

PD-AAR-512
14/08/85

3887750

REPORT
ON THE
EVALUATION OF THE VOLUNTARY
STERILIZATION PROGRAM
FOR
JANUARY-MARCH QUARTER
1985

17

QC

M.A. QUASEM & CO.
8/13 Sir Syed Ahmed Road
Mohammadpur, Dhaka-7

003533

000048

6

CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY | 1 |
| 1.1. Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1.1. Background information | 1 |
| 1.2. Objectives of the evaluation | 2 |
| 1.3. Methodology | 3 |
| 1.3.1. Sample for the evaluation | 3 |
| 1.3.2. Client sample | 4 |
| 1.3.3. Sub-sample for outside upazila clients | 5 |
| 1.3.4. Service provider (physician and clinic staff)/referrer sample | 7 |
| 1.3.5. Field activities | 8 |
| 1.3.6. Field work | 10 |
| 1.3.7. Data processing | 10 |
| Chapter 2: RESULTS OF FIELD SURVEY OF CLIENTS | 11 |
| 2.1. Results of the main sample of within upazila cases | 12 |
| 2.1.1. Locating the clients | 13 |
| 2.1.2. Interviewing the clients | 15 |
| 2.1.3. Clinic verification | 15 |
| 2.1.4. Time verification | 17 |
| 2.1.5. Cross verification of clinic and time | 17 |
| 2.1.6. Verification of informed consent forms | 19 |
| 2.1.7. Verification of surgical apparel | 23 |
| 2.1.8. Payment verification | 25 |
| 2.1.9. Verification of referrer | 28 |

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 2.1.10. Background characteristics of clients | 30 |
| 2.1.10.1. Age | 30 |
| 2.1.10.2. Number of living children | 34 |
| 2.1.10.3. Other client characteristics | 34 |
| 2.2. Results of interview of service providers/referrers | 38 |
| 2.2.1. Interviewing of the service providers/referrers | 38 |
| 2.2.2. Payment verification | 39 |
| 2.3. Results of the sub-sample of outside upazila cases | 40 |
| 2.3.1. Locating the outside clients | 40 |
| 2.3.2. Interview of outside clients | 41 |
| 2.3.3. Reported clinic and time of operation | 41 |
| 2.3.4. Signing of informed consent form by outside clients | 43 |
| 2.3.5. Receiving of surgical apparel | 43 |
| 2.3.6. Amount received | 43 |
| 2.3.7. Verification of referrers | 46 |
| 2.3.8. Socio-demographic characteristics of outside clients | 49 |
| Chapter 3: REPORTING VARIATION | 50 |
| 3.1. Clinic performance data | 50 |
| 3.2. Upazila performance data | 50 |
| 3.3. NGO performance data | 50 |
| 3.4. District performance data | 50 |

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 3.5. MIS performance data | 51 |
| 3.6. Comparison among the verified BDG performance data, upazila data, district data, and MIS data | 52 |
| 3.7. Estimates of BDG component ratios of verified BDG performance data and MIS data | 66 |
| 3.8. Reported and estimated national, BDG, and NGO performance | 68 |
| Chapter 4: FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION | 77 |
| 4.1. Estimated overreporting/underreporting of performances in the MMR of MIS reported data | 77 |
| 4.2. Estimated proportion of clients actually sterilized | 77 |
| 4.3. Estimated proportion of actually sterilized clients who had signed or put thumb impression on the USAID-approved informed consent form | 78 |
| 4.4. Estimated average amount paid to clients actually sterilized | 79 |
| 4.5. Estimated proportion of actually sterilized clients who had received surgical apparel | 79 |
| 4.6. Estimated proportion of actual referrers | 79 |
| 4.7. Estimated average amount received by service providers/referrers | 79 |

APPENDIX

Appendix - A: Tables

Appendix - B: Interviewing schedules

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

1.1. Introduction:

1.1.1. Background information:

Under a grant agreement signed between the USAID and the Government of Bangladesh, the USAID reimburses the Government of Bangladesh the selected costs of the Voluntary Sterilization (VS) Program. These costs include fees paid to the service providers (physicians and clinic staff) and fieldworkers and payments made to the clients for food, transportation to and from the clinic, and wage-loss compensation. The USAID also reimburses the costs of sarees and lungis (surgical apparel) given to the clients before the sterilization operation.

The following table (Table 1) gives the USAID-approved reimbursement rates for female sterilization (tubectomy) and male sterilization (vasectomy).

Table 1: USAID-reimbursed sterilization costs by
type of operation

| Selected costs | Tubectomy (Taka) | Vasectomy (Taka) |
|--|--|---------------------|
| Physician fees | 20.00 | 20.00 |
| Clinic staff | 15.00 | 12.00 |
| Fieldworker compensation for non-routine services | 15.00 | 15.00 |
| Food, transportation, wage-loss compensation | 175.00 | 175.00 |
| Surgical apparel | To be based on cost, not to exceed current retail market value | |

It is the accepted principle of both the USAID and the Government of Bangladesh that the client undergoing sterilization operation

does so voluntarily, being fully informed of the consequences and the risks of the operation. In order to ensure the voluntary nature of the sterilization operation, it has been made a condition that the sterilization client will record his/her consent in a consent form. A USAID-approved informed consent form has therefore to be filled in prior to the operation. The form will be signed/thumb impressed by the client, the physician, and the fieldworker/referral agent.

The approved costs of the VS program are reimbursed on the basis of sterilization performance statistics provided by the Management Information Systems (MIS) Unit of the Ministry of Health and Population Control (MOHPC). These statistics are contained in the "MIS Monthly Performance Report" which is usually issued within four weeks after the end of the month. These statistics include the performance of both the Bangladesh Government (BDG) and the Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) engaged in sterilization activities.

M/s. M.A. Quasem and Co. has signed an agreement with the USAID, Dhaka, to conduct eight quarterly evaluations of the Voluntary Sterilization (VS) Program beginning with January-March 1985 quarter. The present report is the first quarterly evaluation of the VS Program under the contract, based on the findings obtained from a nationally representative sample survey. Thus, in this report, the term 'reference quarter' means the 1985 January-March evaluation quarter.

1.2. Objectives of the evaluation:

The specific objectives of the evaluation are as follows:

- a. to estimate the number of clients actually sterilized in the reference quarter;
- b. to estimate the average rates paid to the actually sterilized clients for wage-loss compensation, food and transport costs; to assess whether there is any consistent and significant pattern of underpayments or overpayments for these client reimbursements;

- c. to estimate the proportion of clients who did not receive sarees and lungis;
- d. to estimate the average rates paid to the physicians, the clinic staff, and the fieldworkers/referral agents as compensation for their services; to assess whether there is any consistent and significant pattern of underpayments or overpayments of these fees; and to estimate the proportion of service providers and fieldworkers/referral agents who received the specified payment;
- e. to estimate the proportion of the sterilized clients who did not sign or put thumb impressions on the USAID-approved informed consent forms;
- f. to estimate the discrepancy between the BDG and the NGO performances as reported by the upazila (thana) level BDG officials and the NGOs and what is reported as BDG and NGO performances by the Deputy Director at the district level and by the MIS at the national level.

To gain insight into the demographic characteristics of the clients, information about age and parity (number of living children) of sterilization clients shall also be gathered.

1.3. Methodology:

1.3.1. Sample for the evaluation:

The sample for the evaluation was drawn in two stages. The first stage sampling comprised selection of the upazila sample and the second stage the client sample. In addition, two sub-samples were drawn for two special purposes. The sub-samples are "sub-sample of outside clients" and "sub-sample of service providers/referrers". The purpose and the selection procedures of these sub-samples are discussed in the respective sections of this chapter.

Upazila sample was drawn in the first stage comprising 50 upazilas throughout the country. The MIS monthly computer printout for

the 1984 October-December quarter was used as the sample frame for the selection of the upazila sample. All the upazilas, according to MIS, were categorised as upazilas having only BDG clinics and those having both BDG and at least one NGO clinic. The former was known as 'only BDG' stratum and the latter 'BDG and NGO' stratum. The total performance of the upazilas included in the only BDG stratum was 108,002 and that of the upazilas and NGO clinics included in the BDG and NGO stratum was 56,702. According to the performance in each stratum the required 50 upazilas were divided into two groups and 33 upazilas were selected from the BDG stratum and the remaining 17 upazilas from the BDG and NGO stratum. From each stratum the required sample upazilas were selected with PPS (Probability Proportional to Size). The size was determined in terms of sterilization performance shown in the MIS monthly reports.

1.3.2. Client sample:

At the second stage of the sample, the client sample was drawn from the selected upazilas. For the second stage selection, the list of the recorded clients at upazila level sterilized during the reference quarter (January-March, 1985) were categorised into two groups: "within upazila" clients and "outside upazila" clients. Clients coming from any part of the selected upazila were considered as the "within upazila" clients while those coming from elsewhere were considered as "outside upazila" clients. For any selected upazila, the sampling frame was prepared from the list of the "within upazila" cases only. The "outside upazila" cases were excluded from the sampling frame.

A total number of within upazila clients in a selected upazila was divided into a number of equal-sized (36 clients) clusters of sterilization cases recorded during the reference quarter. Thus the number of clusters was not the same for all the upazilas, as it was dependent on the performance which varied by upazila. One cluster was randomly selected from among those constructed for each selected upazila. A cluster usually covered an area equivalent to two rural unions. This procedure was applied for both the strata.

However, for BDG/NGO stratum, the clients included in the cluster were in proportion to BDG and NGO performances.

The client sample was selected using 0.01420 as the sampling fraction so that there were 1800 sterilized clients included in the sample. After the end of the quarter the actual client sample stood at 1684 clients. This reduction in the sample size from 1800 to 1684 clients resulted from the fact that in some of the selected upazilas the total performance was found to be less than the cluster size of 36 clients. In order to obtain the design sample size as well as to ensure a uniform sampling fraction, an appropriate weighting was applied for each of the selected upazilas.

The following procedure has been applied to determine the weight to be applied to clients of an upazila:

$$W_i = \frac{\sum Scqi}{\sum Pcqi} \bigg/ \frac{Scqi}{Pcqi}$$

where,

W_i = weight for i th selected upazila

$Scqi$ = the number of clients selected as per design from i th selected upazila

$Pcqi$ = total number of within upazila clients of the i th selected upazila

The names of selected upazilas and the number of clients included in the sample for the reference quarter are shown in Table 2.

1.3.3. Sub-sample for outside upazila clients:

All the quarterly audits/evaluations previously conducted excluded the outside upazila cases. In other words, the audit/evaluation results of those quarters were limited to the clients of "within cases" only. However, an increasing number of outside cases was observed in the previous quarterly audits/evaluations (Table 1, Appendix A). Because of this fact, the present evaluation attempted to cover outside cases on limited basis. A sub-sample of outside cases from the selected upazilas was drawn for this purpose. Of the selected 50 upazilas, 10 upazilas were selected randomly from the "BDG only" strata and the BDG/NGO strata.

Table 2: The name of selected upazilas and the number of clients included in the sample

| Name of upazila | Actual sample | Weighted sample |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Atghoria | 5 | 1 |
| Naria | 36 | 12 |
| Fulchori | 36 | 20 |
| Mohammadpur | 36 | 7 |
| Dumuria | 6 | 1 |
| Koyra | 34 | 6 |
| Kachua | 36 | 24 |
| Tala | 36 | 14 |
| Amtoly | 36 | 41 |
| Galachipa | 36 | 14 |
| Bakergonj | 36 | 43 |
| Kathalia | 31 | 6 |
| Nazirpur | 36 | 11 |
| Dhamrai | 36 | 35 |
| Kaliakoir | 36 | 54 |
| Singair | 36 | 27 |
| Gopalpur | 36 | 35 |
| Azmirigonj | 36 | 10 |
| Barura | 36 | 14 |
| Senbag | 32 | 6 |
| Kaligonj | 36 | 11 |
| Banshkhali | 36 | 42 |
| Khanshama | 36 | 47 |
| Nawabgonj | 14 | 3 |
| Atwari | 36 | 36 |
| Badargonj | 36 | 17 |
| Sherpur | 36 | 49 |
| Manda | 36 | 9 |
| Bagmara | 36 | 27 |
| Nandail | 36 | 19 |
| Tarail | 36 | 30 |
| Thakurgaon | 36 | 122 |
| Ullapara | 36 | 54 |
| Pabna Sadar | 36 | 110 |
| Khulna Sadar | 36 | 76 |
| Narail Sadar | 36 | 57 |
| Pirojpur | 36 | 59 |
| Kotalipara | 36 | 43 |
| Norshingdi Sadar | 36 | 59 |
| Mymensingh Sadar | 36 | 80 |
| Sylhet Sadar | 36 | 50 |
| Chandroghona | 14 | 2 |
| Dinajpur Sadar | 36 | 76 |
| Saidpur | 36 | 15 |
| Rangpur Sadar | 36 | 56 |
| Lalmonirhat Sadar | 36 | 69 |
| Joypurhat Sadar | 36 | 15 |
| Natore Sadar | 36 | 37 |
| Patuakhali Sadar | 36 | 75 |
| Barisal Sadar | 36 | 74 |
| Total | 1684 | 1800 |

Clients for the sub-sample were those operated upon in the clinics under the selected upazilas but coming from outside those upazilas. For the sub-sample upazilas the procedures for selection of clients were similar to those followed for within cases. The only difference was that the extremely remote cases were excluded while forming sampling frame and cases contiguous only to the selected upazilas were considered.

The size of the sub-sample was determined to be 360 clients (36 clients for each upazila) taken from 10 spots. Of those 10 spots, 2 spots had no outside cases done during the reference quarter. Therefore these two spots were excluded from the sub-sample and the size of the sub-sample thus stood at 288 clients drawn from 8 spots. The results of the outside cases in this report is therefore based on those clients of 8 selected spots/areas. However, proper weights have been given to all the figures presented in the tables and analyses. The weighting was done following the procedures of the main sample (page 5).

Given below is the list of the spots and the corresponding sample sizes of outside upazila cases:

| <u>Upazila</u> | <u>Actual sample</u> | <u>Weighted sample</u> |
|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Pabna Sadar | 36 | 53 |
| Dinajpur Sadar | 36 | 57 |
| Rangpur Sadar | 36 | 59 |
| Natore Sadar | 36 | 16 |
| Patuakhali Sadar | 36 | 24 |
| Barisal Sadar | 36 | 22 |
| Thakurgaon | 36 | 50 |
| Bakergonj | 31 | 7 |
| Manda ¹ | - | - |
| Saidpur ¹ | - | - |

¹No outside upazila case was recorded during the period of the quarter before the date of field survey.

1.3.4. Service provider (physician and clinic staff)/referrer sample:

The service provider/referrer sample was drawn in the following manner. A sub-sample of 25 percent of the clients was drawn randomly from the selected client sample for each of the selected upazilas. All the recorded service providers/referrers of the clients in the sub-sample were taken into service provider/referrer sample. Since it is likely that the service providers and the referrers might be common for a number of

clients, the size of the service provider/referrer sample may be smaller than the size of actual sub-sample drawn for this purpose.

The service provider/referrer sample for the evaluation quarter, January-March 1985, included 148 physicians, 159 clinic staff, and 356 referrers. Table 3 shows the distribution by upazilas the sample size of physicians, clinic staff, and referrers included in the sample.

1.3.5. Field activities:

To meet the contract objectives, personal interviews with sterilized clients, with service providers, and with fieldworkers (referrers) were required, as were the review of office records in upazila level family planning offices and collection of performance reports. These activities can be categorised under five headings: (a) field survey of clients, (b) field survey of service providers, (c) field survey of fieldworkers (referrers), (d) review of office records, and (e) collection of sterilization performance reports.

The field survey of clients was made to check by means of personal interviews with recorded sterilized clients whether they were actually sterilized; whether they received money for food, transportation, and wage-loss compensation and if received, what were the amounts; and whether they received surgical apparel.

The field survey of service providers has been made to check by means of personal interviews with recorded service providers whether they actually provided services to the selected clients and to determine whether they received specified payments for their services.

Interviews were also conducted with the recorded fieldworkers (referrers) to check whether they actually referred the clients for sterilization and to verify whether they received the specified referral fees.

The review of office records has been done to find out whether the USAID-approved informed consent form was used for each sterilized client and whether the client recorded his/her consent by putting signature/thumb impression on the consent part of the consent form. The review of office records has also been done to find out the actual number of recorded sterilized clients from the clinic payment register.

