

Assessing Rural Transformations Project (ART) QUIP Report

Self Help Africa Malt Barley project in Oromia, Ethiopia

AUGUST 2015

This report summarises findings from pilot use of the Qualitative Impact Protocol (QUIP) and provides independent evidence on how the selected project is having an impact on the livelihoods and food security of intended beneficiaries at the household level.

Sections 1 and 2 describe the context of the project interventions, and Sections 3-6 summarise findings in tabular form, citing primary sources using standard codes for interviewed. These codes enable the reader also to refer directly to narrative summaries of what respondents said. These are reproduced in the Annex (coded transcripts), sorted by impact domain and attribution level. The layers of information revealed in sections 3-6 are as follows:

- Have things changed for better or worse in different areas of respondents' lives over the past two years?
- *Are these changes in any way linked to the project being assessed, or incidental?*
- *What exactly are the drivers behind the changes cited by respondents?*
- *Are there any interventions which have not proved to be drivers as expected?*
- *Which organisations are respondents aware that they are working with?*

Appendix 1 provides a general summary of the QUIP methodology, Appendix 2 provides details of the household respondents and beneficiaries, and Appendix 3 provides details of interventions received by beneficiaries.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The aim of this research was to explore the contribution of the SHA malt barley project to improving the livelihoods and food security of households in Oromia, Ethiopia, and to provide useful information that can be used to improve project strategies or approaches. The findings from the first round of the research are available in the 'Pilot Quip Report' (July 2014). This report details findings from the second round of research conducted in February 2015.

This research was carried out using the *Qualitative Impact Protocol (QUIP)* evaluation methodology. 24 households were interviewed, 17 of which were SHA beneficiaries and 7 non-beneficiaries. A key characteristic of the QUIP method is that the interviews were as far as possible 'blinded' - the researchers conducting the interviews were not aware that this research was connected to the malt barley project implemented by SHA. All interviews were focused on asking respondents about changes in their lives over the past three years with respect to various areas including their food production, food consumption, cash income, and overall wellbeing.

The malt barley project aims to improve poor farmer's incomes, food consumption and livelihoods, by assisting them to produce and sell malt barley. There is high demand for malt barley from the breweries in Ethiopia that mostly import the crop, and a fair price is available for it locally. However, prior to the project, local production was constrained by land scarcity, poor production methods, and the low uptake of improved inputs such as seed and fertiliser. To close these gaps and assist poor farmers to tap into the potentially lucrative malt barley market, the project aimed to deliver three outputs:

- Increased production and productivity of malt barley
- Improved access to markets for selling malt barley
- Strengthened capacity of farmer's union cooperatives to deliver services to its members

This QUIP study has found that in the past three years, the majority of the 24 respondents experienced positive change across a range of areas in their lives – from food production and consumption, to incomes and overall well being. Table 3.1 provides a snapshot of which areas of their lives respondents feel have changed for the better, worse or stayed the same.

It is clear that the majority of respondents' lives have changed for the better - determining what people attributed the changes to was also explored. The QUIP research finds that the most frequently cited drivers of positive change in people's lives within the sample area are was the provision of malt barley seed by SHA, and advice and support from Government Development Agents (DAs).

Other positive drivers of change in the area include water infrastructure projects, the milk cooperative and the increased keeping of livestock. Water projects have enabled a number of farmers to diversify their crop production beyond the crops previously produced. This is improving food consumption in the household as well as increasing opportunities for earning cash income from selling vegetables. Advice from the Government DAs is also impacting on food consumption – people are reporting more diversity in their diet after acting upon DA advice. Production of livestock is becoming more common and farmers report using improved grazing practices and reducing the number of cattle in favour of retaining a small number of improved breeds that are worth more and are more productive.

The two most commonly cited drivers of negative change were illness or death in the family, and inflation and rising government taxes. One driver of change that was viewed as a positive change by some, and negative by others, was the increased availability of and demand for day wage labourers to assist with farming. Some viewed this as a positive driver of change as it provides much needed cash income, whereas others cite it as a negative shift which has eroded the traditional practices of labourers mutually assisting each other with labour during planting and harvesting.

It reflects well on the project that there were only two statements from the interviews coded as being critical of SHA or the malt barley project. One statement made by a project beneficiary was in relation to SHA not creating market linkages or buying the malt barley harvest [respondent AS14]. One non-beneficiary also noted that he did not want to take improved barley seed from and NGO as he believed he would then be obliged to sell his crops to SHA [respondent AS18].

QUIP data is not statistically representative of the wider population. Findings cannot be extrapolated out across wider project target areas, nor is that the intention. The aim of carrying out a QUIP is to sample a group of people in the project target area to understand if and how their lives have changed in recent years. It also helps to raise questions for further consideration by project staff. The research from this QUIP demonstrates that there is clear evidence that the SHA project has been a driver of change in people's lives, resulting in improved food production and incomes for households among other benefits. It is clear that the project theory of change has been proven successful, and this is further substantiated by the proliferation of similar projects by other agencies in the area. There is evidence that farmers have access to markets, as they are successfully selling their malt barley crops.

However, what is not clear from this QUIP is if this access to markets for the sampled households is as a result of SHA intervention in linking farmers to markets (desired project output 2). Finally, there is little data from this QUIP, which shows that the capacity of farmers unions has been improved (project output 3). The respondents did not cite farmers unions and cooperatives as drivers of change.

