition and promotion lead to premature graduation. Most graduates of the program stress that the implementation was not transparent and well explained. On the other hand, graduate household also claim lack of post-graduation support as a main resound.

In spite of the achievements of the PSNP on local infrastructural development and sustainable land and water conservation due to its public work, there are still areas in which the program could further be developed and refined in order to render it more effective, efficient and sustainable. These include greater standardization of the targeting and graduation process to avoid quota graduation, subjectivity and corruption. It is also essential to design a system to support graduate beneficiaries during transitory food insecurity problems and linking them to other agricultural projects.

In addition, in the current situation the main part of transfers from the public work is used for immediate consumption, at the expense of investments in sustainable welfare improvement. The objectives of the PSNP should be broadened with elements that go behind this if one wants to help households out of food insecurity in the long term. The program should focus more on education and accumulation of asset.
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