Table 3: The name of selected upazilas and the number of physicians, clinic staff, and referrers included in the sample

| Name of upazila | Weighted sample | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------|
| | Physician | Clinic staff | Referrer |
| Manda | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| Sherpur | 4 | 2 | 8 |
| Baghmara | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| Tarail | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| Fulchori | 1 | 4 | 7 |
| Nandail | 4 | 4 | 9 |
| Ullapara | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| Atgoria | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Badargonj | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| Atwari | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Thakurgaon | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Nowabgonj | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Khansama | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Mohammadpur | 3 | 8 | 8 |
| Golachipa | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| Amtoli | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| Tala | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| Koyra | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| Dumuria | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Kachua | 3 | 1 | 9 |
| Bakergonj | 3 | 6 | 7 |
| Dhamrai | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| Nazirpur | 5 | 4 | 9 |
| Senbag | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| Kaligonj | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| Barura | 3 | 5 | 9 |
| Azmirigonj | 2 | 4 | 7 |
| Banshkhali | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| Kathalia | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Gopalpur | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| Noria | 1 | 4 | 8 |
| Kaliakoir | 5 | 4 | 7 |
| Singair | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| Saidpur | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| Lalmonirhat Sadar | 2 | 3 | 9 |
| Natore Sadar | 4 | 5 | 7 |
| Rangpur Sadar | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Joypurhat Sadar | 4 | 7 | 9 |
| Dinajpur Sadar | 4 | 4 | 9 |
| Kotalipara | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| Patuakhali Sadar | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| Narail | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| Khulna Sadar | 5 | 4 | 9 |
| Pirojpur | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Barisal Sadar | 6 | 6 | 8 |
| Chandroghona | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Sylhet Sadar | 4 | 7 | 9 |
| Mymensingh Sadar | 4 | 3 | 8 |
| Pabna Sadar | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| Narsingdi Sadar | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| Total | 148 | 159 | 356 |

Certified copies of BDG and NGO performance reports filed by the UFPO to the district, reports filed by the district level Deputy Director to the MIS, MIS Monthly Computer Printout (MMCP) showing sterilization performance by districts and upazilas, and the MIS Monthly Performance Report (MMPR) were collected to ascertain whether there was any discrepancy among these data sources and also to ascertain whether there was any overreporting or underreporting in the MMPR.

1.3.6. Field work:

The field work for the 1985 January-March quarter was carried out during March and April, 1985. Seven interviewing teams were deployed to collect the data from the field survey. Each interviewing team included 8 members -- one male supervisor, one female supervisor, two male interviewers, two female interviewers, one field assistant and one team leader. The six members of the interviewing group were assigned the responsibility of interviewing the clients, the service providers and the referrers included in the sample, while the team leader was mainly responsible for: (a) review of sterilization records and informed consent forms, (b) selection of client sample and service provider/referrer sample in each upazila, and (c) collection of performance reports.

Two quality control teams were assigned to supervise the work of the interviewing teams. Each quality control team was composed of one male Quality Control Officer and one female Quality Control Officer. Senior professional staff of the firm also made a number of field visits to ensure the quality of data.

1.3.7. Data processing:

Data were processed manually in the following manner. First, the data from interviews were edited and verified by senior staff, then coded into code sheets. The code sheets on completion were verified by Quality Control Officers and senior professional staff. The tables were prepared manually by sorting of code sheets according to the tabulation plan.

111

Chapter 2

RESULTS OF FIELD SURVEY OF CLIENTS

The results of the field survey of the interviewed sterilized clients are presented in this chapter. The results have been categorised into three sections. The findings of the main sample comprising both BDG and NGO clinics constitute the first group. According to the methodology, these findings would be nationally representative. The second group of findings is on the sub-sample of outside cases. These are described in section 2.3, a separate section in this chapter. Findings on NGOs only are given as the third group - analysed and presented in a separate report as per terms of the contract.

Each of the selected clients was interviewed with the help of structured interviewing schedules. The major purpose of the client interview was to determine whether the respondents who had been recorded as sterilized according to clinic records were actually operated upon for sterilization and if so whether other items of information shown in the clinic records were genuine. The items of information thus collected related to the clinic, date of operation, referrer payment, surgical apparel, and informed consent form.

To facilitate spontaneous responses, each of the clients was asked some indirect questions. To begin with, s(he) was asked to name the clinic where s(he) had been sterilized, the date of sterilization, the name of the referrer, and other relevant facts. If her/his reported information did not correspond to the recorded information, s(he) was asked some leading questions to ascertain the correct position. For example, for clinic verification, questions were asked to ascertain whether s(he) knew the recorded clinic and had visited that clinic for any purpose. Similar questions were also asked for other

items of information. If the respondent reported herself/himself as not sterilized, s(he) was told that her/his name had been recorded as a sterilized client in the clinic records on the recorded date. The client was considered to be not sterilized if s(he) furnished facts to establish that the recorded information was not correct.

2.1. Results of the main sample of within upazila cases:

At the outset two separate tables were prepared and analysed on the results of clinic and time verification. Attempts were made to find out from these tables whether the clients' reported clinics were the same as those recorded and also whether their reported date of operation fell within the reference quarter. For some of the clients, the reported information on the clinics and/or time did not conform to the corresponding recorded information. As the evaluation is intended to identify the clients who are found to be actual cases of sterilization, it had to be found out whether the clients were reportedly sterilized in the recorded clinic and also within the reference quarter. A table was prepared for the purpose of cross verification of the two items of information on clinic and time. This cross verification table shows the common group of clients whose reported clinic and reported time of operation matched with information recorded. Only these clients were considered in this evaluation to be actual cases of sterilization.

Information on informed consent forms was obtained from the clinics as well as from the interviewed clients. In view of the fact that (a) there must be USAID-approved informed consent forms in the clinics for each of the sterilized clients and (b) the clients might have mistaken signing or giving thumb impression on USAID-approved informed consent forms with signing some other forms or

or registers, the clinic records were considered to be the basis of analysis. In the relevant section on verification of informed consent forms two sets of findings have been presented; the first set comprising all the selected clients and the second comprising only the actually sterilized clients.

The results of verification of the referrers are presented in a later section. The results of referrer verification are based on the actually sterilized clients. The findings on referrer verification for the evaluation quarter have been presented and analysed separately.

Limited data on demographic and socio-economic characteristics were also collected from the interviewed clients. The findings on actually sterilized clients are presented in this chapter in the section entitled "Background characteristics of clients".

2.1.1. Locating the clients:

The interviewers made resolute attempts to locate and interview the clients included in the sample. If and when necessary several attempts were made by interviewers and also by supervisors during their field work to locate individual clients. They first tried to locate the clients by themselves or by asking the villagers. If the first attempt failed, assistance was sought from the local family planning fieldworkers, ward members, and from referrers in locating the client. The interviewers noted down the reasons and documented evidence from the persons assisting for each of the unsuccessful attempts to locate the selected clients. The distribution of not located clients by categories and persons providing evidence is shown in Table 2: Appendix-A.

Table 4 shows the percentage distribution of clients by status of locating them. Among the clients selected in the sample, 84.7 percent could be located in the field, which included 88.5 percent of the tubectomy clients and 80.3 percent of the vasectomy clients.

The clients who could not be located consisted of six categories; 'client permanently left the address', 'client temporarily visiting the address', 'incomplete address', 'not attempted', 'address not found', and 'others'. The 'client permanently left the address' group consisted 2.9 percent of the tubectomy clients and 4.3 percent of the vasectomy clients, while the 'client temporarily visiting the address' group constituted 7.5 percent of the tubectomy clients and 8.4 percent of the vasectomy clients. Another 4.3 percent of the vasectomy clients and 0.4 percent of the tubectomy clients could not be located in the field due to incomplete address. The interviewers failed to locate 0.2 percent of the clients as the addresses of these clients were found to be inaccessible.

The 'address not found' group included both those clients who never lived at the address indicated and client whose listed address did not exist. The 'address not found' group constituted 0.5 percent of the tubectomy clients and 2.3 percent of the vasectomy clients.

Table 4: Percentage distribution of all clients by status of locating the clients

| Status of locating the clients | Categories of clients | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------|-------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy | All |
| Client located | 88.5 | 80.3 | 84.7 |
| Client has permanently left the address | 2.9 | 4.3 | 5.8 |
| Client was only temporarily visiting there | 7.5 | 8.4 | 5.6 |
| Address not found | 0.5 | 2.3 | 1.4 |
| Incomplete address | 0.4 | 4.3 | 2.2 |
| Others | - | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Not attempted | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Total | 99.9 ^a | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 958 | 842 | 1800 |

^aPercentage total is less than 100 percent due to rounding error.

2.1.2. Interviewing the clients:

Once the clients were located, interviews were conducted with them by trained male and female interviewers under the direct supervision of the field supervisors. Table 5 shows the percentage distribution of located clients by status of interviews. Among the located clients, 91.6 percent of the tubectomy clients and 84.2 percent of the vasectomy clients could be interviewed. The clients who could not be interviewed were found absent from their residence during the scheduled stay of the interviewing team in their localities. The proportion of not interviewed clients was higher for vasectomy (15.8 percent) than for tubectomy (8.4 percent).

Table 5: Percentage distribution of located clients by status of interviews

| Interview status | Categories of clients | | |
|------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy | All |
| Interviewed | 91.6 | 84.2 | 88.3 |
| Not interviewed | 8.4 | 15.8 | 11.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 848 | 676 | 1524 |

2.1.3. Clinic verification:

All the interviewed clients were asked some indirect and leading questions on clinics in which they had the sterilization operation. This was done to ascertain whether the client's reported clinic of operation was the same as or different from the clinic in which s(he) was recorded to have been sterilized.

Table 6 shows the percentage distribution of the interviewed clients by reported clinics. Among the interviewed tubectomy clients, 99.2 percent reported the recorded clinic as the clinics of their operation.

Of the remaining 0.7 percent, 0.6 percent clients reported other than the recorded clinic as the clinic of their operation and 0.1 percent client (one tubectomy client) reported that she had visited the recorded clinic for some other purpose.

Similarly, among the interviewed vasectomy clients, 93.1 percent reported the recorded clinics as the clinics of their operation. Another 2.8 percent clients reported other than the recorded clinic as the clinic of their operation. It can also be seen from the table that there were 3.0 percent vasectomy clients who reported that they had undergone sterilization operations twice. The remaining 1.1 percent of the clients never had been sterilized.

Table 6: Percentage distribution of the interviewed clients by reported clinics

| Reported clinic | Categories of clients | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------|-------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy | All |
| Recorded clinic | 99.2 | 93.1 | 96.7 |
| Other than the recorded clinic | 0.6 | 2.8 | 1.5 |
| <u>Sterilized twice</u> | | | |
| Recorded clinic and other than recorded clinic | - | 1.8 | 0.7 |
| Both operations in the recorded clinic | - | 1.2 | 0.5 |
| <u>Never sterilized</u> | | | |
| Did not know the recorded clinic | - | 0.9 | 0.4 |
| Visited the recorded clinic for other purpose | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Total | 99.9 ^a | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 777 | 569 | 1346 |

^aPercentage total is less than 100 percent due to rounding error.

2.1.4. Time verification:

Since all the selected clients of the sample upazilas were those who were recorded to have been sterilized within the quarter, January-March 1985, the date of operation for any of them must fall within the quarter. Therefore, all the interviewed clients were asked questions to ascertain whether they had undergone sterilization operation during the reference quarter.

Table 7 shows the percentage distribution of interviewed clients by status of reported date of operation. Among the interviewed tubectomy clients, 97.7 percent reported that they had undergone sterilization operation within the reference quarter. Of the remaining 2.3 percent, most of them (2.2 percent) reported that they had been operated upon before the reference quarter.

Similarly, among the interviewed vasectomy clients, 88.9 percent reported that they had undergone sterilization operation within the reference quarter. On the other hand, 7.1 percent of the clients reported that they had undergone sterilization operation before the reference quarter. Another 3.0 percent clients reported that they had undergone sterilization operation twice -- once before the quarter and again within the quarter. The 'never sterilized' vasectomy clients constituted 1.1 percent.

2.1.5. Cross verification of clinic and time:

The cross verification of clinic and time has been done to ascertain the number of actually sterilized cases of the reporting quarter. If the reported clinic and the reported time match with the recorded clinic and the recorded time then the client is considered to be an actually sterilized client. The subsequent sections deal with those actually sterilized clients only.

Table 7: Percentage distribution of interviewed clients
by status of reported date of operation

| Status of date of operation | Categories of clients | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|-------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy | All |
| Within the quarter | 97.7 | 88.9 | 94.0 |
| <u>Before the quarter</u> | | | |
| Visited any clinic within the quarter | 0.1 | 1.8 | 0.8 |
| Never visited any clinic within the quarter | 2.1 | 5.3 | 3.4 |
| <u>Sterilized twice</u> | | | |
| 1st operation before the quarter and 2nd operation within the quarter | - | 3.0 | 1.3 |
| <u>Never sterilized</u> | | | |
| Visited the Recorded Clinic for other purpose | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Did not know the Recorded Clinic | - | 0.9 | 0.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.1 ^a | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 777 | 569 | 1346 |

^aPercentage total is more than 100 percent due to rounding error.

The percentage distribution of the interviewed clients by status of reported date of operation and of reported clinic is shown in Table 8. It can be seen from the table that 97.7 percent of the tubectomy clients and 87.0 percent of the vasectomy clients reported their operation within the quarter and also in the recorded clinic. Another 1.5 percent of the tubectomy clients and 6.2 percent of the vasectomy clients reported the recorded clinic as the clinic of their operation but they reported having undergone the sterilization operation before the quarter. It can also be seen from the table that the reported clinic and the reported time were different from those recorded for 0.6 percent of the tubectomy clients and 0.9 percent of the vasectomy clients. The clients who reported that they had been sterilized twice -- once before the quarter and again within the quarter -- were all vasectomy clients. Thus the proportion of actually sterilized clients was found to be 97.7 percent for tubectomy and 87.0 percent for vasectomy.

2.1.6. Verification of informed consent forms:

It is an agreed principle of both BDG and USAID that a USAID-approved informed consent form for each sterilization case must be properly filled in and maintained. Therefore, the field team checked whether a USAID-approved informed consent form had been filled in for each selected sterilized client. Secondly, the consent forms were examined to ensure that those were signed/thumb impressed by the clients. To verify the fact, information from each of the selected upazilas was collected.

Thus, the verification of informed consent forms was based on data collected by the Team Leaders from the office records of the selected upazilas. The information thus obtained is presented in two separate tables - Table 9 and Table 10. In Table 9 all the selected clients are included but in Table 10 only the actually sterilized clients are covered. The first table gives an overall picture of the use of the USAID-approved informed consent forms. The purpose of the second

Table 8: Percentage distribution of interviewed clients by status of reported date of operation and by status of reported clinics

| Status of reported date of operation | Tubectomy | | | | Vasectomy | | | | | All | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------------|---|------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------------|---|------------------|-------|
| | Within the quarter | Before the quarter | Never sterilized | All | Within the quarter | Before the quarter | Within the quarter and before the quarter | Never sterilized | All | Within the quarter | Before the quarter | Within the quarter and before the quarter | Never sterilized | All |
| Sterilized in the recorded clinic | 97.7 | 1.5 | - | 99.2 | 87.0 | 6.2 | - | - | 93.2 | 93.2 | 3.5 | - | - | 96.7 |
| Sterilized in other than the recorded clinic | - | 0.6 | - | 0.6 | 1.9 | 0.9 | - | - | 2.8 | 0.8 | 0.7 | - | - | 1.5 |
| Sterilized twice (Sterilized in the recorded clinic and other than recorded clinic) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 1.3 | - | 1.3 |
| Never sterilized | - | - | 0.1 | 0.1 | - | - | - | 1.0 | 1.0 | - | - | - | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Total | 97.7 | 2.2 ^a | 0.1 | 100.0 | 88.9 | 7.1 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 94.0 | 4.2 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | | | | 777 | | | | | 569 | | | | | 1346 |

^aThe sub-category total does not add to 2.2 due to rounding error.

Table 9: Percentage distribution of all selected clients
by type and status of informed consent forms

| Status of informed consent form | Type of operation | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy | |
| <u>USAID-approved</u> | | | |
| Signed by clients | 94.2 | 93.3 | 93.8 |
| Not signed by clients | 2.4 | 0.8 | 1.7 |
| <u>Not USAID-approved</u> | | | |
| Signed by clients | 3.4 | 5.2 | 4.2 |
| Not signed by clients | - | - | - |
| <u>No informed consent form</u> | - | 0.6 | 0.3 |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Total | 100.0 | 99.9 ^a | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 958 | 842 | 1800 |

^aPercentage total is less than 100 percent due to rounding error.