1. PROJECT INFORMATION

This report summarises the findings from research carried out on households in Assela, Oromia District, Ethiopia - which is a target area of a Malt Barley Project implemented by Self Help Africa from May 2012 – April 2015.

Beer production in Ethiopia has increased in recent years, with new breweries emerging and existing ones increasing production. While there is high potential to grow malt barley in Ethiopia, there is a shortage of domestic malt barley to meet the demands of existing local breweries. Self Help Africa initiated the Malt Barley Project in 2012 to support farmers to produce malt barley locally that was of high quality and suitable for sale to breweries.

The Malt Barley Project had a total budget of approximately €400,382, and was funded fully by Irish Aid. The project was implemented over 3 years, from May 2012 to April 2015. Given its successes, this project has recently been extended, and will continue to be implemented until 31 December 2015. The project is implemented in collaboration with Galema and Raya Kejewa Farmers Cooperative Unions in two woredas of Arsi and one woreda of West Arsi Zones of Oromia Region; Digalu Tijo, Limu Bilbilo and Kofele.

The project aims to improve the livelihoods of small-scale farmers by increasing productivity and obtaining better market terms and prices for malt barley. Many of the farmers in the selected districts rely on barley both as a food crop and as a source of cash income. Demand prospects for malt barley are good but production is constrained by land scarcity and the low uptake of improved inputs - especially seed and fertiliser. Returns from sales of barley are also reduced by weak and fragmented post-harvest and marketing systems. Improving access to quality barley seed has the potential to raise productivity directly and indirectly through its effect on household farming income. Expected outputs of the project included:

- Increased production and productivity of malt barley
- Improved access to markets for selling malt barley
- Strengthened capacity of farmers union cooperatives to deliver services to its members

Project activities included:

- Distribute basic and improved malt barley seed to farmers through their cooperative unions. Support in kind was provided to the union (as a revolving fund), whereas individual farmers received inputs on loan.
- Provide on-site practical training for 5,000 farmers in quality malt barley production systems
- Provide ‘Training of Trainers’ training to 70 extension agents on seed inspection, crop husbandry, seed processing, marketing and business plan development
- Conduct workshop to link unions to the Assela malt factory
- Train farmers’ unions in business and enterprise skills
- Undertake experience sharing visits among farmers producing malt barley
- Link farmers to microfinance institutions

In summary, SHA aimed to improve the food, nutrition security, incomes and livelihoods of farmers in the target area by tackling the challenges faced by smallholder producers and tapping into the growing malt barley market.

2. METHODOLOGY

This research was carried out using the *Qualitative Impact Protocol (QUIP)* evaluation methodology. The aim of this report is to explore the contribution the Malt Barley Project is having on the livelihoods and food security of households in the area, and to provide useful information that can be used to improve upon project strategies or approaches. The first QUIP research on the Malt Barley Project was carried out in May 2014, and

involved interviewing 16 beneficiary households. The findings from this first round of the research are available in the 'Pilot Quip Report' (July 2014). This report details findings from the second round of research conducted in February 2015. There was no overlapping of households surveyed in 2014 and 2015?

As part of this QUIP research, interviews were conducted both with individual households and focus groups. A total of 24 households were interviewed of which 17 were listed as being beneficiary households of the SHA Malt Barley Project, and seven were listed as non-beneficiaries. The lead respondents comprised 21 men and three women aged between 25 and 68. Other members of the household present at interviews were also encouraged to contribute to the discussion.

In addition to the individual interviews with households, four focus groups were also carried out. The focus groups were organised according to age and gender: younger women, older women, younger men and older men. These focus groups included some of the respondents who participated in the individual household interviews, as well as friends and neighbours who they were asked to suggest.

A key characteristic of the QUIP method is that the interviews were as far as possible 'blinded'. The researchers conducting the interviews were not aware that this research was connected to exploring the potential impact of the Malt Barley Project implemented by SHA. An additional characteristic of the QUIP methodology is that all interviews are focused on exploring general changes in the lives and livelihoods of the households. Respondents were asked to comment on changes in their lives and livelihoods over the past two years with respect to various areas including their food production, food consumption, cash income, and overall wellbeing.

The 24 households that participated in this research were randomly selected from the list of households who had already been surveyed as part of an Individual Household Methodology (IHM) Survey – which is the methodology tool used by SHA to gather quantitative baseline and end line data in project areas. While these sampled households cannot be taken as statistically representative of the 180 villages in the district, they are typical of the project area. As mentioned above, 17 of the 24 households were project beneficiaries.

The QUIP methodology allows for the qualitative information gathered from interviews to be coded and displayed in tables contained in this report. The codes used in the tables and quotations also enable the reader to trace back to the original quote available in a separate document - Coded Transcripts. These are organised according to impact domain (e.g. Food production, Cash Income) and attribution code. A full description of the QUIP methodology is available in Appendix 1.

3. RESPONSES TO CLOSED QUESTIONS

At the end of each section of the interview, respondents were asked closed questions intended to summarise the changes they had experienced over the previous two years. These provide a useful snapshot of responses as an introduction to the findings. It is important, however, to stress that these closed questions are limited in their scope as respondents are only given three choices (better, worse, the same), and the more detailed narrative responses offer a lot more context to what is often a more complex picture of change.