Table 10: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized clients by types of informed consent forms and status of signing

| Types of consent forms and status of signing | Categories of clients | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy | All |
| <u>USAID-approved</u> | | | |
| Signed by clients | 93.5 | 95.3 | 94.2 |
| Not signed by clients | 2.4 | 0.6 | 1.7 |
| <u>Not USAID-approved</u> | | | |
| Signed by clients | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 |
| Not signed by clients | - | - | - |
| <u>No consent form</u> | - | 0.1 | ^a |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.1 ^b | 100.0 |
| Weighted N ¹ | 759 | 495 | 1254 |

^aThe percentage of this sub-category is insignificant (i.e. less than 0.1 percent)

^bPercentage total is larger than 100 percent due to rounding error.

¹Of 777 interviewed tubectomy clients, 18 were determined to be false (Table 8); of 569 interviewed vasectomy clients, 74 were determined to be false.

table is to see whether, for each of the actually sterilized clients, a USAID-approved informed consent form was properly maintained.

As can be seen from tables 9 and 10, for most of the clients the USAID-approved informed consent forms were maintained. Informed consent forms not approved by the USAID were also found to have been used for some clients. On the other hand, for some of the clients no consent form was maintained by the clinics.

Among all the selected clients, the proportion of clients having USAID-approved informed consent forms which were also signed/thumb impressed by the clients was 93.8 percent while it was 94.2 percent when only the actually sterilized clients were considered. Not USAID-approved and no consent form groups constituted about 4.5 percent of the clients in each case.

The distribution of number of consent forms not signed by clients and the number of consent forms not approved by USAID, by upazila, is given in Table 3: Appendix-A.

2.1.7. Verification of surgical apparel:

Each interviewed actually sterilized client was asked questions to ascertain whether s(he) had received the surgical apparel for undergoing the sterilization operation. The surgical apparel for the tubectomy client is a saree and that for the vasectomy client, a lungi.

Table 11 shows the percentage distribution of actually sterilized clients by whether they were given the surgical apparel or not as well as the status of use of USAID-approved informed consent forms. It can be seen from the table that, overall, 100.0 percent of the tubectomy clients and 97.0 percent of the vasectomy clients reported receipt of the surgical apparel. When use of USAID-approved informed consent

Table 11: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized clients by status of informed consent forms and status of receipt of surgical apparel

| Status of informed consent form | Status of receipt of surgical apparel | Categories of clients | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------|
| | | Tubectomy | Vasectomy | All |
| USAID-approved informed consent forms signed by client | Received | 93.5 | 92.7 | 93.2 |
| | Did not receive | - | 2.4 | 1.0 |
| Sub-total | | 93.5 | 95.1 | 94.2 |
| Informed consent form not USAID-approved/informed consent form USAID-approved but not signed by clients/ no consent form | Received | 6.5 | 4.3 | 5.6 |
| | Did not receive | - | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| Sub-total | | 6.5 | 4.9 | 5.8 |
| All | Received | 100.0 | 97.0 | 98.8 |
| | Did not receive | - | 3.0 | 1.2 |
| Total | | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | | 759 | 495 | 1254 |

form was considered, 93.5 percent of the tubectomy clients and 92.7 percent of the vasectomy clients reported receipt of surgical apparel and had also signed the USAID-approved informed consent forms.

2.1.8. Payment verification:

The interviewed sterilized clients were asked questions about payments that they had received for undergoing the sterilization operation. If the clients reported receiving less than the approved amount of Tk.175/- they were further asked questions to assess whether they were provided with any facility by the clinic. The term 'facility' includes provision of food to the client during his/her stay in the clinic or transport for travelling to and from the clinic or both.

Table 12 shows the percentage distribution of actually sterilized tubectomy clients by amounts that they reported to have received. Of the tubectomy clients, 90.0 percent reported that they had received the approved amount of Tk. 175/-. The remaining 10.0 percent clients reported receiving less than the approved amount. Since these clients reported receiving less than the approved amount they were asked further questions to ascertain whether they had received any facility or not. Of the 10.0 percent of the clients, 8.7 percentage points were accounted for by clients who reported receiving facility from the clinic while the remaining 1.3 percentage points were accounted for by clients who reported that they were not provided with any facility, and therefore, those clients were found to have been paid less than the approved amount of Tk. 175/-.

The clients who reported receiving less than the approved amount but were provided with facility by the clinic were considered to have received the full payment of the approved amount assuming that they were paid the balance amount after deducting the expenses. Under this assumption two estimates of the average client-payment have been calculated. The first estimate has been computed for all clients

Table 12: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized tubectomy clients by amount reportedly received

| Amount reportedly received in Taka | All clients | Status of facilities received | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| | | Received any facility | Received no facility |
| 175.00 | 90.0 | NA | NA |
| 171.00 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - |
| 170.00 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.6 |
| 167.00 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - |
| 165.00 | 1.5 | 1.5 | - |
| 164.00 | 1.2 | 1.2 | - |
| 163.00 | 0.3 | 0.3 | - |
| 160.00 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| 156.00 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - |
| 155.00 | 0.8 | 0.8 | - |
| 150.00 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 0.1 |
| 145.00 | 0.5 | 0.5 | - |
| 140.00 | 0.3 | 0.3 | - |
| 100.00 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - |
| Total | 100.0 | 8.7 | 1.3 |
| Weighted N | 759 | | |

Reported average amount: Tk. 173.36

Estimated average amount considering the 'received any facility' category received the approved amount: Tk. 174.86.

Note: NA in the table stands for not applicable cases.

Table 13: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized vasectomy clients by amount reportedly received

| Amount reportedly received in Taka | All clients | Status of facilities received | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| | | Received any facility | Received no facility |
| 175.00 | 95.0 | NA | NA |
| 170.00 | 0.8 | - | 0.8 |
| 165.00 | 0.2 | - | 0.2 |
| 160.00 | 0.8 | - | 0.8 |
| 120.00 | 1.2 | - | 1.2 |
| 100.00 | 1.4 | - | 1.4 |
| 50.00 | 0.6 | - | 0.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | - | 5.0 |
| Weighted N | 495 | | |

Reported average amount: Tk. 172.36

Note: NA in the table stands for not applicable cases.

irrespective of whether they had received the approved amount or not and whether they had been provided with any facility or not. The second estimate of average amount has been calculated for all clients, excluding those who had received less than the approved amount and who had reported receiving no facility from the clinic. Thus the average amount for the first category is Tk. 173.36 and that for the second category is Tk. 174.86.

Similarly, Table 13 shows the percentage distribution of actually sterilized vasectomy clients by amounts that they reported to have received. Of the vasectomy clients, 95.0 percent reported that they had received the approved amount of Tk. 175/-. The remaining 5.0 percent of the clients reported receiving less than the approved amount. These clients also reported that they were not provided with any facility and therefore, these clients were found to have been paid less than the approved amount of Tk. 175/-. Thus, the average amount received by all vasectomy clients was found to be Tk. 172.36.

2.1.9. Verification of referrer:

An interviewed client reporting herself/himself as sterilized was asked questions to find out if (s) he was actually referred for sterilization by the referrer shown in clinic records. The findings on this information, separately for tubectomy and vasectomy, are discussed below.

Table 14 shows the percentage distribution of actually sterilized tubectomy clients by their reported and recorded referrers. Among the tubectomy clients the recorded referrers and reported referrers were found to be the same for 86.1 percent of the clients. According to clinic records, the highest number of clients (39.5 percent) were referred by BDG family planning workers followed by NGO family planning workers (20.6 percent) and registered Dai (19.0 percent). Members of general public and registered agents referred 19.4 percent

Table 14: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized tubectomy clients by recorded and reported referrers

| Recorded referrer | Reported referrer | | | | | | | | | | All |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------|---------------|------------|--|-------|
| | BDG FP fieldworker | NGO FP fieldworker | FP fieldworker (not ascertained whether BDG or NGO) | Registered Dai | Registered Agent | General public | Went alone | Does not know | Not stated | | |
| BDG FP fieldworker | 34.7 | - | - | 1.6 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | | 39.5 |
| NGO FP fieldworker | 0.2 | 17.2 | - | - | 1.4 | 1.2 | - | 0.2 | 0.3 | | 20.5 |
| FP fieldworker (not ascertained whether BDG or NGO) | - | - | 0.7 | - | 0.3 | - | - | - | - | | 1.0 |
| Registered Dai | 0.4 | - | - | 16.5 | - | 1.5 | - | 0.2 | 0.4 | | 19.0 |
| Registered Agent | - | - | - | 0.4 | 11.6 | - | 0.1 | 0.3 | - | | 12.4 |
| General public | 0.3 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.1 | 5.4 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.3 | | 7.0 |
| Not stated | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.6 | | 0.6 |
| Total Weighted N = 759 | 35.6 | 17.2 | 0.7 | 18.6 | 14.6 | 9.6 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 1.9 | | 100.0 |

clients to clinics for sterilization. On the other hand, information reported by clients reveal some discrepancy in the referrers. A total of 10.1 percent of the clients reported that they went to clinics with somebody other than the recorded referrer.

Similar distribution of vasectomy clients is shown in Table 15. Of the vasectomy clients a total of 74.5 percent clients reported that they went for sterilization operation with their recorded referrers. The remaining 21.8 percent did not go with their recorded referrers with the exception of 0.9 percent who could not mention or interviewers failed to record the name of referrers. It is evident from the table that the highest number of clients (33.1 percent) were referred by members of the general public followed by BDG family planning workers (23.4 percent). One major discrepancy is that according to clinic records 15.7 percent clients were referred by registered Dais but according to the clients the figure was only 5.4 percent.

2.1.10. Background characteristics of clients:

2.1.10.1. Age:

Table 16 shows the percentage distribution of actually sterilized tubectomy clients by reported age of the client and that of their husband. The largest number of tubectomy clients were found to be in the age group of 25-29 years while most of their husbands were in the age group of 35-39 years. The mean ages of the clients and their husbands were 29.9 years and 40.7 years respectively. The percentage distribution of actually sterilized vasectomy clients by their reported age and that of their wives is shown in Table 17. It can be seen from the table that 2.0 percent of the vasectomy clients had wives who were no longer in the reproductive age group.

Table 15: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized vasectomy clients by recorded and reported referrers

| Recorded referrer \ Reported referrer | BDG FP fieldworker | NGO FP fieldworker | FP fieldworker (not ascertained whether BDG or NGO) | Registered Dai | Registered Agent | General public | Went alone | Does not know | Not stated | All |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------|---------------|------------|-------|
| BDG FP fieldworker | 18.3 | - | - | 0.3 | - | 1.5 | 3.1 | - | 0.2 | 23.4 |
| NGO FP fieldworker | - | 11.3 | - | - | - | - | 2.4 | 1.3 | - | 15.0 |
| FP fieldworker (not ascertained whether BDG or NGO) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Registered Dai | 0.4 | - | - | 5.1 | 0.5 | 5.9 | 3.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 15.7 |
| Registered Agent | 0.2 | - | - | - | 10.9 | 0.4 | 0.3 | - | 0.2 | 12.0 |
| General public | 0.4 | 1.2 | - | - | - | 28.9 | 1.8 | 0.8 | - | 33.1 |
| Not stated | 0.4 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.4 | - | - | 0.8 |
| Total Weighted N = 495 | 19.7 | 12.5 | - | 5.4 | 11.4 | 36.7 | 11.0 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 100.0 |

Table 17: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized vasectomy clients by reported age of client and wife

| Age group of clients (in years) | Age group of wife (in years) | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60-64 | NS | | |
| 15-19 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 20-24 | 0.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.2 |
| 25-29 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 0.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4.0 |
| 30-34 | 0.2 | 6.1 | 7.7 | 0.2 | - | 0.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 14.4 |
| 35-39 | 0.8 | 4.4 | 14.1 | 3.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 23.2 |
| 40-44 | - | 0.4 | 2.4 | 9.5 | 3.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 15.6 |
| 45-49 | - | - | 0.8 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 0.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 14.2 |
| 50-54 | - | - | 0.2 | 3.0 | 5.4 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | - | - | - | - | 12.9 |
| 55-59 | - | - | - | 0.4 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.8 | - | - | - | - | - | 8.3 |
| 60-64 | - | 0.2 | 0.4 | - | - | 1.4 | 0.8 | 0.6 | - | - | 1.0 | - | 4.4 |
| 65-69 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | - | - | - | 1.6 |
| 70-74 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.8 | 0.2 | - | - | 0.2 | - | - | 1.2 |
| NS | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 2.6 | 13.3 | 26.1 | 23.4 | 17.8 | 8.9 | 4.8 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.0 | - | 100.0 |
| Weighted N = 495 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2.1.10.2. Number of living children:

Table 18 shows the percentage distribution of actually sterilized clients by reported number of living children. The mean number of living children for tubectomy clients was 3.7 while for vasectomy clients it was 3.9. The proportion of clients having less than two children for tubectomy was 2.5 percent and for vasectomy, it was 2.6 percent.

2.1.10.3. Other client characteristics:

Information on women's employment was collected from both vasectomy and tubectomy clients. In case of tubectomy the information was collected from the woman herself but for vasectomy clients it was about his wife. The findings are shown in Table 19. No significant difference could be found to exist between them for vasectomy and tubectomy. In both the cases about 86.0 percent of the women were reportedly not employed with any regular work. Table 20 shows the percentage distribution of clients by the reported main occupation of clients/husbands. Sterilized clients came mostly from day labour class and agricultural worker class. Table 21 shows that 81.3 percent of all tubectomy clients and 71.9 percent of all vasectomy clients had no education. It can also be seen from the table that 2.9 percent of the tubectomy clients and 4.2 percent of the vasectomy clients had at least secondary school education. Among the sterilized clients about 80.0 percent were Muslims and the remaining were non-Muslims. All but a few non-Muslims clients were Hindus (Table 22). Data on land ownership were also collected. The interviewed clients were asked whether her/his family owned any cultivable land. Clients owning any cultivable land constituted a very small percentage of the sample especially for vasectomy clients (Table 23).

Table 18: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized clients by reported number of living children

| Reported number of living children | Categories of clients | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy |
| 0 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| 1 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| 2 | 19.8 | 19.6 |
| 3 | 26.5 | 26.1 |
| 4 | 24.9 | 21.0 |
| 5 | 13.4 | 14.9 |
| 6 | 7.8 | 6.9 |
| 7 | 3.7 | 5.1 |
| 8 | 1.3 | 3.6 |
| 9 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 759 | 495 |

Table 19: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized clients by employment status of women

| Employment status of wife/client | Categories of clients | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy |
| Employed with cash earning | 11.7 | 14.8 |
| Employed without cash earning | 2.0 | - |
| Not employed | 86.3 | 85.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 759 | 495 |

Table 20: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized clients by occupation of husband/client

| Occupation of husband/client | Categories of clients | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy |
| Agriculture | 27.1 | 14.1 |
| Day labour | 42.6 | 70.5 |
| Business | 14.8 | 8.5 |
| Service | 13.3 | 4.5 |
| Not employed | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| Others | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 759 | 495 |

Table 21: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized clients by their educational level

| Educational level | Categories of clients | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy |
| No schooling | 81.3 | 71.9 |
| No class passed | 0.7 | 1.2 |
| Class <u>I-IV</u> | 10.5 | 19.0 |
| Class <u>V</u> | 4.7 | 3.6 |
| Class <u>VI-IX</u> | 2.6 | 3.2 |
| SSC and HSC | 0.3 | 1.0 |
| Total | 100.1 ^a | 99.9 ^b |
| Weighted N | 759 | 495 |

^aPercentage total is larger than 100 percent due to rounding error.

^bPercentage total is less than 100 percent due to rounding error.

Table 22: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized clients by religion

| Religion | Categories of clients | |
|------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy |
| Muslim | 78.3 | 80.4 |
| Hindu | 20.3 | 18.4 |
| Christian | 0.4 | 1.2 |
| Buddhist | 1.0 | - |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 759 | 495 |

Table 23: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized clients by ownership of land

| Status of land ownership | Categories of clients | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy |
| Owned land | 38.9 | 19.6 |
| Did not own land | 61.1 | 80.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 759 | 495 |

2.2. Results of interview of service providers/referrers:

2.2.1. Interviewing of the service providers/referrers:

The findings discussed in this section are on both service providers (physicians and clinic staff) and referrers included in the service providers/referrers sample. The findings were obtained through personal interviews. Service providers and referrers of 450 selected clients were included in the sample. However, the sample size for each of them, that is, for physician, for clinic staff, and for referrers was not the same. In all, 148 physicians, 159 clinic staff, and 356 referrers were included in the sample. The sample selection procedure has already been discussed in section 1.3.4.