The closed questions asked of respondents were:

1. Overall, how has the ability of your household to produce enough food to meet its needs changed in this time?
2. Overall how has your cash income as a household changed over this time?
3. Overall, how has what you as a household can purchase with money changed over the period?
4. Overall, how much are you eating as a household compared to this time two years ago?
5. Overall, do you feel the combined total value of all your assets has gone up or down?
6. Overall, do you feel your overall wellbeing, and that of your family, has gone up or down?

Table 3.1 below provides an overall snapshot of change experienced by respondents over the last two years, in six different areas of their life from food production to wellbeing.

Table 3.1 Summary of household responses to closed questions

HH	Beneficiary ?	Gender	Food Production	Cash income	Purchasing power	Food consumption	Assets	Wellbeing
AS1	Yes	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS2	No	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS3	Yes	Male	=	=	=	-	-	-
AS4	Yes	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS5	No	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS6	Yes	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS7	No	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS8	Yes	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS9	Yes	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS10	Yes	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS11	Yes	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS12	No	Female	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS13	Yes	Male	+	+	-	+	+	+
AS14	Yes	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS15	Yes	Male	+	+	+	=	=	+
AS16	Yes	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS17	Yes	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS18	No	Male	+	=	-	-	=	+
AS19	Yes	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS20	No	Female	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS21	Yes	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS22	Yes	Male	+	+	+	=	+	+
AS23	No	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+
AS24	Yes	Male	+	+	+	+	+	+

Table 3.1 shows that the responses are overwhelmingly positive, and that for the most part, all except for two respondents experienced positive change in the majority of various aspects in their lives over the past two years.

The two respondents who have not experienced positive change/improvements in their lives are AS3 and AS18. Respondent AS3 is listed by SHA as being a beneficiary of the Malt Barley project, but he did not mention SHA when asked to list organisations they have important links to, nor mention having received any seed inputs or training. The respondent commented, *“others who were able to access improved seed from different organization produces good harvest”*, but he remains using local barley seed and labouring on other farms to earn an income.

The second respondent who did not experience positive change to the same degree as the other respondents is AS18. His purchasing power and food consumption has reduced, with cash income and assets experiencing declining or negative change. However, he noted his household food production and wellbeing has improved. AS18 is not a beneficiary of the SHA project, and interestingly he noted that he continues to grow with local

barley seed, as he does not want to take seed from an NGO and be tied into any arrangement whereby he has to sell his harvest:

“However, I do not use improved seed from any organization. I have been using seed either from the earlier harvest or buy selected variety of seed from grain traders in the market. I do not use improved seed from any organization including Self Help Africa because I think that if I get seed from SHA, there is obligation to sell back the harvest for the organization. I have small plot of land and I produce only small amount of crops which cannot excess from my consumption and I can’t sell back the harvest for the organization.” [AS 18]

Discussions with project staff have confirmed that this farmer has misunderstood the terms of farmer’s agreements with SHA. While this respondent’s perceptions of the project were mistaken, it may be beneficial for SHA to briefly review how the terms of the project are communicated to potential beneficiaries, to ensure these terms are communicated as clearly as possible.

4. ATTRIBUTED IMPACT

To code respondents’ answers to open questions, the codes and definitions listed in Table 4.1 below were used. All of the original quotes from the interviews are available in the accompanying document – Coded Transcripts. To code the quote from a respondent, a number between 1-9 depending on what is said, is attributed to the statement. Only statements related to *changes* that the household experienced are coded. Table 4.1 shows the definitions used to code the open-ended responses, and Tables 4.2 and 4.3 show the distribution of positive and negative codes for household interviews and focus group discussions.

Table 4.1 Coding of impacts

	Positive code	Negative code	Explanation
Explicit project link	1	2	Positive or negative change explicitly attributed to the project or to explicitly named project activities.
Implicit project link	3	4	Change confirming (positive) or refuting (negative) the specific mechanism (or theory of change) by which the project aims to achieve impact, but with no explicit reference to the project or named project activities. Could also be a reference to another NGO with a similar ToC/Project activity to SHA (see note below).
Other attributed	5	6	Change attributed to other forces (not related to activities included in the project’s theory of change).
Other not attributed	7	8	Change not attributed to any specific cause.
Neutral	9		Change that is ambiguous, ambivalent or neutral in its effects: i.e. cannot readily be coded positive or negative.

There was a slight modification to the coding of the QUIP research carried out in 2015 compared to the QUIP in 2014. In the pilot QUIP research in 2014 few or no other organisations in the area were reported to be working on supporting farmers to produce and sell malt barley. However, in 2015 there was a notable increase in the number of organisations that were involved in activities similar to the theory of change underpinning the SHA Malt Barley Project. For the 2014 QUIP, a code of 3 or 4 was attributed to data when the activities and

intervention the respondent spoke were similar enough to SHA's Malt Barley project to be considered an 'implicit reference' to the SHA project. However, since the malt barley sector appears to have broadened considerably, in order to be able to capture examples of similar projects and differentiate between these and other non-SHA project related drivers it was decided to apply codes 3 and 4 to all references to other similar non-SHA projects. This proliferation of similar projects could be an indication that the SHA Malt Barley Project theory of change has been seen to be successful and has led to replication by other organisations.