The members of the interviewing team made a number of attempts to locate and interview the selected service providers and referrers. Each of the interviewed service providers/referrers was asked questions whether s(he) had received payments for his/her services rendered to the clients.

Among the selected physicians, clinic staff, and referrers, interviews were conducted with 75.0 percent of the physicians, 88.7 percent of the clinic staff, and 79.5 percent of the referrers. The remaining 25.0 percent physicians, 11.3 percent clinic staff, and 20.5 percent referrers could not be interviewed. The reasons for not interviewing the physicians and clinic staff include absence, leave, and transfer; while for the referrers the reason for not interviewing was mainly due to their absence from the given address during the scheduled stay of the interviewing team in their locality.

Table 24: Percentage distribution of service providers/referrers by status of interview

| Interview status | Categories of service providers/referrers | | |
|------------------|---|--------------|-----------|
| | Physicians | Clinic staff | Referrers |
| Interviewed | 75.0 | 88.7 | 79.5 |
| Not interviewed | 25.0 | 11.3 | 20.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 148 | 159 | 356 |

2.2.2. Payment verification:

Payments to service providers: All the interviewed service providers (physicians and clinic staff) reported during the interview that they had received the approved amount for the services rendered to the sterilized clients except two clinic staff for two selected vasectomy clients.

Payments to referrers: Table 25 shows the distribution of the number of clients whose referrers were interviewed, by status of receipt of referral fees. It can be seen from the table that the referrers reported receiving the approved amount of referral fees for 96.7 percent tubectomy clients and 97.0 percent vasectomy clients. The referrers reported not to have received the referral fees for the remaining 3.3 percent tubectomy clients and 3.0 percent vasectomy clients.

Table 25: Distribution of clients whose referrers were interviewed by status of receipt of referral fee

| Status of receipt of referral fee reported by referrers | Number of clients whose referrers were interviewed | | |
|---|--|-----------|-------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy | All |
| Received | 96.7 | 97.0 | 96.8 |
| Did not receive | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 209 | 132 | 341 |

2.3. Results of the sub-sample of outside upazila cases:

The sub-sample of outside cases consisted of 288 reportedly sterilized clients (weighted figure) selected from eight sample spots. The instruments and techniques of client interview were exactly the same with those applied for within cases. The findings obtained from this survey of the sub-sample were entirely independent of the main survey findings of the evaluation.

2.3.1. Locating the outside clients:

The members of the interviewing team tried to locate each and every selected outside upazila client at his/her recorded address. The results of this effort were found to vary. Of the tubectomy clients, 90.3 percent could be located and the remaining clients could not be contacted. The reasons were categorised and presented with the proportion under each category in Table 26. In case of vasectomy, the proportion of located clients was 76.5 percent. The rest could not be located and they were categorised by reasons of not locating (Table 26).

Table 26: Percentage distribution of outside clients by status of locating the clients

| Status of locating the clients | Categories of clients | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|-------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy | All |
| Client located | 90.3 | 76.5 | 79.5 |
| Client has permanently left the address | 3.2 | 4.0 | 3.8 |
| Client was only temporarily visiting the address | 4.9 | 6.2 | 5.9 |
| Address not found ¹ | - | 3.5 | 2.8 |
| Incomplete address | - | 5.3 | 4.2 |
| Not attempted | 1.6 | 4.4 | 3.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 99.9 ^a | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 62 | 226 | 288 |

¹ 'Address not found' includes both those clients who never lived at the address indicated and clients whose listed addresses did not exist.

^a Percentage total is less than 100 percent due to rounding error.

2.3.2. Interview of outside clients:

Table 27 shows the percentage distribution of outside clients located by status of interview i.e. by categories 'Interviewed' and 'Not interviewed'. Interviewed means that those clients selected and located were successfully interviewed. Not interviewed clients were located but could not be interviewed successfully by the team members during their scheduled stay in the areas. The reasons for not interviewing the clients were that they were temporarily not available or they had no time to go through the interview, refusal and the like. As most of the spots of this sub-sample were more or less in the urban areas, the clients in those areas did not have fixed addresses. As a result 'Not interviewed' group constituted a high percentage, particularly for vasectomy (26.0 percent). However, overall, 79.0 percent of the total outside sterilized clients could be interviewed successfully.

Table 27: Percentage distribution of located outside clients by status of interviews

| Interview status | Categories of clients | | |
|------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy | All |
| Interviewed | 94.6 | 74.0 | 79.0 |
| Not interviewed | 5.4 | 26.0 | 21.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 56 | 173 | 229 |

2.3.3. Reported clinic and time of operation:

To ascertain an actual case of sterilization the reported clinic and the time of operation are two important determinants. If the reported clinic was found to be other than that recorded or the reported time did not fall within the reference quarter the case could not be an actual case of sterilization as recorded. Keeping this in mind a cross table has been prepared (Table 28). The table shows that only 78.1 percent of the interviewed vasectomy clients were reportedly actual cases. Of the remaining clients, some reported

Table 28: Percentage distribution of interviewed outside clients by status reported date of operation and status of reported clinic

| Status of reported date of operation | Tubectomy | | | | | Vasectomy | | | | | All | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------|
| | Within quarter | Before quarter | Within quarter and before quarter | Never sterilized | All | Within quarter | Before quarter | Within quarter and before quarter | Never sterilized | All | Within quarter | Before quarter | Within quarter and before quarter | Never sterilized | All |
| Status of reported clinic | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sterilized in recorded clinic | 98.1 | 1.9 | - | - | 100.0 | 78.1 | 5.5 | - | - | 83.6 | 86.3 | 2.1 | - | - | 88.4 |
| Sterilized in other than recorded clinic | - | - | - | - | - | 3.1 | 4.7 | - | - | 7.8 | - | 5.9 | - | - | 5.9 |
| Sterilized twice | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1.6 | - | 1.6 | - | - | 0.9 | - | 0.9 |
| Never sterilized | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7.0 | 7.0 | - | - | - | 4.8 | 4.8 |
| Total | 98.1 | 1.9 | - | - | 100.0 | 81.2 | 10.2 | 1.6 | 7.0 | 100.0 | 86.3 | 8.0 | 0.9 | 4.8 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | | | | | 53 | | | | | 128 | | | | | 181 |

that they had their operation in other than the recorded clinic and/or before the reference quarter. The proportion of actual cases of tubectomy clients was 98.1 percent.

2.3.4. Signing of informed consent form by outside clients:

Table 29 shows the percentage distribution of actually sterilized clients by status of informed consent forms kept for them by clinics. About 92.0 percent of the vasectomy and 85.6 percent of the tubectomy clients were found to have consent forms which were USAID approved. However, a few of the approved consent forms were not signed by the clients (Table 29). Overall, for about 10 percent of the total clients not USAID-approved forms were used.

2.3.5. Receiving of surgical apparel:

All of the tubectomy clients who were found to be actually sterilized, reported that they had received their surgical apparel. But among the corresponding vasectomy clients about 5 percent client mentioned not receiving their surgical apparel. This finding has been shown in Table 30.

2.3.6. Amount received:

The percentage distribution of clients by amount reportedly received by them for sterilization is shown in two separate tables (Table 31 and Table 32). The first table is for tubectomy clients while the second is for vasectomy clients. According to the table, 86.5 percent of the tubectomy clients and 92.3 percent of the vasectomy clients received the approved amount of Tk.175/- each. Others reported receiving different amounts. Thus the average amount received by tubectomy clients was Tk.171.3 and by vasectomy clients was Tk.171.8. However, some of the clients reported that they enjoyed some other facilities, such as food, transport or both, as the reason of less payment. If those clients were considered that they received the approved amount the average amount increases to Tk.173.7 for tubectomy and to Tk.172.8 for vasectomy clients.

Table 29: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized outside clients by types of informed consent forms and status of signing

| Status of informed consent form | Categories of clients | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy | All |
| <u>USAID-approved</u> | | | |
| Signed by clients | 82.6 | 90.8 | 88.0 |
| Not signed by clients | 3.0 | 1.6 | 2.1 |
| <u>Not USAID-approved</u> | | | |
| Signed by clients | 14.4 | 7.6 | 9.9 |
| Not signed by clients | - | - | - |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 52 | 100 | 152 |

Table 30: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized outside clients by status of receipt of surgical apparel

| Status of receipt of surgical apparel | Categories of clients | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy | All |
| Received | 100.0 | 95.0 | 96.7 |
| Did not receive | - | 5.0 | 3.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weighted N | 52 | 100 | 152 |

Table 31: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized outside tubectomy clients by amount reportedly received

| Amount reportedly received in Taka | All | Status of facilities received | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| | | Received any facility | Received no facility |
| 175.0 | 86.5 | NA | NA |
| 163.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | - |
| 160.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | - |
| 150.0 | 7.7 | 7.7 | - |
| 108.0 | 1.9 | - | 1.9 |
| Total | 99.9 ^a | 11.5 | 1.9 |
| Weighted N = 52 | | | |

Reported average amount: Tk. 171.3

Estimated average amount considering the 'received any facility' category received the approved amount: Tk.173.7.

Note: NA in this table stands for not applicable cases.

Table 32: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized outside vasectomy clients by amount reportedly received

| Amount reportedly received in Taka | All | Status of facilities received | |
|------------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| | | Received any facility | Received no facility |
| 175.0 | 92.3 | NA | NA |
| 170.0 | 0.7 | - | 0.7 |
| 155.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | - |
| 150.00 | 1.6 | - | 1.6 |
| 125.0 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| 112.0 | 1.5 | - | 1.5 |
| 100.0 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 0.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 2.6 | 5.2 |
| Weighted N = 100 | | | |

Reported average amount: Tk.171.8

Estimated average amount considering the 'received any facility' category received the approved amount: Tk.172.8

Note: NA in this table stands for not applicable cases.

2. 3.7. Verification of referrers:

To ascertain whether the recorded referrers for outside cases had actually referred those cases or not, a verification of both the recorded and the reported referrers has been done. The verification has been accomplished in tabular forms for tubectomy and vasectomy clients separately. Table 33 shows that for 80.0 percent of the tubectomy clients both the recorded and the reported referrers were the same. NGO FP workers constituted majority of those referrers. The fact, however, was supported by both the sources.

On the other hand, 63 percent of vasectomy clients reported that they were referred by the recorded referrers. Of the vasectomy clients 66.3 percent reported the name of members of general public as their referrers. (Table 34).

Table 33: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized outside tubectomy clients by recorded and reported referrers

| Recorded referrer | Reported referrer | | | | | | | | All |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------|---|-------|
| | BDG FP fieldworker | NGO FP fieldworker | Registered Dai | Registered Agent | General public | Does not know | Not stated | | |
| BDG FP fieldworker | 6.9 | - | - | 0.8 | - | - | - | - | 7.7 |
| NGO FP fieldworker | - | 44.1 | - | - | 3.7 | 1.2 | - | - | 49.0 |
| Registered Dai | - | - | 5.8 | - | 2.9 | - | - | - | 8.7 |
| Registered Agent | - | 2.6 | - | 13.2 | 3.0 | - | - | - | 18.8 |
| General public | - | - | 2.9 | - | 10.0 | - | - | - | 12.9 |
| Not stated | - | - | - | - | 2.9 | - | - | - | 2.9 |
| Total | 6.9 | 46.7 | 8.7 | 14.0 | 22.5 | 1.2 | - | - | 100.0 |
| Weighted N = 52 | | | | | | | | | |

Table 34: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized outside vasectomy clients by recorded and reported referrers

| Recorded referrer | Reported referrer | | | | | | | | | | All |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------|---------------|------------|-------|-----|
| | BDG FP fieldworker | NGO FP fieldworker | FP fieldworker (not ascertained whether BDG or NGO) | Registered Dai | Registered Agent | General public | Went alone | Does not know | Not stated | | |
| BDG FP fieldworker | 2.8 | - | - | - | 0.9 | 2.9 | - | - | 0.6 | 7.2 | |
| NGO FP fieldworker | - | 10.0 | - | - | - | 3.9 | 2.3 | - | 2.5 | 18.7 | |
| FP fieldworker (not ascertained whether BDG or NGO) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Registered Dai | 0.6 | - | - | - | 0.9 | 1.6 | 0.4 | - | - | 3.5 | |
| Registered Agent | - | - | - | - | 5.0 | 12.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | - | 19.1 | |
| General public | - | - | 1.6 | - | - | 45.2 | 1.6 | 3.1 | - | 51.5 | |
| Not stated | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Total Weighted N = 100 | 3.4 | 10.0 | 1.6 | - | 6.8 | 66.3 | 5.0 | 3.8 | 3.1 | 100.0 | |

2.3 .8. Socio-demographic characteristics of outside clients:

Similar to the within upazila cases some limited information on the clients' socio-demographic characteristics were collected during the field survey of the outside upazila cases. It is not considered expedient to give detailed tables for all those information rather a single table (Table 35) containing summary of those is presented.

Table 35: Some socio-demographic characteristics of
the outside upazila clients

| Selected characteristics | Categories of clients | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy |
| 1. Mean age in years | 29.2 | 45.1 |
| 2. Proportion of clients at least 50 years old | 0.0% | 26.0% |
| 3. Mean number of living children | 3.9 | 4.0 |
| 4. Proportion of clients having less than 2 children | 0.0% | 4.0% |
| 5. Proportion of clients who never attended any school | 85.1% | 52.3% |
| 6. Proportion of clients having any cultivable land of their own family | 37.8% | 40.2% |
| 7. Proportion of Muslim clients | 95.1% | 77.9% |
| Weighted N | 52 | 100 |

Note: N in this table is the number of actually sterilized clients found after personal interview.

Chapter 3

REPORTING VARIATION

One of the most important tasks of the evaluation of the VS program is to ascertain whether the BDG and the NGO performance data are correctly reflected in the MIS-reported performance. To accomplish this task, data were collected from different reporting tiers. The reporting tiers are: clinics, upazilas, districts, NGOs, and the MIS Unit of the Directorate of Population Control. In the subsequent section, these are discussed under five broad headings: (i) clinic performance data, (ii) upazila performance data, (iii) NGO performance data, (iv) district performance data, and (v) MIS performance data.

3.1. Clinic performance data:

The clinic performance data refer only to BDG performance data recorded in the clinic register. These data were collected by the Team Leader from each sample upazila. These BDG performance data are hereinafter referred to as 'verified BDG performance data'.

3.2. Upazila performance data:

A copy of the monthly sterilization performance report, broken down by BDG and NGO, sent by the Upazila Family Planning Office to the district was collected from each of the selected upazilas. The copy of the report was certified as authentic by the FP Officer of the upazila.

3.3. NGO performance data:

The NGO performance data were collected directly from the NGO offices of the selected upazilas where clinic based NGOs were functioning.

3.4. District performance data:

A copy of the monthly sterilization performance report, broken down by BDG and NGO, filed by the district to the MIS was collected from the

district headquarters. In the subsequent discussions these data are called districts reported performance.

3.5. MIS performance data:

USAID reimburses the Bangladesh Government for selected costs of the VS program on the basis of the performance statistics contained in the MIS Monthly Performance Report (MMPR). The 'MIS reported performance' from the MIS Monthly Computer Printout (MMCP) was used for upazila-wise comparison of the performance data collected from different reporting tiers because the MMPR does not show performance statistics by upazilas and does not separate BDG and NGO performances in the main body of the report. However, NGO performance data (for major NGOs only) by organizations are shown in an annex of the MMPR. But the NGO data in the annex are not given by upazilas and districts. On the other hand, the MMCP contains BDG performance by districts. Because of this, evaluation of the MIS data had to be done by using the MIS computer printout (MMCP).

Table 36 compares the total performances reported in the MMCP for the 1985 January-March quarter with those obtained from the MMPR for the same period. It can be seen from the table that there were some differences between these two data sources with respect to the total sterilization performance, although the ratio of the total sterilization performance of all types of sterilization in the MMPR to that shown in the MMCP was almost close to unity, being 0.99. The ratio remained at 0.99 even when it was computed separately for tubectomy and vasectomy. Therefore, the use of the MMCP rather than the MMPR in the evaluation of MIS reported total national performance for the reporting quarter seems justified as the ratio of these two sources of data remained at 0.99.

Table 36: Comparison of total national performance between the MMCP (MIS Monthly Computer Printout) and the MMPR (MIS Monthly Performance Report) for the quarter January-March, 1985

| MIS reports | Categories of clients | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy | All |
| MMCP | 48,360 | 43,513 | 91,873 |
| MMPR | 47,770 | 43,051 | 90,821 |
| MMPR/MMCP | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |

3.6. Comparison among the verified BDG performance data, upazila data, district data, and MIS data:

Differences among the 'verified BDG performance data', upazila data, district data, and MIS data were examined in several ways. Table 37 and Table 38 highlight discrepancies among data from the MMCP, data collected from the UFPO, data collected from the DFPO and those collected by the interviewing team in course of interviews with the clients. Column-2 of the tables contains the 'verified BDG performance data' collected from the BDG clinics of the selected upazilas. The upazila reported BDG performance data and the district reported BDG performance data are shown in column-3 and column-4 respectively. The MIS reported BDG performance in the MMCP is shown in column-5. The differences between verified data and upazila reported data, between verified data and district reported data, and between verified data and MIS reported data are shown in column-6, column-7, and column-8 respectively. The findings of these tables are summarised in Table 39 which shows the levels of overall reporting discrepancy.

Table 39 clearly shows that there are differences among the verified BDG performance data, upazila reported data, district reported data, and MIS reported data in the MMCP. In the case of tubectomy, the

MIS reported data in the MMCP were 13.8 percent higher than the verified BDG performance data. In the case of vasectomy, the MIS reported data in the MMCP were 7.0 percent higher than the verified BDG performance data.

It is clearly seen that MIS monthly data in the MMCP do not give an accurate figure of the BDG performance for the reporting quarter. According to Table 39, overall, BDG performance data in the MIS computer printout were overreported for both tubectomy and vasectomy. The reason for the overreporting can be analysed with the help of Table 37 and Table 38. The tables show that for most of the upazilas there was no discrepancy among the different data sets. Only in the case of some upazilas, such as Mymensingh Sadar, there were big differences. The differences were due to the inclusion of NGO performance data and/or inclusion of cases done in other upazilas in course of reporting. This had been done by some of the upazilas and also by some districts, namely, Pabna, Khulna, Dhaka, Manikgonj and Chittagong Hill Tracts. The reports collected from those districts lend evidence to this statement.

Therefore, this report makes an attempt below to derive an estimate of the ratio of verified BDG performance data to MIS data, and then apply it to calculate the actual BDG performance of the reporting quarter (January-March, 1985).

Table 37: Comparison among actual BDG TUBECTOMY performance collected from the clinic register, the upazila reported performance, the district reported performance, and MIS reported performance in the MMCP (MIS Monthly Computer Printout) by sample upazilas¹

| Upazilas | Verified BDG performance data collected from the clinic register | Upazila reported BDG performance | District reported BDG performance | MIS reported BDG performance in the MMCP | Discrepancy between verified BDG performance and | | |
|--------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | upazila reported data | district reported data | MIS data |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | 6=(3)-(2) | 7=(4)-(2) | (8)=(5)-(2) |
| <u>Dinajpur</u> | | | | | | | |
| Khansama* | 139 | 139 | 126 | 126 | 0 | -13 | -13 |
| Nawabgonj* | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sadar* | 131 | 131 | 131 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Thakurgaon</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | 27 | 27 | 25 | 25 | 0 | - 2 | - 2 |
| <u>Panchgarh</u> | | | | | | | |
| Atwari* | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Nilphamari</u> | | | | | | | |
| Saidpur* | 69 | 71 | 56 | 56 | + 2 | -13 | -13 |
| <u>Rangpur</u> | | | | | | | |
| Badargonj* | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sadar* | 49 | 29 | 13 | 13 | -20 | -36 | -36 |
| <u>Gaibandha</u> | | | | | | | |
| Fulchari* | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Lalmonirhat</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | 269 | 269 | 269 | 269 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(Tubectomy)

| Upazilas | Verified BDG performance data collected from the clinic register | Upazila reported BDG performance | District reported BDG performance | MIS reported BDG performance in the MMCP | Discrepancy between verified BDG performance and | | |
|------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | upazila reported data | district reported data | MIS data |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6)=(3)-(2) | (7)=(4)-(2) | (8)=(5)-(2) |
| <u>Bogra</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sherpur* | 117 | 117 | 117 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Joypurhat</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | 39 | 38 | 38 | 38 | - 1 | - 1 | - 1 |
| <u>Naogaon</u> | | | | | | | |
| Manda* | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Natore</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | 143 | 143 | 143 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Rajshahi</u> | | | | | | | |
| Bagmara* | 122 | 122 | 122 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Pabna</u> | | | | | | | |
| Atghoria* | 5 | 39 | 39 | 39 | +34 | +34 | +34 |
| Sadar | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Serajgonj</u> | | | | | | | |
| Ullahpara* | 210 | 210 | 210 | 210 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Magura</u> | | | | | | | |
| Mohammadpur | 30 | 30 | 19 | 19 | 0 | -11 | -11 |

(Tubectomy)

| Upazilas | Verified BDG performance data collected from the clinic register | Upazila reported BDG performance | District reported BDG performance | MIS reported BDG performance in the MMCP | Discrepancy between verified BDG performance and | | |
|-------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | upazila reported data | district reported data | MIS data |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6)=(3)-(2) | (7)=(4)-(2) | (8)=(5)-(2) |
| <u>Khulna</u> | | | | | | | |
| Dumuria | 1 | 1 | 102 | 102 | 0 | +101 | +101 |
| Koyra | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sadar | 17 | 68 | 93 | 93 | -9 | +16 | +16 |
| <u>Narail</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sadar | 110 | 110 | 110 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Bagerhat</u> | | | | | | | |
| Kachua | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 0 | +1 | +1 |
| <u>Satkhira</u> | | | | | | | |
| Tala | 73 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Barguna</u> | | | | | | | |
| Amtoli | 204 | 204 | 204 | 204 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Patuakhali</u> | | | | | | | |
| Golachipa | 73 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sadar* | 75 | 75 | 74 | 65 | 0 | -1 | -10 |
| <u>Barisal</u> | | | | | | | |
| Bakergonj | 109 | 111 | 111 | 111 | +2 | +2 | +2 |
| Sadar* | 126 | 126 | 126 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Jhalakhati</u> | | | | | | | |
| Kathalia | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(Tubectomy)

| Upazilas | Verified BDG performance data collected from the clinic register | Upazila reported BDG performance | District reported BDG performance | MIS reported BDG performance in the MMCP | Discrepancy between verified BDG performance and | | |
|------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | upazila reported data | district reported data | MIS data |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6)=(3)-(2) | (7)=(4)-(2) | (8)=(5)-(2) |
| <u>Pirojpur</u> | | | | | | | |
| Nazirpur | 51 | 51 | 51 | 51 | | | |
| Sadar | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Gopalganj</u> | | | | | | | |
| Kotalipara | 182 | 193 | 191 | 191 | +11 | + 9 | + 9 |
| <u>Sariatpur</u> | | | | | | | |
| Naria | 81 | 81 | 81 | 45 | 0 | 0 | -36 |
| <u>Dhaka</u> | | | | | | | |
| Dhamrai | 204 | 204 | 274 | 274 | 0 | +70 | +70 |
| <u>Gazipur</u> | | | | | | | |
| Kaligonj | 62 | 62 | 156 | 156 | 0 | +94 | +94 |
| Kaliakoir | 310 | 310 | 305 | 305 | 0 | - 5 | - 5 |
| <u>Narsingdi</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sadar | 162 | 151 | 151 | 103 | -11 | -11 | -59 |
| <u>Manikgonj</u> | | | | | | | |
| Singair | 158 | 219 | 182 | 182 | +61 | +24 | +24 |
| <u>Tangail</u> | | | | | | | |
| Gopalpur | 183 | 183 | 166 | 166 | 0 | -17 | -17 |

(Tubectomy)

| Upazilas | Verified BDG performance data collected from the clinic register | Upazila reported BDG performance | District reported BDG performance | MIS reported BDG performance in the MMCP | Discrepancy between verified BDG performance and | | |
|--------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | upazila reported data | district reported data | MIS data |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6)=(3)-(2) | (7)=(4)-(2) | (8)=(5)-(2) |
| <u>Mymensingh</u> | | | | | | | |
| Nandail* | 74 | 74 | 83 | 83 | 0 | +9 | +9 |
| Sadar | 103 | 103 | 553 | 553 | 0 | +450 | +450 |
| <u>Kishoregonj</u> | | | | | | | |
| Tarail* | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Hobigonj</u> | | | | | | | |
| Azmirigonj | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Comilla</u> | | | | | | | |
| Barura | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Sylhet</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sadar | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Noakhali</u> | | | | | | | |
| Senbag | 38 | 38 | 38 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Chittagong</u> | | | | | | | |
| Banshkhali | 114 | 114 | 114 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(Tubectomy)

| Upazilas | Verified BDG performance data collected from the clinic register | Upazila reported BDG performance | District reported BDG performance | MIS reported BDG performance in the MMCP | Discrepancy between verified BDG performance and | | |
|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | upazila reported data | district reported data | MIS data |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6)=(3)-(2) | (7)=(4)-(2) | (8)=(5)-(2) |
| <u>Chittagong Hill Tracts</u> | | | | | | | |
| Chandroghona | 17 | 17 | 43 | 43 | 0 | +26 | +26 |
| Total | 4589 | 4658 | 5315 | 5222 | | | |
| Total cases overreported | | | | | +110 | +836 | +836 |
| Total cases underreported | | | | | - 41 | -110 | -203 |
| Balance | | | | | + 69 | +726 | +633 |

¹Upazila marked by asterisk shows two months' performance and those without asterisk shows three months' performance.

Table 38: Comparison among actual BDG VASECTOMY performance collected from the clinic register, the upazila reported performance, the district reported performance, and MIS reported performance in the MMCP (MIS Monthly Computer Printout) by sample upazilas¹

| Upazilas | Verified BDG performance data collected from the clinic register | Upazila reported BDG performance | District reported BDG performance | MIS reported BDG performance in the MMCP | Discrepancy between verified BDG performance and | | |
|--------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | upazila reported data | district reported data | MIS data |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | 6=(3)-(2) | 7=(4)-(2) | (8)=(5)-(2) |
| <u>Dinajpur</u> | | | | | | | |
| Khansama* | 119 | 119 | 306 | 306 | 0 | +187 | +187 |
| Nawabgonj* | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sadar* | 531 | 532 | 519 | 639 | + 1 | -12 | +108 |
| <u>Thakurgaon</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | 1103 | 1103 | 1103 | 1103 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Panchgarh</u> | | | | | | | |
| Atwari* | 162 | 162 | 162 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Nilphamari</u> | | | | | | | |
| Saidpur* | 58 | 60 | 56 | 56 | + 2 | - 2 | - 2 |
| <u>Rangpur</u> | | | | | | | |
| Badargonj* | 77 | 77 | 77 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sadar* | 224 | 245 | 224 | 224 | +21 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Gaibandha</u> | | | | | | | |
| Fulchari* | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Lalmonirhat</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(Vasectomy)

| Upazilas | Verified BDG performance data collected from the clinic register | Upazila reported BDG performance | District reported BDG performance | MIS reported BDG performance in the MMCP | Discrepancy between verified BDG performance and | | |
|------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | upazila reported data | district reported data | MIS data |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6)=(3)-(2) | (7)=(4)-(2) | (8)=(5)-(2) |
| <u>Bogra</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sherpur* | 186 | 186 | 186 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Joypurhat</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | 28 | 27 | 27 | 27 | - 1 | - 1 | - 1 |
| <u>Naogaon</u> | | | | | | | |
| Manda* | 4 | 9 | 9 | 9 | + 5 | + 5 | + 5 |
| <u>Natore</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Rajshahi</u> | | | | | | | |
| Bagmara* | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Pabna</u> | | | | | | | |
| Atghoria* | 3 | 50 | 50 | 50 | +47 | +47 | +47 |
| Sadar | 137 | 137 | 137 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Serajgonj</u> | | | | | | | |
| Ullahpara* | 143 | 143 | 180 | 180 | 0 | +37 | +37 |
| <u>Magura</u> | | | | | | | |
| Mohammadpur | 9 | 9 | 20 | 20 | 0 | +11 | +11 |

(Vasectomy)

| Upazilas | Verified BDG performance data collected from the clinic register | Upazila reported BDG performance | District reported BDG performance | MIS reported BDG performance in the MMCP | Discrepancy between verified BDG performance and | | |
|-------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | upazila reported data | district reported data | MIS data |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6)=(3)-(2) | (7)=(4)-(2) | (8)=(5)-(2) |
| <u>Khulna</u> | | | | | | | |
| Dumuria | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 0 | + 3 | + 3 |
| Koyra | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sadar | 407 | 179 | 457 | 457 | -228 | +50 | +50 |
| <u>Narail</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sadar | 92 | 89 | 89 | 89 | - 3 | - 3 | - 3 |
| <u>Bagerhat</u> | | | | | | | |
| Kachua | 166 | 166 | 172 | 172 | 0 | + 6 | + 6 |
| <u>Satkhira</u> | | | | | | | |
| Tala | 15 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 0 | + 1 | + 1 |
| <u>Barguna</u> | | | | | | | |
| Amtoli | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Patuakhali</u> | | | | | | | |
| Galachipa | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sadar* | 119 | 119 | 119 | 119 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Barisal</u> | | | | | | | |
| Bakergonj | 222 | 220 | 220 | 220 | - 2 | - 2 | - 2 |
| Sadar* | 105 | 105 | 105 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Jhalakhati</u> | | | | | | | |
| Kathalia | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(Vasectomy)

| Upazilas | Verified BDG performance data collected from the clinic register | Upazila reported BDG performance | District reported BDG performance | MIS reported BDG performance in the MMCP | Discrepancy between verified BDG performance and | | |
|------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | upazila reported data | district reported data | MIS data |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6)=(3)-(2) | (7)=(4)-(2) | (8)=(5)-(2) |
| <u>Pirojpur</u> | | | | | | | |
| Nazirpur Sadar | 11 256 | 11 256 | 11 256 | 11 256 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 |
| <u>Gopalganj</u> | | | | | | | |
| Kotalipara | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Sariatpur</u> | | | | | | | |
| Naria | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Dhaka</u> | | | | | | | |
| Dhamrai | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | + 3 | + 3 |
| <u>Gazipur</u> | | | | | | | |
| Kaligonj | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | + 1 | + 1 |
| Kaliakoir | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | + 2 | + 2 |
| <u>Narsingdi</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sadar | 134 | 145 | 145 | 67 | +11 | +11 | -67 |
| <u>Manikgonj</u> | | | | | | | |
| Singair | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | + 2 | + 1 | + 1 |
| <u>Tangail</u> | | | | | | | |
| Gopalpur | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(Vasectomy)

| Upazilas | Verified BDG performance data collected from the clinic register | Upazila reported BDG performance | District reported BDG performance | MIS reported BDG performance in the MMCP | Discrepancy between verified BDG performance and | | |
|--------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | upazila reported data | district reported data | MIS data |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6)=(3)-(2) | (7)=(4)-(2) | (8)=(5)-(2) |
| <u>Mymensingh</u> | | | | | | | |
| Nandail* | 14 | 14 | 19 | 19 | 0 | + 5 | + 5 |
| Sadar | 727 | 727 | 735 | 735 | 0 | + 8 | + 8 |
| <u>Kishoregonj</u> | | | | | | | |
| Tarail* | 110 | 110 | 110 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Hobigonj</u> | | | | | | | |
| Azmirigonj | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Comilla</u> | | | | | | | |
| Barura | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Sylhet</u> | | | | | | | |
| Sadar | 58 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Noakhali</u> | | | | | | | |
| Senbag | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Chittagong</u> | | | | | | | |
| Banshkhali | 119 | 119 | 119 | 119 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(Vasectomy)

| Upazilas | Verified BDG performance data collected from the clinic register | Upazila reported BDG performance | District reported BDG performance | MIS reported BDG performance in the MMCP | Discrepancy between verified BDG performance and | | |
|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | upazila reported data | district reported data | MIS data |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6)=(3)-(2) | (7)=(4)-(2) | (8)=(5)-(2) |
| <u>Chittagong Hill Tracts</u> | | | | | | | |
| Chandroghona | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 5709 | 5564 | 6067 | 6109 | | | |
| Total cases overreported | | | | | + 89 | +378 | +475 |
| Total cases underreported | | | | | -234 | - 20 | - 75 |
| Balance | | | | | +145 | +358 | +400 |

¹Upazila marked by asterisk shows two months' performance and those without asterisk shows three months' performance.