Tables 4.2 and 4.3 below show the positive and negative changes reported by households and focus groups, and whether these changes are related to the project. These tables reinforce the overall picture that is conveyed in Table 3.1, which shows that the majority of respondents have experienced positive changes in their lives in the last two years. We can see that there is a broad range of positive responses across the positive codes 1, 3 and 5 – for beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

16 of the 17 project beneficiaries interviewed experienced positive changes in their food production, and explicitly attributed the change to the project. This is also the case with regards to positive changes in cash income – 16 of 17 beneficiaries interviewed also explicitly attributed this change to the project.

This statement from respondent AS11 is representative of a number of statements made by project beneficiaries who have experienced positive changes in their food production and cash income due to the project:

"She said that in the last three years she is able to produce enough food for family consumption and surplus production for the market. Moreover, she has started to produce different vegetable crops intensively than before in order to supplement the food consumption of the household. The change in food production comes because of the provision of improved barley seed from Self Help Africa. The seed is highly productive and demandable in the market with higher selling price. She uses the mallet barley for the household consumption though she mainly produces it for income earning. Previously, She only produces potato and garlic and used other vegetables like lentil from market. However, since the last three years she has started to produce lentil and other addition vegetables such as onion. This in turn saved her money that used to spend for it. She also said that she uses fertilizer since the last three years for those vegetables which enable her to have much harvest. Moreover, she has two milk cows and chickens from which her family consume milk and egg." [AS11 C1]

Many of the statements coded as '3 – project implicit' relate to respondents experiencing positive changes, and attribute this to the advice and assistance they received from the Government Development Agents (DAs). These are coded as being implicitly related to the project, as SHA works closely with the Government DAs in delivering the project. SHA provides transport support to government DAs and enables them to reach target smallholder farmers. This method is employed so that some of the gains made by the project will continue after SHA completes the project.

"There is a change and improvement in my household food productivity. I have tried to produce crops using recommended amount of fertilizer, herbicide, improved seed, and farming practice (seed sowing in raw) due to the regular advice I have gotten from DAs (Development Agents)." [AS24 C1]

Table 4.2 Positive changes reported by households and focus groups

	1 Project explicit	3 Project implicit	5 Other
Food production	AS3, AS4, AS5, AS6, AS7, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS19, AS21, AS22, AS23, AS24 FGAS1, FGAS3, FGAS4	AS4, AS6, AS7, AS12, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS18, AS19, AS20, AS21, AS22, AS23, AS24 FGAS1, FGAS2, FGAS3, FGAS4	AS1, AS2, AS5, AS6, AS7, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS12, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS18, AS19, AS20, AS21, AS22, AS23, AS24 FGAS1, FGAS2, FGAS3
Cash income	AS1, AS4, AS5, AS6, AS7, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS19, AS21, AS22, AS23, AS24 FGAS3, FGAS4	AS4, AS11, AS12, AS19, AS21, AS23 FGAS2, FGAS3, FGAS4	AS1, AS2, AS4, AS5, AS6, AS7, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS12, AS13, AS14, AS16, AS17, AS20, AS21, AS22, AS23, AS24 FGAS1, FGAS2, FGAS4
Purchasing power	AS4, AS6, AS8, AS14, AS22	AS1, AS6, FGAS1, FGAS3, FGAS4	AS1, AS6, AS8, AS13, AS16, AS20, AS23
Food consumption	AS4, AS9, AS11, AS14, AS23	AS1, AS7, AS10, AS11, AS12 FGAS1, FGAS2, FGAS3	AS1, AS2, AS5, AS6, AS7, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS12, AS13, AS14, AS16, AS19, AS20, AS21, AS23, AS24 FGAS1, FGAS2, FGAS3, FGAS4
Relationships		AS1, AS7, AS9, AS13 FGAS1	AS1, AS4, AS6, AS7, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS14, AS16, AS18, AS19, AS21, FGAS1, FGAS3, FGAS4
Asset accumulation	AS4, AS23 FGAS3	AS12, AS23 FGAS1, FGAS2, FGAS4	AS10, AS12 FGAS1, FGAS2, FGAS3, FGAS4
External relationships	AS4, AS6, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS19, AS21, AS22, AS23, AS24 FGAS3, FGAS4	AS6, AS11, AS14, AS15, AS17, AS19, AS20, AS22, AS23, AS24 FGAS3, FGAS4	AS1, AS4, AS8, AS16, AS17, AS20, AS21, FGAS3, FGAS4
Wellbeing	AS1, AS4, AS5, AS6, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS13, AS15, AS16, AS19	AS1, AS6, AS7, AS8, AS9, AS12, AS21 FGAS1, FGAS3	AS5, AS15, AS16, AS18

Households in bold are SHA project beneficiaries

Table 4.3 shows that overall, the most frequent negative changes experienced was in terms of household purchasing power. Table 5.3 shows that this is largely attributed to rising government taxes and inflation of the Ethiopian birr.

Respondent AS7 makes a negative statement, but in relation to a similar project run by another organisation, not SHA. This statement is not in reference to SHA, but it is coded as a 4 'project implicit' as the project is of a similar nature to that of SHA:

“Important link to Hundee Oromo - It distributes barley seed, ‘walker beer’ but it was a mixed and of low quality. Though they promised us they will pay compensation if the crop is not good, they [the organization] are requesting the community to pay its prices explaining the seed was mixed because of the problem resulted from the machine.”

Respondents AS14 made the only negative statement that is explicitly linked to the SHA project. Respondent AS14 commented that:

“However, the organization (SHA) neither creates market linkage nor buys our harvest.”

Similarly, respondent AS17 cites a positive impact from the SHA’s project, but also notes the lack of market linkage:

“Important link to Self Help Africa - The organization provides improved barley seed with half and full credit since the last three years. It also provides us training how to grow the seed and visit our farm. Therefore, because of the good quality and productivity of the seed I able to harvest good yield and consequently improve my income and food consumption. However, Self Help Africa did not buy the harvest so far. Hence, I sold the harvest for local traders.”

These remarks are important, as strengthened cooperatives and improved links to market are part of the theory of change, and one of the three intended outputs of the programme. It is notable that Farmers Unions and Cooperatives are not listed by respondents as being an important driver of change in Table 5.1 below.

Positive changes in food production and incomes has also had an impact on improving food consumption of a number of households, such as AS9:

“Before three years, the household was unable to eat enough food due to small production he said. The situation has changed in the last three years and the household is getting enough food. Additionally, the vegetables he produces supplement and are consumed by the family members in order to get balanced diet. They also started eating different fruits like apple and banana due to their availability in markets and his able to buy them for the household.” [AS9 D2]

Table 4.3 Negative changes reported by households and focus groups

	2 Project explicit	4 Project implicit	6 Other
Food production			AS3, AS17
Cash income			
Purchasing power			AS1, AS2, AS3, AS5, AS6, AS7, AS8, AS9, AS11, AS12, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS18, AS19, AS20, AS21, AS22, AS24
Food consumption			AS3, AS18
Relationships			AS2, AS13, AS16
Asset accumulation			
External relationships	AS14	AS7	
Wellbeing			AS3

Households in bold are SHA project beneficiaries

These tables only give us an overview of the distribution of responses across the codes, they don’t tell us what the attributed drivers were – for this we need to move to the next section on Drivers of Change.

5. DRIVERS OF CHANGE

Tables 5.1 and 5.2 drill deeper into factors behind observed changes by listing the main cause-and-effect statements reported from the open-ended discussions. As the data was coded by impact domain, the analyst also looked for reasons *why* positive or negative statements had been made in relation to that domain. The coded statements were also tagged with a driver, and then collated into the following tables. A driver was only selected if two or more households or focus groups had referred to it, thereby eliminating one-off statements. The drivers are listed on the left, with the domains across the top.

Table 5.1 Drivers of positive change

Driver	Food production	Income	Purchasing power	Food consumption	Relationships	Assets	Overall wellbeing
SHA distribution of malt barley seed	AS3, AS4, AS5, AS6, AS7, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS19, AS21, AS22, AS23, AS24, FGAS1, FGAS3, FGAS4	AS4, AS5, AS6, AS7, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS19, AS21, AS22, AS23, AS24, FGAS3, FGAS4	AS4, AS14, AS22	AS4, AS9, AS11, AS14, AS23		AS4, AS23 FGAS3	AS4, AS5, AS6, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS13, AS15, AS16, AS19
Agricultural Support/ Advice from Government DA (supported by SHA)	AS4, AS6, AS7, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS18, AS19, AS20, AS21, AS22, AS23, AS24 FGAS1, FGAS2, FGAS3, FGAS4	AS4, AS11, AS19, AS21, AS23 FGAS3, FGAS4	AS6	AS7, AS10, AS11, AS12	AS7, AS9, AS13 FGAS1	 FGAS1	AS1, AS6, AS7, AS8, AS9, AS21, FGAS1, FGAS3
Membership of milk cooperative	AS1, FGAS1	AS1, AS4 FGAS1	AS1,				
Diversified crop production	AS2, AS5, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS12, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS18, AS19, AS21, AS22, AS23, AS24, FGAS3	AS2, AS5, AS7, AS10, AS12, AS14, AS16, AS17, AS20, AS21, AS22, AS23, AS24 FGAS1, FGAS2	AS6, AS8, AS16	AS1, AS5, AS6, AS7, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS12, AS14, AS16, AS20		 FGAS3, FGAS4	AS5, AS15, AS16, AS18
Awareness raising on HH decision making					AS1, AS6, AS8 FGAS1		
Traditional community cohesion and conflict resolution					AS1, AS4, AS7, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS14, AS18, AS19, AS21 FGAS1, FGAS3, FGAS4	AS10	
TechnoServe seed & fertiliser assistance						AS23	AS1
Began irrigating farmland	AS2, AS7, AS8, AS9	AS8		AS2			

Raising livestock	AS6, AS10, AS12, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS18, AS21, AS22, AS24 FGAS2, FGAS3	AS5, AS6, AS8, AS10, AS11 , AS20, AS23 FGAS4	AS16	AS13, AS16, AS23		AS10, AS12 FGAS2, FGAS3, FGAS4	AS5
Barley sales/good price for barley in market	AS12 FGAS2	AS1, AS6, AS7, AS12 FGAS2, FGAS4	FGAS1, FGAS3, FGAS4	AS12		AS12 FGAS1, FGAS2, FGAS4	AS12 FGAS1
Gaining income through other businesses		AS9, AS11, AS13, AS14, AS21 FGAS1				FGAS1	

Households in bold are SHA project beneficiaries

As Table 5.1 shows, SHA distribution of malt barley seed, advice from Government DAs, diversifying crop production and raising livestock are the most common drivers of positive change in household food production and cash income, and overall wellbeing.