Table 39: Summary of reporting differences of BDG performance among verified BDG performance data, upazila reported data, district reported data, and MIS reported data in the MMCP for the 1985 January-March quarter¹

| Reporting differences | Categories of clients | |
|---|-----------------------|---------------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy |
| Verified BDG performance data for the selected upazilas - i.e., collected at the upazilas | 4,589 | 5,709 |
| Performance for the selected upazilas according to the MMCP | 5,222 | 6,109 |
| Difference between verified BDG performance data and upazila reported data (net of underreporting and overreporting) ² | +69 (1.5) | +145 (2.5) |
| Difference between verified BDG performance data and district reported data (net of underreporting and overreporting) ³ | +726 (15.8) | +358 (6.3) |
| Difference between verified BDG performance data and MIS reported data in the MMCP (net of underreporting and overreporting) ⁴ | +633 (13.8) | +400 (7.0) |

¹ Figures in the brackets are the percentage of the verified BDG performance data.

² From balance, column 6 in Tables 37 and 38.

³ From balance, column 7 in Tables 37 and 38.

⁴ From balance, column 8 in Tables 37 and 38.

3.7. Estimates of BDG component ratios of verified BDG performance data and MIS data:

Estimates of BDG component ratio have been computed by using the formula described below:

$$p = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n m_i} \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

where a_i = the verified BDG performance data in the i th sample upazilas

m_i = the MIS data from the MMCP for the sample upazila

P = the estimate of the BDG component ratio of verified BDG performance data and MIS data

n = the number of sample upazilas = 50

The variance $V(P)$ of the estimate has been derived by using the equation:

$$V(P) = \frac{(N-n)}{Nn(n-1)} \frac{1}{M^2} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 + p^2 \sum_{i=1}^n m_i^2 - 2P \sum_{i=1}^n a_i m_i \right] \dots (2)$$

where N = total number of program upazilas¹ = 497

\bar{M} = the average performance per program upazila according to the MMCP

The results of the computation are displayed in Table 40. As can be seen from the table, the ratio of the verified BDG performance data to MMCP data for the BDG component was 87.9 per 100 MIS reported tubectomy cases while for vasectomy, it was 93.5. The standard errors of the estimate as found by using formula (2) are 0.107 and 0.070 respectively.

Table 40: Estimates of BDG component ratios of the verified BDG performance data and MIS data in the MMCP

| Estimates | Categories of clients | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy |
| Ratio ² | 87.9 | 93.5 |
| Standard errors | 0.107 | 0.070 |

¹Program upazilas were those that were listed in the MMCP during the quarter, October-December, 1984.

²Verified BDG performance data/BDG data in the MMCP

3.8. Reported and estimated national, BDG, and NGO performance:

Table 41 shows, by tubectomy and vasectomy for the reporting quarter (January-March, 1985), the reported and estimated sterilization performances for the national, the BDG, and the NGO program separately, as derived from the MMCP, the MMPR, and the verified BDG performance data. The performance of the national program (or the national performance) includes both the BDG and NGO sterilization performances. The BDG performance is the total sterilization performances done by the Government clinics while the NGO performance is the sterilization performance done by all the non-government organizations engaged in family planning activities.

It can be seen from line 10 of Table 41 that the estimated actual BDG performance during the reporting quarter was 33,421 cases of tubectomy and 27,972 cases of vasectomy. The estimated actual BDG performance was computed by applying the estimated BDG component ratio of the verified BDG performance data and the MIS data to the total of BDG performance shown in the MMCP. The estimated actual performance indicates overreporting in the MMCP (line 5) of BDG performances for the reporting quarter (January-March, 1985) by 4,601 cases of tubectomy and 1,945 cases of vasectomy.

The other programs' (all NGOs) performance for the reporting quarter, as indicated in the MMCP, was 10,338 cases of tubectomy and 13,596 cases of vasectomy (line 6, Table 41). The performance of major NGOs alone during the reporting quarter as obtained from the annex of the MMPR was 7,538 cases of tubectomy and 10,270 cases of vasectomy. BAVS (Bangladesh Association for Voluntary Sterilization), FPAB (Family Planning Association of Bangladesh), CHCP (Community Health Care Project), MFC (Mohammadpur Fertility Clinic), MSC (Metropolitan Satellite Clinic), and the Pathfinder Fund Projects are the major sterilization performing NGOs. Their total performances, found from the annex of the MMPR for the reporting quarter

is shown in the second line of Table 41. As can be seen from Table 41, there were differences between the performance of other programs (all NGOs) as shown in the MMCP and the performance of major NGOs (derived from the attachment of the MMPR). For tubectomy, the difference was 2,800 cases (10,338-7,538) and for vasectomy the difference was 3,326 cases (13,596-10,270). As such, the differences of 2,800 cases of tubectomy and 3,326 cases of vasectomy were considered to be the performances of the local clinic based NGOs which were not taken into consideration while calculating the performances of NGOs from the annex of the MMPR as these were not reflected in the annex of the MMPR.

The thirteenth line of Table 41 shows the basis for adjustment of MMPR to obtain the actual NGO performance. The ratio confirms that 37.1 percent of tubectomy and 32.4 percent of vasectomy cases were not reflected in the MMPR.

Differences also exist between the BDG performance found by subtracting the performance of major NGOs from the national performance of MMPR (line 3) and the MMCP (line 5). In the case of tubectomy the difference was for 2,210 cases (40,232-38,022) and in the case of vasectomy, the difference was for 2,864 cases (32,781-29,917).

The estimated proportion of actual BDG performance was calculated to find out the extent of overreporting or underreporting of the estimated BDG performance in the MMPR (line 3). The twelfth line of Table 41 shows the proportion of actual BDG performance. The proportion confirms that there was overstating of the total BDG performance in the MMPR, and the extent of overreporting was 16.9 percent for tubectomy and 14.7 percent for vasectomy.

On the other hand, estimated actual national (BDG+NGO) performance (line 11) was also calculated to find out the extent of overreporting or underreporting in the national level. While calculating the

Table 41: Reported, estimated national, BDG, NGO performances as derived from different sources

| Performances | Categories of clients | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------|
| | Tubectomy | Vasectomy |
| 1. National performances as reported by MMPR = Z_1 | 47,770 | 43,051 |
| 2. Performance of major NGOs in the MMPR (from annex) = Z_2 | 7,538 | 10,270 |
| 3. Estimate of BDG performance in the MMPR = $Z_3 = Z_1 - Z_2$ | 40,232 | 32,781 |
| 4. National performance in the MMCP = Z_4 | 48,360 | 43,513 |
| 5. BDG performance in the MMCP = Z_5 | 38,022 | 29,917 |
| 6. Other programs (all NGOs) performances in the MMCP = Z_6 | 10,338 | 13,596 |
| 7. Verified BDG performance collected at the selected upazilas = Z_7 | 4,589 | 5,709 |
| 8. BDG performance for the selected upazilas according to MMCP = Z_8 | 5,222 | 6,109 |
| 9. Estimated BDG component ratio based on verified BDG clinic performance data and MIS data in the MMCP = $Z_9 = Z_7 / Z_8$ | 0.879 | 0.935 |
| 10. Estimated actual BDG performance based on estimated BDG component ratio = $Z_{10} = Z_5 \times Z_9$ | 33,421 | 27,972 |
| 11. Estimated actual national performance = $Z_{11} = Z_6 + Z_{10}$ | 43,759 | 41,568 |
| 12. Proportion of actual BDG performance in the MMPR = $Z_{12} = Z_{10} / Z_3$ | 0.831 | 0.853 |
| 13. Basis for adjustment of MMPR to obtain actual NGO performance = $Z_{13} = Z_6 / Z_2$ | 1.371 | 1.324 |
| 14. Basis for adjustment of MMPR to obtain actual national performance = $Z_{14} = Z_{11} / Z_1$ | 0.916 | 0.966 |
| ----- | | |
| 15. Overreporting (+)/underreporting (-) of performance in the MMPR: | | |
| i. BDG performance ($1 - Z_{12}$) | + 0.169 | + 0.147 |
| ii. NGO performance ($1 - Z_{13}$) | - 0.371 | - 0.324 |
| iii. National performance ($1 - Z_{14}$) | + 0.084 | + 0.034 |

actual national performance the performance of other programs (all NGOs) shown in the MMCP were considered as the actual national NGO performance. Line 14 of Table 41 shows the basis for adjustment of MMPR to obtain actual national performance. The ratio confirms that there was overstating of national performance in the MMPR to the extent of 8.4 percent in the case of tubectomy and in the case of vasectomy by 3.4 percent.

To get an insight into the sterilization performances of NGOs as reported by different reporting tiers, data were collected during the field survey from those sample upazilas which were selected for the 'BDG and NGO stratum'. Table 42 shows all those sample upazilas and their corresponding NGO performance figures as reported by different reporting levels. In this table, the term 'verified NGO performance' means the performances found to have been done according to NGO clinic records in the selected upazilas. It was observed that the NGO clinics reported their monthly performance either to upazila FP offices or the district FP offices or in some cases to both the offices. These reportings were in addition to the regular reporting to their respective NGO headquarters. However, for publication in the national MIS reports, district FP offices send NGO performance reports to the MIS. MIS reports do not show NGO performances by upazilas. Instead, these are shown by districts and in some cases by major NGOs. This system of reporting of NGO performance by MIS has already been discussed in section 3.5.

In order to find out the reporting variations of the NGO performances, a comparison has been attempted in Table 42. The summary of the comparison is shown at the bottom of the table. From the table it is clear that there was no difference between the verified NGO performance figures and the figures sent to NGO headquarters. On the other hand, remarkable variations have been

observed when the verified figures were compared with the corresponding figures sent to MIS by district FP offices. It has been done on the assumption that MIS would report only those NGO performance figures which are transmitted by district FP offices. By this comparison it has been found that NGO performances were underreported by district FP offices. Those underreporting were 13.2% and 21.5% of the verified NGO performances for tubectomy and vasectomy respectively.

Table 42: Comparison between actual NGO STERILIZATION performance collected from the NGO clinic register and the District FP office reported NGO performance by sample upazilas¹

| Upazila | Organizations | Verified NGO performance | | NGO performance sent to upazila | | NGO performance sent to District FP office | | NGO performance sent to NGO headquarters | | NGO performance sent to MIS by District FP office | | Difference between District FP office reported NGO performance and verified NGO performance | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------|---------------------------------|------|--|------|--|------|---|------|---|---------------|
| | | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13)=(11)-(3) | (14)=(12)-(4) |
| <u>Dinajpur</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | BAVS | 62 | 29 | - | - | 62 | 29 | 62 | 29 | 62 | 29 | 0 | 0 |
| | FPAB | 60 | 228 | - | - | 60 | 228 | 60 | 228 | 60 | 228 | 0 | 0 |
| | Sub-total | 122 | 257 | - | - | 122 | 257 | 122 | 257 | 122 | 257 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Nilphamari</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Saidpur* | Pathfinder (Railway Hospital) | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | - | - | 3 | 1 | 11 | 3 | + 8 | + 2 |
| <u>Rangpur</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | BAVS | 62 | 20 | 62 | 20 | 62 | 20 | 62 | 20 | 62 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| | FPAB | 73 | 50 | 73 | 50 | - | - | 73 | 50 | 73 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| | Anjuman Memorial Clinic | 0 | 364 | 0 | 366 | - | - | 0 | 366 | - | 318 | 0 | -46 |
| | Sub-total | 135 | 434 | 135 | 436 | 62 | 20 | 135 | 436 | 135 | 388 | 0 | -46 |
| <u>Lalmonirhat</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | RDRS | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 3 | +18 | + 1 |
| | Pathfinder (Railway Hospital) | 14 | 4 | 14 | 4 | 14 | 4 | 14 | 4 | 5 | 3 | - 9 | - 1 |
| | Sub-total | 14 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 23 | 6 | + 9 | 0 |

| Upazila | Organizations | Verified NGO performance | | NGO performance sent to upazila | | NGO performance sent to District FP office | | NGO performance sent to NGO head-quarters | | NGO performance sent to MIS by District FP office | | Difference between District FP office reported NGO performance and verified NGO performance | |
|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|------|---------------------------------|------|--|------|---|------|---|------|---|---------------|
| | | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13)=(11)-(3) | (14)=(12)-(4) |
| <u>Joypurhat</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | BAVS | 39 | 59 | - | - | 39 | 59 | 39 | 59 | 39 | 59 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Natore</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | BAVS | 86 | 39 | - | - | 86 | 39 | 86 | 39 | 86 | 39 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Pabna</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sadar | BAVS | 218 | 256 | 218 | 259 | 218 | 259 | 218 | 259 | 163 | 250 | -55 | -6 |
| | FPAB | 60 | 363 | 60 | 363 | 60 | 363 | 60 | 363 | 60 | 363 | 0 | 0 |
| | Sub-total | 278 | 619 | 278 | 622 | 278 | 622 | 278 | 622 | 223 | 613 | -55 | -6 |
| <u>Khulna</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sadar | BAVS | 213 | 58 | - | - | 213 | 58 | 213 | 58 | 159 | 43 | -54 | -15 |
| | FPAB | 90 | 54 | - | - | 90 | 54 | 90 | 54 | 90 | 54 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ashrafuddin clinic | 34 | 130 | 34 | 130 | - | - | 34 | 130 | - | - | -34 | -130 |
| | Khulna Nursing Home | 34 | 0 | 34 | 0 | - | - | 34 | 0 | - | - | -34 | 0 |
| | Sub-total | 371 | 242 | 68 | 130 | 303 | 112 | 371 | 242 | 249 | 97 | -122 | -145 |
| <u>Narail</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sadar | BAVS | 7 | 130 | 7 | 130 | 7 | 130 | 7 | 130 | 7 | 130 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Patuakhali</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | FPAB | 64 | 204 | - | - | 64 | 204 | 64 | 204 | 57 | 197 | -7 | -7 |

| Upazila | Organizations | Verified NGO performance | | NGO performance sent to upazila | | NGO performance sent to District FP office | | NGO performance sent to NGO headquarters | | NGO performance sent to MIS by District FP office | | Difference between District FP office reported NGO performance and verified NGO performance | |
|-------------------|---------------|--------------------------|------|---------------------------------|------|--|------|--|------|---|------|---|---------------|
| | | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13)=(11)-(3) | (14)=(12)-(4) |
| <u>Barisal</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sadar* | BAVS | 148 | 135 | - | - | 148 | 135 | 148 | 135 | 113 | 126 | -35 | -9 |
| | FPAB | 37 | 72 | - | - | 37 | 72 | 37 | 72 | 8 | 16 | -29 | -56 |
| | Sub-total | 185 | 207 | - | - | 185 | 207 | 185 | 207 | 121 | 142 | -64 | -65 |
| <u>Pirojpur</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sadar | BAVS | 38 | 115 | - | - | 38 | 115 | 38 | 115 | 38 | 115 | 0 | 0 |
| | IFA Clinic | 0 | 251 | 0 | 251 | - | - | 0 | 251 | - | - | 0 | -251 |
| | Sub-total | 38 | 366 | 0 | 251 | 38 | 115 | 38 | 366 | 38 | 115 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Gopalganj</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kotalipara | CHCP | 54 | 0 | 54 | 0 | - | - | 54 | 0 | 2 | 0 | -52 | 0 |
| <u>Narsingdi</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sadar | BAVS | 55 | 685 | - | - | 55 | 685 | 55 | 685 | 272 | 468 | +217 | -217 |
| <u>Mymensingh</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sadar | BAVS | 420 | 152 | - | - | 420 | 152 | 420 | 152 | 310 | 131 | -110 | -21 |
| | FPAB | 316 | 304 | - | - | 316 | 304 | 316 | 304 | 189 | 209 | -127 | -95 |
| | BAU FP Clinic | 0 | 39 | - | - | 0 | 39 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 24 | 0 | -15 |
| | Sub-total | 736 | 495 | - | - | 736 | 495 | 736 | 495 | 499 | 364 | -237 | -131 |

| Upazila | Organizations | Verified NGO performance | | NGO performance sent to upazila | | NGO performance sent to District FP office | | NGO performance sent to NGO head-quarters | | NGO performance sent to MIS by District FP office | | Difference between District FP office reported NGO performance and verified NGO performance | |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|------|---------------------------------|------|--|------|---|------|---|------|---|---------------|
| | | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. | Tub. | Vas. |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13)=(11)-(3) | (14)=(12)-(4) |
| <u>Sylhet</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sadar | BAVS | 106 | 238 | - | - | 106 | 238 | 106 | 238 | 106 | 238 | 0 | 0 |
| | FPAB | 0 | 51 | - | - | 0 | 51 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 |
| | Sub-total | 106 | 289 | - | - | 106 | 289 | 106 | 289 | 106 | 289 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 2293 | 4033 | 559 | 1576 | 2095 | 3240 | 2293 | 4038 | 1990 | 3167 | | |
| Total cases overreported | | | | | | | | | | | | +234 | + 2 |
| Total cases underreported | | | | | | | | | | | | -537 | -868 |
| Balance | | | | | | | | | | | | -303 | -866 |

¹Upazila marked by single asterisk show two months' performance and those without asterisk show three months' performance.