Table 5.2 Drivers of negative change

Driver	Health	Food production	Purchasing power	Food consumption	Relationships	Overall wellbeing
Illness/death	AS1, AS2, AS3, AS4, AS5, AS6, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS17, AS19, AS22	AS18,	AS1, AS2, AS9, AS17			
Inflation & rising government taxes			AS1, AS2, AS3, AS5, AS6, AS7, AS8, AS9, AS11, AS12, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS18, AS19, AS20, AS21, AS22, AS24	AS18		

Households in bold are SHA project beneficiaries

The most common complaint/driver of negative change is inflation and rising government taxes. Farmers with cash income are coping better than those who are subsistence farmers as the prices they are receiving for the crops they are selling are also getting higher, protecting them from the increase in their own costs. Those producing for subsistence/consumption are fairing much worse, as they don't have the flexible cash income to buy non-food items. No focus groups cited any negative drivers of change.

The final driver is separated as it is not always clearly referred to as a negative driver – often coded as a 9 as it is referred to as both a positive and a negative change. This point is expanded upon in the concluding remarks below.

Table 5.3 Drivers of change cited by respondents as being either positive or negative

Driver	Health	Food production	Purchasing power	Food consumption	Relationships	Overall wellbeing
Increasing day wage labour reducing traditional practices of shared labour	-	-	-	-	AS2, AS3, AS5, AS6, AS13, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS18, AS19, AS20, AS22, AS23 FGAS4	-

Households in bold are SHA project beneficiaries

The previous three tables give us a clear view of the drivers of change according to respondents. They don't, however, show what respondents *didn't* report, e.g. which households are missing in areas where they may have been expected to feature.

Table 5.4 Interventions vs. reported drivers of positive change

Intervention	Beneficiaries reporting related change	Beneficiaries not reporting related change
Site based practical training on quality malt barley production Provision of improved malt barley seed (certified and basic)	AS3, AS4, AS6, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS19, AS21, AS22, AS24	AS1
Training on business and enterprise skills Experience exchange and training Marketing produce	AS1, AS6	AS3, AS4, AS8, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS19, AS21, AS22, AS24

Only beneficiaries are included in this table – see Appendix 3 for a full table of beneficiaries and interventions

It is clear that the overwhelming majority of beneficiary households have reported positive change based on the provision of improved seed and training. There is, however, less reported evidence of change based on training in business and enterprise skills, and improving links to market. It could have been expected that beneficiaries would report on this in terms of improved income, but the only beneficiary households who mentioned improved barley sales as a positive driver were AS1 and AS6. Household AS1 has fared well overall, but does not cite the SHA project at all in any part of the questionnaire. The respondent says that his crop production has increased (he can now afford to rent additional land and use a combine harvester) and the price received for barley has increased, but he does not cite any training or cooperative for the malt barley sales. The household is listed as a beneficiary, but this may need to be checked. The other main reason cited for the increase in income is his membership of the milk cooperative.

“He is the only member and leader of the milk producer’s cooperative called ‘Madditu Dannisa’. He joined the cooperative during which he was the kebele chair and he said he get the chance of membership because of his position at that time. The members of the cooperative sell milk at 8 (eight) birr per litre to the union. He also said that now the cooperative has a plan to invest in milk production in the town.”

Household AS6 does mention the farmers’ cooperative:

“They (he and other farmers) sell their harvest to Asella malt factory through farmers’ cooperative called ‘Madda bora’. They sell out the harvest with the price of 1200 (one thousand three hundred)

birr per a quintal and took their money after paying 150 (one hundred fifty) birr of membership for the union.”

6. EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS

Towards the end of the questionnaire interviewees were asked to list and rank - without prompting - the most important ties they had with organisations from outside the village. The chart below shows how frequently different organisations were cited and ranked. It is important to stress that this question seeks to elicit *perceptions* about which organisations are linked to changes in livelihoods and wellbeing, rather than ascertaining who has delivered what. The fact that some respondents may have wrongly attributed an intervention to another organisation is of interest in itself.

Table 6.1 Interviewees’ ranking of external organisations that are important to them

Organisation	Ranking order					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Self Help Africa	8	8	1			17
TechnoServe	1	3	4	2		10
Farmers co-operative	2	4	3	1	1	11
World Vision	6	2	1			9
Hundee Oromo	1	1		1	1	4
Milk co-operative	1		1	1		3
Heineken		1			1	2
FAO			1			1

The most frequently cited organisation is SHA. A total of 17 out of the 24 interviewees cited SHA as being important to them. Where SHA was cited, respondents consistently commented that SHA had provided them with new and improved varieties of malt barley seed, which had contributed to greater yields and cash incomes given the good market price. For example, respondent AS6, ranked SHA as being of first importance to them, and commented that SHA:

“Provides quality seed and trainings about how to grow it in order to get good harvest. It is the first NGO that paved the way for improvement of the farmers since the last three years. Its payment system is fair and this helped farmers to be free from burden debt.” [AS6]

AS4 cited SHA as being of second importance to them and noted that SHA:

“Distributes a good quality barley seed, locally called 'Walker beer' with half payment and takes back the remaining after harvest. This system helps the poor farmers to crop without bothering about the cost of seed and sells their harvest with good price to Assela malt factory”.

The organisation second most frequently cited, was TechnoServe which 10 interviewees cited important links to. TechnoServe is an international NGO that promotes business solutions to poverty, and is also currently working on malt barley production and marketing in Oromia to improve smallholders’ productivity and market access. The Farmers’ Cooperative and World Vision were also cited as being important to the interviewees.

Hundee Oromo is an organisation that did not appear in the 2014 QUIP ranking, but has emerged in the 2015 research. It is a local NGO working in Oromia. It is currently working with Heineken brewery to create access to

market for malt barley producers. In addition to this, the organization implements a dairy production and marketing project.

The results from the focus groups varied from the individual interviews. Focus group participants were less able to list and rank external organisations that they perceive as being important to them.

Table 6.2 Focus Groups ranking of external organisations

Organisation	Ranking order					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Heineken	1					1
TechnoServe		1				1
Farmers' Co-operative			1			1
World Vision (provided piped water)				1		1
Self Help Africa					1	1

FGAS4 highlighted the increase in numbers of organisations working on similar projects to SHA's Malt Barley project even though they were not able to list them all:

“Even though we do not the exact names, there are different organizations that have started providing improved seed and fertilizer to the community since the last year. As a result, the farmers who suffered from lack of money for seed and fertilizers are now able to access it with credit from those organizations and improve their life. Some of the organizations include ‘Techno’ and ‘Self help Africa’.” FGAS4

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This QUIP study finds that the most frequently cited drivers of positive change in people's lives within the sample area are SHA's malt barley project and advice and support from Government Development Agents (DAs). This is also true for most non-beneficiaries as many other households have been recipients of other similar intervention packages. This demonstrates the success of the SHA project, which has been replicated by other local agencies. It helps that price of barley has remained high – farmers are willing to invest in improved production as the returns are high.

Overall, this project aims to deliver upon three outputs:

- Increased production and productivity of malt barley
- Improved access to markets for selling malt barley
- Strengthened capacity of farmer's union cooperatives to deliver services to its members

Research carried out as part of this QUIP evaluation demonstrates that there is clear evidence that the SHA project has been a driver of change in peoples lives, resulting in improved food production and incomes for households among other benefits. There is evidence that farmers have access to markets, as they are successfully selling their malt barley crops – however, it is not clear from this research if this access to markets for the sampled households is as a result of SHA intervention. Finally, there is little data from this QUIP, which shows that the capacity of farmers unions has been improved. The respondents did not cite farmers unions and Cooperatives as drivers of change. There could be many reasons for this – it is possible that work of the farmers' unions is carried out in the background, and is not directly visible to farmers, for example.

More research could perhaps be done by SHA to find out why little was said regarding the project's impact on improved links to markets and strengthening farmers unions and cooperatives.

Other significant drivers in the area, which have had an impact, include water infrastructure projects, the milk cooperative and the increased keeping of livestock. Water projects have enabled a number of farmers to diversify their crop production beyond the crops previously produced. This is improving food consumption in the household as well as increasing opportunities for earning cash income from selling vegetables. Advice from the Government DAs is also impacting on food consumption – people are reporting more diversity in their diet after acting upon DA advice.

Production of livestock is becoming more common; farmers report using improved grazing practices and reducing the number of cattle in favour of retaining a small number of improved breeds that are worth more and are more productive.

Intensified production and farmers' ability to rent out more land is leading to an increased need for labour. As a result traditional practices of sharing labour and assisting neighbours are reducing as farmers are becoming busier (and more wealthy) and opting to hire labour instead of relying on sharing labour. This change is being viewed by some as positive, as it signals higher productivity and returns, but it is also being viewed as being a negative shift by some farmers (as seen in the table on drivers of negative change) as it marks a cultural change in traditional relationships.

“He said there is a social self-help organization named 'dabo'. It is declining these days because many people are opting for working with money (as daily labourers) than helping each other.” [AS3]

For some it is not clear if they see it as negative or positive. A quote from household AS9 demonstrates how this change is seen as a manifestation of increasing wealth, although there is an implication that community relations may suffer as a result. (This comment was coded as a 9 as it is not clear whether the respondent sees it as a negative or positive change):

“He told as there is a change in the relationships with others living in this village in the last three year. This change has come because of the economic change of the households. Before three years, the community help each other with the traditional self-help systems called 'dabo' and 'wonfel' during seed sowing, weeding and harvesting. After these three years, many people prefer to use daily labourers to harvest their crops than working together with other as it used to in order to save their time and energy by using their money, while others, especially the economically weak farmers, also opt for working as daily labourers to get money by working for others.” [AS9]

There is little doubt that SHA's Malt Barley Project has had a significant impact not only on the income and consumption of direct beneficiaries of the project, but also on other local development agents and therefore on other non-beneficiary households who are now implementing similar practices to benefit from the rising market in malt barley.

Appendix 1. The QUIP Protocol

The QUIP is an experimental tool for credible qualitative assessment of the impact of development activities (referred to for simplicity as projects) in the context of complex rural livelihood transformations. A full draft of the QUIP guidelines is available at <http://go.bath.ac.uk/art>. The main purpose of the QUIP is to elicit evidence of household level impacts that can credibly be attributed to a project: (a) to complement quantitative monitoring of project activities and before-after changes in key impact indicators; (b) by relying on self-reported attribution of drivers of change from intended project beneficiaries without the need for a control group; (c) mitigating potential response bias by framing data collection sufficiently broadly that both interviewers and respondents are unaware of the specific impact hypotheses, or theories of change, being investigated.