Note: The 'dash' shown against the columns indicate that the NGOs were not found to report to that tiers.

77-

Chapter 4

FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

The findings of the evaluation of January-March, 1985 quarter have been presented in this chapter in a very summarized manner. For more details, reference should be made to the earlier chapters. The estimates in this chapter are all national estimates derived from the evaluation. However, all those estimates were obtained from the main sample of within upazila cases. The findings of the sub-sample of outside upazila cases did not differ significantly from those of the main sample. For this reason the findings below can be taken to be nationally representative.

4.1. Estimated overreporting/underreporting of performances in the MMR of MIS reported data:

NGO performance: The evaluation findings show that the total NGO performance in the MMR has been underreported by an estimated 37.1 percent in the case of tubectomy and 32.4 percent in the case of vasectomy.

BDG performance: The overreporting of total BDG performance in the MMR is estimated at 16.9 percent for tubectomy, and 14.7 percent for vasectomy.

National performance: The overreporting of total national performance in the MMR is estimated at 8.4 percent in the case of tubectomy, while for vasectomy, the overreporting is 3.4 percent.

4.2. Estimated proportion of clients actually sterilized:

Tubectomy: The interview of the tubectomy clients revealed 1 client who was not sterilized, 12 clients who were sterilized before the quarter in the recorded clinic, and 5 clients who were sterilized before the quarter in other than the recorded clinic. Five selected

clients could not be located in the field because their recorded addresses were either non-existent or they never lived in the recorded addresses. These 'address not found' clients are therefore unverified and are presumed to be false cases of sterilization. Under the assumption that 'address not found' cases, those sterilized before the quarter, those sterilized other than recorded clinic, and never sterilized, are false cases, the proportion of false cases among recorded tubectomy clients is estimated at 23/958 or 2.4 percent. The standard error¹ of the estimate is 0.008. Thus, the proportion actually tubectomised is estimated at 97.6 percent of the upazila level data.

Vasectomy: Among the interviewed vasectomy clients, 6 were found to be not sterilized, 19 clients were 'address not found' cases, 11 clients were sterilized within the quarter but in other than the recorded clinic, 35 clients were sterilized before the quarter in the recorded clinic, 5 clients were sterilized before the quarter in other than the recorded clinic, and 17 clients were sterilized twice. It is thus found that the number of false cases among the 842 vasectomy clients in the sample was 93 or 11.1 percent. The standard error¹ of the estimate is 0.025. So, the proportion actually sterilized is estimated at 88.9 percent of the upazila level data.

Estimated proportion of clients actually sterilized for each of the selected upazilas are shown in Table 4: Appendix-A.

4.3. Estimated proportion of actually sterilized clients who had signed or put thumb impression on the USAID approved informed consent form:

The estimated proportion is calculated on the number of clients found to be actually sterilized. In the case of tubectomy, the proportion

¹The formula used for the calculation of the standard error is

$$V(P) = (1-f) \frac{S^2}{a}$$

of clients who had signed or put thumb impression on the USAID-approved informed consent form is estimated at 93.5 percent, while for vasectomy, it is 95.3 percent.

4.4. Estimated average amount paid to clients actually sterilized:

While calculating the average amount paid to the actually sterilized clients, referred to sub-section 4.2 above, those reporting receipt of less than the approved amount were assumed to have received the approved amount, if they were given free food and/or transport or both. The average amount paid, estimated in this way, comes to Tk.174.86 for tubectomy clients and Tk.172.36 for vasectomy clients. Since the differences of the estimated averages from their corresponding approved amounts are very small, the estimated errors have not been calculated.

4.5. Estimated proportion of actually sterilized clients who had received surgical apparel:

The estimated proportion is calculated on clients who were actually sterilized. Accordingly, in the case of tubectomy, the proportion of clients who had received surgical apparel is estimated at 93.5 percent, while for vasectomy, it is 92.7 percent.

4.6. Estimated proportion of actual referrers:

Estimation of these statistics is based on the clients survey data. Accordingly, it is estimated that 86.1 percent of tubectomy clients and 74.5 percent of vasectomy clients had actual referrers, that is, both the recorded referrer and the reported referrer were the same.

4.7. Estimated average amount received by service providers/ referrers:

Estimation of these statistics is based on the service providers/ referrers survey data. The survey data show that service providers (physicians and clinic staff) were reported to have received fees of the approved amount for each of the sterilized clients except two clinic staff for two selected vasectomy clients.

The interviewed referrers of 96.7 percent tubectomy clients and 97.0 percent vasectomy clients were reported to have received referral fees of the approved amount.

The current report is the first quarterly evaluation report under the present contract. Earlier, seven quarterly audits/evaluations of the VS Reimbursement Program were also conducted by this firm. However, except for the one for the last quarter, all those were termed as audits while the last one was termed evaluation. It should be mentioned that those audits/evaluation were different from the current quarterly evaluation. The changed objectives and methodology of the current quarterly evaluation were the reasons for the differences. More specifically, the previous quarterly audits/evaluations covered only BDG clinics while the present evaluation includes both BDG and NGO clinics. For this reason, no direct comparison between the findings of the current quarter and those of the previous quarters has been attempted. The key findings of the current quarter's evaluation are shown in Table 43. The findings of the previous quarters are shown in Table 5 of Appendix-A as reference.

Table 43: The key findings of the evaluation of VS program for January-March, 1985 quarter

| Findings | January-March 1985 quarter |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. Estimated proportion of clients actually sterilized: | |
| Tubectomy | 97.6% |
| Vasectomy | 88.9% |
| 2. Estimated overreporting(+)/underreporting(-) of the total BDG performance in the MIS data: | |
| Tubectomy | BDG +16.9% |
| | NGO -37.1% |
| Vasectomy | BDG +14.7% |
| | NGO -32.4% |
| 3. Estimated average amount paid to clients actually sterilized: | |
| Tubectomy | Tk.174.86 |
| Vasectomy | Tk.172.36 |
| 4. Estimated average amount paid to service providers/referrers: | |
| Tubectomy | Tk. 50.00 |
| Vasectomy | Tk. 47.00 |
| 5. Estimated proportion of actual referrers: | |
| Tubectomy | 86.1% |
| Vasectomy | 74.5% |
| 6. Estimated proportion of clients who did not receive surgical apparel: | |
| Tubectomy | 6.5% |
| Vasectomy | 7.3% |
| 7. Estimated proportion of <u>actually sterilized clients</u> having USAID-approved informed consent forms signed/thumb impressed by clients: | |
| Tubectomy | 93.5% |
| Vasectomy | 95.3% |
| 8.a) Estimated proportion of clients whose consent form was missing <u>among actually sterilized clients</u> : | |
| Tubectomy | Nil |
| Vasectomy | 0.1% |

| Findings | January-March 1985 quarter |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 8.b) Estimated proportion of clients whose consent form was not USAID-approved among <u>actually sterilized clients</u> : | |
| Tubectomy | 4.1% |
| Vasectomy | 4.1% |
| 8.c) Estimated proportion of clients whose consent form was USAID-approved but not signed by client, <u>among actually sterilized clients</u> : | |
| Tubectomy | 2.4% |
| Vasectomy | 0.6% |
| 9. Estimated proportion of clients having USAID-approved informed consent forms signed/thumb impressed by clients <u>among all the selected clients</u> : | |
| Tubectomy | 94.2% |
| Vasectomy | 93.3% |
| 10. Proportion of clients sterilized two or more times: | |
| Tubectomy | Nil |
| Vasectomy | 3.0% |
| 11. Mean age (in years) of clients: | |
| Tubectomy | 29.9 |
| Vasectomy | 44.1 |
| 12. Proportion of clients under 20 years old: | |
| Tubectomy | 0.8% |
| Vasectomy | Nil |
| 13. Proportion of clients over 49 years old: | |
| Tubectomy | Nil |
| Vasectomy | 28.4% |
| 14. Mean number of living children: | |
| Tubectomy | 3.7 |
| Vasectomy | 3.9 |

| Findings | January-March 1985 quarter |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 15. Proportion of clients with 0-1-2 children: | |
| <u>Tubectomy</u> | |
| 0 | 0.3% |
| 1 | 2.2% |
| 2 | 19.8% |
| <u>Vasectomy</u> | |
| 0 | 0.6% |
| 1 | 2.0% |
| 2 | 19.6% |
| 16. Proportion of clients referred by (clinic record data): | |
| <u>Tubectomy</u> | |
| Fieldworker | 60.0% |
| Registered Dai | 19.0% |
| Registered Agent | 12.4% |
| General public | 7.0% |
| <u>Vasectomy</u> | |
| Fieldworker | 38.4% |
| Registered Dai | 15.7% |
| Registered Agent | 12.0% |
| General public | 33.1% |
| 17. Proportion of clients referred by (survey data): | |
| <u>Tubectomy</u> | |
| Fieldworker | 53.5% |
| Registered Dai | 18.6% |
| Registered Agent | 14.6% |
| General public | 9.6% |
| Went alone | 0.5% |
| Does not know | 1.3% |
| <u>Vasectomy</u> | |
| Fieldworker | 32.2% |
| Registered Dai | 5.4% |
| Registered Agent | 11.4% |
| General public | 36.7% |
| Went alone | 11.0% |
| Does not know | 2.4% |

APPENDIX - A

Table 1: Distribution of the sterilized clients in selected upazilas by audits/evaluations and their recorded residence^{1,2}

| Recorded residence of clients | Audit/evaluation quarters | | | | | | | | Overall |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| | April-June 1983 | July-Sept. 1983 | Oct.-Dec. 1983 | Jan.-March 1984 | April-June 1984 | July-Sept. 1984 | Oct.-Dec. 1984 | Jan.-March 1985 | |
| Within the upazila | 6983 (81.6) | 6494 (88.0) | 17602 (82.6) | 17859 (73.3) | 12521 (76.9) | 17463 (75.3) | 17396 (72.3) | 9676 (53.1) | 105994 (73.9) |
| Outside the upazila | 1575 (18.4) | 884 (12.0) | 3699 (17.4) | 6503 (26.7) | 3763 (23.1) | 5732 (24.7) | 6663 (27.7) | 8546 (46.9) | 37365 (26.1) |

¹ Figures without brackets are the absolute number, while those within brackets are the percentage of the column total.

² The January-March 1985 quarter includes both BDG and NGO clinics performance while the earlier quarters included only BDG performance.

5

Table 2: Distribution of upazila-wise selected clients (unweighted) by address not found/not exist and persons providing evidences

| Upazila | Number of address not found/not exist clients | Persons providing evidences | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | Referrer | FP worker | Ward member | Referrer and FP worker | Referrer and Ward member | Ward member and village peer | Referrer, Ward member and villager |
| Thakurgaon Sadar | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Rangpur Sadar | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Lalmohirhat Sadar | 3 | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - |
| Natore Sadar | 2 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | - |
| Pabna Sadar | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Kachua | 4 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | - | - |
| Singair | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Total | 14 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

Table 3: Distribution of actual number of informed consent forms by categories and by selected upazilas

| Upazilas | Categories of informed consent forms | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| | Not signed by clients | Not approved by USAID | No forms |
| Manda | - | 5 | - |
| Ullahpara | 17 | - | - |
| Mohammadpur | - | 30 | - |
| Golachipa | - | - | 1 |
| Dhamrai | - | 1 | - |
| Khatalia | 1 | - | - |
| Kaliakoir | 1 | - | - |
| Natore Sadar | - | 8 | - |
| Khulna Sadar | - | 6 | - |
| Pirojpur | - | - | 3 |
| Mymensingh Sadar | 1 | - | - |
| Pabna Sadar | - | 12 | - |
| Narsingdi Sadar | - | 6 | - |
| Total | 20 | 68 | 4 |

Table 4: Estimated proportions of clients actually sterilized
by selected upazila

| Upazilas | Weighted sample size | | | Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the sample ^{1,2} | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|------|-----|---|------|------|
| | Tub. | Vas. | All | Tub. | Vas. | All |
| <u>Dinajpur</u> | | | | | | |
| Khansama | 5 | 42 | 47 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Nawabgonj | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sadar | 34 | 42 | 76 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.97 |
| <u>Thakurgaon</u> | | | | | | |
| Sadar | - | 122 | 122 | - | 0.77 | 0.77 |
| <u>Panchagarh</u> | | | | | | |
| Atwari | 1 | 35 | 36 | 1.00 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| <u>Nilphamari</u> | | | | | | |
| Saidpur | 14 | 1 | 15 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Rangpur</u> | | | | | | |
| Badargonj | 2 | 15 | 17 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 0.94 |
| Sadar | 9 | 47 | 56 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 0.89 |
| <u>Gaibandha</u> | | | | | | |
| Fulchori | 20 | - | 20 | 0.95 | - | 0.95 |
| <u>Lalmonirhat</u> | | | | | | |
| Sadar | 52 | 17 | 69 | 0.73 | 0.12 | 0.58 |
| <u>Bogra</u> | | | | | | |
| Sherpur | 42 | 7 | 49 | 1.00 | 0.86 | 0.98 |
| <u>Joypurhat</u> | | | | | | |
| Sadar | 9 | 6 | 15 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Naogaon</u> | | | | | | |
| Munda | 8 | 1 | 9 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Natore</u> | | | | | | |
| Sadar | 32 | 5 | 37 | 1.00 | 0.60 | 0.95 |
| <u>Rajshahi</u> | | | | | | |
| Bagmara | 21 | 6 | 27 | 1.00 | 0.83 | 0.96 |

| Upazilas | Weighted sample size | | | Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the sample 1,2 | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|------|-----|--|------|------|
| | Tub. | Vas. | All | Tub. | Vas. | All |
| <u>Pabna</u> | | | | | | |
| Atghoria | 1 | - | 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sadar | 24 | 86 | 110 | 1.00 | 0.90 | 0.92 |
| <u>Serajgonj</u> | | | | | | |
| Ullahpara | 47 | 7 | 54 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Magura</u> | | | | | | |
| Mohammadpur | 6 | 1 | 7 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Khulna</u> | | | | | | |
| Dumuria | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Koyra | 6 | - | 6 | 1.00 | - | 1.00 |
| Sadar | 23 | 53 | 76 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 0.95 |
| <u>Narail</u> | | | | | | |
| Sadar | 24 | 33 | 57 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.98 |
| <u>Bagerhat</u> | | | | | | |
| Kachua | 1 | 23 | 24 | 1.00 | 0.78 | 0.79 |
| <u>Satkhira</u> | | | | | | |
| Tala | 13 | 1 | 14 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Barguna</u> | | | | | | |
| Amtali | 34 | 7 | 41 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Patuakhali</u> | | | | | | |
| Golachipa | 14 | - | 14 | 1.00 | - | 1.00 |
| Sadar | 25 | 50 | 75 | 1.00 | 0.88 | 0.92 |
| <u>Barisal</u> | | | | | | |
| Bakergonj | 16 | 27 | 43 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sadar | 35 | 39 | 74 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.97 |
| <u>Jhalakhati</u> | | | | | | |
| Kathalia | 4 | 2 | 6 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Pirojpur</u> | | | | | | |
| Sadar | 5 | 54 | 59 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 0.88 |
| Nazirpur | 8 | 3 | 11 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

| Upazilas | Weighted sample size | | | Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the sample ^{1,2} | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|------|-----|---|------|------|
| | Tub. | Vas. | All | Tub. | Vas. | All |
| <u>Gopalganj</u> | | | | | | |
| Kotalipara | 42 | 1 | 43 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Sariatpur</u> | | | | | | |
| Naria | 12 | - | 12 | 1.00 | - | 1.00 |
| <u>Dhaka</u> | | | | | | |
| Dhamrai | 35 | - | 35 | 1.00 | - | 1.00 |
| <u>Gazipur</u> | | | | | | |
| Kaligonj | 11 | - | 11 | 1.00 | - | 1.00 |
| Kaliakoir | 54 | - | 54 | 1.00 | - | 1.00 |
| <u>Narsingdi</u> | | | | | | |
| Sadar | 36 | 23 | 59 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Manikgonj</u> | | | | | | |
| Singair | 26 | 1 | 27 | 0.69 | 1.00 | 0.70 |
| <u>Tangail</u> | | | | | | |
| Gopalpur | 35 | - | 35 | 1.00 | - | 1.00 |
| <u>Mymensingh</u> | | | | | | |
| Nandail | 16 | 3 | 19 | 1.00 | 0.67 | 0.95 |
| Sadar | 47 | 33 | 80 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Kishoregonj</u> | | | | | | |
| Tarail | 14 | 16 | 30 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Comilla</u> | | | | | | |
| Barura | 11 | 3 | 14 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Hobigonj</u> | | | | | | |
| Azmirigonj | 8 | 2 | 10 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Chittagong</u> | | | | | | |
| Banshkhali | 32 | 10 | 42 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

| Upazilas | Weighted sample size | | | Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the sample ^{1,2} | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|------|------|---|-------|-------|
| | Tub. | Vas. | All | Tub. | Vas. | All |
| <u>Sylhet</u> | | | | | | |
| Sadar | 35 | 15 | 50 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Noakhali</u> | | | | | | |
| Senbag | 6 | - | 6 | 1.00 | - | 1.00 |
| <u>Ctg. Hill Tracts</u> | | | | | | |
| Chandroghona | 2 | - | 2 | 1.00 | - | 1.00 |
| Total | 958 | 842 | 1800 | 0.976 | 0.889 | 0.936 |

¹After field survey of clients, the clients excluding those falling under the category, 'address not found', 'never sterilized clients', 'operations not done in the quarter', 'operations not done in recorded clinic', and 'double operations', have been considered as actually sterilized.