A key design feature is that the lead researcher employed to collect primary data is recruited and inducted into the task in such a way as to remain as unaware as possible of the project being evaluated. For this reason separate guidelines have been drafted for the commissioner of the evaluation and the lead researcher. Primary data collection is structured to create opportunities for respondents (both in household level interviews and focus group discussions) to volunteer cause-and-effect observations linking project activities to intended impact alongside unintended impacts and indeed observations on drivers of change that are unrelated to the project. This serves as an exploratory reality check for the project. At the same time analysis independently and logically identifies evidence that explicitly or implicitly confirms or refutes the project's theory of change.

The first step of data collection is for the research commissioner to provide the lead researcher with a list of households who are ideally representative of the intended beneficiaries of the project, or at least not untypical of them. The lead researcher then selects an agreed number of households from this list for semi-structured interviews. This data is triangulated against data collected through focus groups attended by members of the same household plus additional friends and/or neighbours. Their responses are noted down by the research team using pro-forma sheets and then transcribed into matching Excel sheets to facilitate rapid coding and classification of the data.

Development of the QUIP is part of the "ART project" - action research into "assessing rural transformations" - being conducted by the Centre for Development Studies at the University of Bath in collaboration with the NGOs *Self Help Africa*, *Farm Africa*, and *Evidence for Development*. The research is sponsored by the UK Department for International Development and the Economic and Social Research Council [grant number ES/J018090/1].

Pro bono support with spreadsheet design was provided by *F1F9* and is gratefully acknowledged. For further information about the ART project contact James Copestake j.g.copestake@bath.ac.uk or Fiona Remnant f.l.remnant@bath.ac.uk

Appendix 2. Details of interviews and focus group discussions

Table A1: Individual Household Interviews

HH	Beneficiary ?	Respondent Gender	Age	Respondent Education	HH Size *	Under 16s in HH	Gender of head of hh	Interview Date	Duration (mins)
AS1	Yes	Male	38	Grade 8	7	4	Male	19/02/15	87
AS2	No	Male	36	Grade 5	4	1	Male	19/2/15	76
AS3	Yes	Male	45	Grade 3	8	6	Male	20/02/15	67
AS4	Yes	Male	32	Grade 10	8	6	Male	20/02/15	62
AS5	No	Male	37	Grade 6	9	4	Male	21/02/15	103
AS6	Yes	Male	60	Grade 6	8	3	Male	21/02/15	73
AS7	No	Male	57	Grade 3	5	1	Male	22/02/15	66
AS8	Yes	Male	-	Grade 10	5	-	Male	22/02/15	67
AS9	Yes	Male	28	Grade 10	7	2	Male	23/02/15	110
AS10	Yes	Male	26	Grade 10	3	1	Male	23/02/15	41
AS11	Yes	Female	-	Grade 8	9	7	Male	24/02/15	106
AS12	No	Female	60	Grade 3	6	4	Female	25/03/15	70
AS13	Yes	Male	50	Grade 6	6	2	Male	19/02/15	125
AS14	Yes	Male	29	Grade 5	5	3	Male	19/02/15	85
AS15	Yes	Male	32	Grade 2	5	3	Male	20/02/15	60
AS16	Yes	Male	57	Grade 9	15	10	Male	20/02/15	107
AS17	Yes	Male	48	Grade 12	7	4	Male	21/02/15	101
AS18	No	Male	30	Grade 7	4	2	Male	21/02/15	69
AS19	Yes	Male	25	Grade 8	6	2	Male	22/02/15	120
AS20	No	Female	26	Grade 4	4	3	Female	22/02/15	70
AS21	Yes	Male	45	Grade 10	11	5	Male	23/02/15	107
AS22	Yes	Male	68	Basic	7	1	Male	23/02/15	71
AS23	No	Male	62	Basic	5	2	Male	24/02/15	63
AS24	Yes	Male	56	Grade 5	6	3	Male	25/02/15	68

*Household size only includes those who were resident for more than six of the previous twelve months

Table A2: Focus Group Interviews

Focus Groups	No. Participants	Type of group	Interview Date	Duration (mins)
FGAS1	5	Older Women	24/02/2015	66
FGAS2	3	Younger Women	25/02/2015	132
FGAS3	3	Older Men	24/02/2015	74
FGAS4	5	Younger men	25/02/2015	71

Appendix 3. Intervention table for the SHA Assela Malt Barley Project

Period	Intervention	HH involved	Comments
Q2 2012	- Planning workshop with partners - Provision of improved malt barley seed (certified and basic) - Site based practical training on quality malt barley production	AS1, AS6, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS19, AS21, AS22	
Q3 2012	- Training on business and enterprise skills	AS1, AS6, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS19, AS21, AS22	
Q4 2012	- Experience exchange and training (farmers' field day) - Marketing produce	AS1, AS6, AS9, AS10, AS11, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16, AS17, AS19, AS21, AS22	
Q2 2013	- Provision of improved malt barley seed (certified and basic) - Site based practical training on quality malt barley production	AS3, AS4, AS8 ,AS24	
Q3 2013	- Training on business and enterprise skills	AS3, AS4, AS8 ,AS24	
Q4 2013	- Experience exchange and training (farmers' field day) - Marketing produce	AS3, AS4, AS8 ,AS24	High wind occurred in the area resulting in malt barley yield reduction (information from farmers and Government extension Agents)
Q4 2014			High wind occurred in the area resulting in malt barley yield reduction (information from farmers and Government extension Agents)