²This proportional estimate will not be used to estimate upazila performance because of the small sample. Instead the aggregated estimates will be used.

Table 5: The key findings of the audits/evaluations of the previous quarters based only on the survey of BDG clinics

| Findings | AUDIT/EVALUATION QUARTERS | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| | April-June 1983 | July-Sept. 1983 | Oct.-Dec. 1983 | Janu.-March 1984 | April-June 1984 | July-Sept. 1984 | Oct.-Dec. 1984 |
| 1. Estimated proportion of clients actually sterilized: | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | 97.7% | 97.2% | 97.8% | 97.0% | 93.2% | 97.7% | 98.8% |
| Vasectomy | 87.6% | 88.1% | 91.2% | 91.8% | 82.3% | 89.6% | 91.2% |
| 2. Estimated overreporting(+)/underreporting(-) of the total BDG performance in the MIS data: | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | a | a | +3.9% | +3.2% | +2.6% | +4.5% | BDG +9.8% NGO -5.2% |
| Vasectomy | a | a | +2.5% | -8.4% | -5.7% | +0.1% | BDG +8.7% NGO -3.0% |
| 3. Estimated average amount paid to clients actually sterilized: | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | Tk.107.75 | Tk.104.48 | Tk.107.34; & Tk.173.40 (enhanced rate) | Tk.174.25 | Tk.174.05 | Tk.174.69 | Tk.174.37 |
| Vasectomy | Tk. 95.39 | Tk. 94.25 | Tk. 94.65; & Tk.174.56 (enhanced rate) | Tk.174.23 | Tk.173.97 | Tk.173.02 | Tk.172.55 |
| 4. Estimated average amount paid to service providers/referrers: | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | Tk. 38.00 | Tk. 38.00 | Tk. 38.00; & Tk. 50.00 (enhanced rate) | Tk. 50.00 | Tk. 50.00 | Tk. 50.00 | Tk. 50.00 |
| Vasectomy | Tk. 36.00 | Tk. 36.00 | Tk. 36.00; & Tk. 47.00 (enhanced rate) | Tk. 47.00 | Tk. 47.00 | Tk. .47.00 | Tk. 47.00 |

2/2

| Findings | AUDIT/EVALUATION QUARTERS | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | April-June 1983 | July-Sept. 1983 | Oct.-Dec. 1983 | Janu.-March 1984 | April-June 1984 | July-Sept. 1984 | Oct.-Dec. 1984 |
| 5. Estimated proportion of actual referrers: | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | - | - | 86.9% | 87.4% | 87.5% | 83.9% | 83.4% |
| Vasectomy | - | - | 76.1% | 75.4% | 72.9% | 70.5% | 74.3% |
| 6. Estimated proportion of clients who did not receive surgical apparel (survey data): | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | 0.6% | 0.3% | 0.4% | 0.8% | 0.2% | Nil | 0.1% |
| Vasectomy | | | | | 4.0% | 7.0% | 8.1% |
| 7. Estimated proportion of <u>actually sterilized clients</u> having USAID-approved informed consent forms signed/thumb impressed by clients: | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | - | - | - | - | - | - | 96.4% |
| Vasectomy | - | - | - | - | - | - | 90.0% |
| 8.a) Estimated proportion of clients whose consent form was missing <u>among actually sterilized clients</u> : | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1.5% |
| Vasectomy | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3.3% |
| 8.b) Estimated proportion of clients whose consent form was not USAID-approved <u>among actually sterilized clients</u> : | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.9% |
| Vasectomy | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4.1% |

| Findings | AUDIT/EVALUATION QUARTERS | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | April-June 1983 | July-Sept. 1983 | Oct.-Dec. 1983 | Janu.-March 1984 | April-June 1984 | July-Sept. 1984 | Oct.-Dec. 1984 |
| 8.c) Estimated proportion of clients whose consent form was USAID-approved but not signed by client, <u>among actually sterilized clients</u> : | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1.2% |
| Vasectomy | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.6% |
| 9. Estimated proportion of clients having USAID-approved informed consent forms signed/thumb impressed by clients <u>among all the selected clients</u> : | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | 91.2% | 92.8% | 91.6% | 81.3% | 94.2% | 94.1% | 96.4% |
| Vasectomy | 88.9% | 94.6% | 89.1% | 87.4% | 87.3% | 95.3% | 89.1% |
| 10. Proportion of clients sterilized two or more times: | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | Nil | Nil | 0.1% | Nil | Nil | Nil | Nil |
| Vasectomy | 0.9% | 3.9% | 1.3% | Nil | 0.9% | 0.2% | 0.6% |
| 11. Mean age (in years) of clients (survey data): | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | 29.4 | 29.4 | 29.7 | 29.4 | 30.3 | 30.3 | 29.9 |
| Vasectomy | 39.1 | 39.7 | 40.0 | 40.3 | 42.3 | 43.1 | 43.7 |
| 12. Proportion of clients under 20 years old (survey data): | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | 0.8% | 1.4% | 0.4% | 1.2% | Nil | 0.5% | 0.3% |
| Vasectomy | Nil | Nil | 0.1% | Nil | Nil | 0.2% | Nil |

| Findings | AUDIT/EVALUATION QUARTERS | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | April-June 1983 | July-Sept. 1983 | Oct.-Dec. 1983 | Janu.-March 1984 | April-June 1984 | July-Sept. 1984 | Oct.-Dec. 1984 |
| 13. Proportion of clients over 49 years old (survey data): | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | Nil | Nil | 0.2% | Nil | Nil | Nil | 0.1% |
| Vasectomy | 7.8% | 12.6% | 10.7% | 12.3% | 19.5% | 22.2% | 23.3% |
| 14. Mean number of living children (survey data); | | | | | | | |
| Tubectomy | 3.9 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 |
| Vasectomy | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 4.1 |
| 15. Proportion of clients with 0-1-2 children (survey data): | | | | | | | |
| <u>Tubectomy</u> | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Nil | Nil | 0.2% | 0.5% | 0.2% | 0.1% | 0.3% |
| 1 | 3.0% | 3.0% | 1.8% | 2.6% | 1.8% | 2.0% | 2.7% |
| 2 | 19.3% | 16.2% | 17.1% | 18.4% | 15.4% | 17.8% | 16.8% |
| <u>Vasectomy</u> | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Nil | 0.9% | Nil | 0.4% | Nil | 1.7% | 0.6% |
| 1 | 3.5% | 5.2% | 3.9% | 3.1% | 3.0% | 3.1% | 3.5% |
| 2 | 18.3% | 14.3% | 17.2% | 22.7% | 14.0% | 17.2% | 15.2% |
| 16. Proportion of clients referred by (clinic record data) ¹ : | | | | | | | |
| <u>Tubectomy</u> | | | | | | | |
| Fieldworker | | 59.9% | 38.6% | 41.4% | 45.7% | 53.9% | 51.0% |
| Dai | 100.0% | 21.4% | 29.4% | 30.8% | 24.6% | 25.8% | 29.4% |
| General public | | 18.7% | 31.8% | 27.8% | 29.4% | 20.3% | 19.6% |
| <u>Vasectomy</u> | | | | | | | |
| Fieldworker | | 59.7% | 29.6% | 15.2% | 26.9% | 22.0% | 21.8% |
| Dai | 100.0% | 17.6% | 27.0% | 38.6% | 30.4% | 36.6% | 36.4% |
| General public | | 22.6% | 43.3% | 46.2% | 42.7% | 41.4% | 41.8% |

¹ Dai payments were introduced in July 1983 and general public payments in mid August 1983.

| Findings | AUDIT/EVALUATION QUARTERS | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | April-June 1983 | July-Sept. 1983 | Oct.-Dec. 1983 | Janu.-March 1984 | April-June 1984 | July-Sept. 1984 | Oct.-Dec. 1984 |
| 17. Proportion of clients referred by (survey data) ² : | | | | | | | |
| <u>Tubectomy</u> | | | | | | | |
| Fieldworker | - | - | - | 42.5% | 47.4% | 55.7% | 42.4% |
| Dai | - | - | - | 31.0% | 21.8% | 21.7% | 24.7% |
| General public | - | - | - | 25.9% | 30.0% | 21.4% | 30.2% |
| Went alone | - | - | - | 0.3% | 0.6% | 0.4% | 1.5% |
| Does not know | - | - | - | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.8% | 1.2% |
| <u>Vasectomy</u> | | | | | | | |
| Fieldworker | - | - | - | 14.6% | 24.3% | 26.5% | 17.2% |
| Dai | - | - | - | 33.8% | 31.0% | 37.0% | 21.8% |
| General public | - | - | - | 45.4% | 39.8% | 32.8% | 48.4% |
| Went alone | - | - | - | 5.4% | 3.4% | 7.3% | 11.1% |
| Does not know | - | - | - | 0.8% | 1.5% | 2.4% | 1.5% |

¹ Tables were not prepared for first three quarters.

APPENDIX - B

Interviewing schedule for the client

B. CLINIC IDENTIFICATION:

Name of the clinic : _____

Name of the NGO : _____

Address of the clinic : _____

Type of clinic: BDG clinic BAVS clinic Other NGO clinic

C. TIME:

Date of admission : _____

Date of operation : _____

Date of release : _____

D. REFERRER:

Name of the referrer : _____

Type of referrer: BDG FP Fieldworker 1
NGO FP Fieldworker 2
FP Fieldworker (Not ascertained whether BDG or NGO) 3
Registered Dai 4
Registered Agent 5
Other _____ 6
(specify)

Address of the referrer: _____

E. INFORMED CONSENT FORM (ICF):

(i) Type of ICF:

USAID approved 1 BDG ICF without stamp 2
Others 3 No ICF 4 (SKIP TO F)

(ii) Signing/Thumb impression by:

Client : Signed 1 Not signed 2
Physician : Signed 1 Not signed 2
Witness : Signed 1 Not signed 2

F. INFORMATION COLLECTED BY:

Name : _____ Date : _____

99

INTERVIEWING SCHEDULE FOR THE CLIENT

Information on Attempts

| Attempt No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Date | | | | |
| Person Assisting* | | | | |
| Result Codes** | | | | |
| Interviewer Code | | | | |

*PERSON ASSISTING

| | | | |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------|---|
| None | 1 | Village Peers | 5 |
| Referrer | 2 | Villagers | 6 |
| F.P. Worker (Govt.) | 3 | Ward Members | 7 |
| NGO Worker | 4 | Other _____ (specify) | 8 |

**RESULT CODES

| | |
|---|---|
| Client located | 1 |
| Address found, but no such person ever lived at that address | 2 |
| Address found, but client has permanently left that address | 3 |
| Address found, but client was only temporarily visiting there | 4 |
| Address does not exist/not found | 5 |
| Address given on forms was incomplete | 6 |
| No attempt made to locate client | 7 |
| _____ (specify reason) | |
| Other _____ (specify) | 8 |

INTERVIEWER: If the result code is other than 1, write down below the reasons and collect evidences from local FWA, FPA, NGO workers, Referrers, Ward Members.

Reasons: _____

Interview Information

| Interview Call | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Date | | | | |
| Result Code* | | | | |
| Interviewer Code | | | | |

*Result Codes

Completed 1

Respondent not available 2

Deferred 3

Refused 4

Others _____ 5
(specify)

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Scrutinized <input type="checkbox"/> | Reinterviewed or spot checked <input type="checkbox"/> | Edited <input type="checkbox"/> | Coded <input type="checkbox"/> |
| By <input type="text"/> | By <input type="text"/> | By <input type="text"/> | By <input type="text"/> |
| Date _____ | Date _____ | Date _____ | Date _____ |

General Information Section

101. Please tell me your name : _____

102. Do you have any other names?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 104)

103. Please tell me all those names. (PROBE)

(Client's all other reported names)

104. What is your husband's/father's name?

(Husband's/father's name)

105. Does he have any other names?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 107)

106. Please tell me his names.

(Husband's/father's all other names)

107. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

| | | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| (a) Reported names of the respondent and those of the respondent's husband/father | | | |
| Same as recorded | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Respondent's reported name is different from her/his recorded name | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| Respondent's husband's/father's reported name is different from that recorded | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Others (specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |

108

108. How old are you? (Interviewer: Assist him/her in determining the exact age)

_____ years (in complete years)

109. Have you ever read in a school or a madrasha?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 112)

110. Was the educational institute that you last attended a primary school or a secondary school or a college or a university or a madrasha or something else?

Primary school 1 Secondary school 2

College/ university 3 Madrasha 4

Others _____ 5
(specify)

111. What was the highest class in that institute that you passed?

_____ Class.

112. What is your religion?

Islam 1 Hinduism 2

Christianity 3 Buddhism 4

Others _____ 5
(specify)

113. Aside from doing normal housework, do you do any other work (for cash or kind) on a regular basis such as agricultural work, making things (for sale), selling things in the market, or anything else?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 115)

114. Did you/your wife earn any money last year by doing this work?

Yes 1 No 2

115. How old is your husband/wife? (Interviewer: Assist her/him in determining the exact age)

_____ years (in complete years)

116. Did your husband/wife ever read in a school?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 119)

117. Was the educational institute that your husband/wife last attended a primary school or a secondary school or a college or a university or a madrasa or something else?

Primary school 1 Secondary school 2

College/university 3 Madrasa 4

Don't know 5 Others _____ 6
(specify)

(SKIP TO 119)

118. What was the highest class in that institute that your husband/wife passed?

_____ Class.

119. What is the main occupation of your husband/what is your main occupation?

Agriculture 1 Business 2

Day labour 3 Service 4

Without work 5 Others _____ 6
(specify)

120. Does your family own any agricultural land?

Yes 1 No 2

121. Now I want to ask you some other personal questions.
How many of your children are alive now?

Son _____ Daughter _____ Total _____

122. How long ago was your youngest child born? (PROBE)

_____ years _____ months.

123. Are you or is your husband/wife now using any family planning method?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 126)

124. What is the method that you are or your husband/wife is using now?

(Name of the method)

125. (Interviewer: If the method mentioned is tubectomy/vasectomy, go to 127 and tick the box labelled sterilized)

126. a. (For female respondent ask this question): Some women have an operation called female sterilization (or tubectomy) in order not to have any more children. Have you ever heard of this method?

b. (For male respondent ask this question): Some men have an operation called male sterilization (or vasectomy) so that their wives will not have any more children. Have you ever heard of this method?

Heard 1 Did not hear 2

(SKIP TO 204)

127. Have you yourself undergone such operation?

Sterilized 1 Not sterilized 2

(SKIP TO 204)

105

Clinic Verification Section

201. Do you know the name and address of the place/office/center/clinic where you were operated upon for sterilization?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 204)

202. Please tell me the name and address of the center.

Name : _____

Address : _____

203. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

Sterilized in the recorded clinic 1 Sterilized in a different clinic 2

(SKIP TO 301)

204. Do you know or have you ever heard of the name of the following family planning office/hospital/clinic?

Name and address of the recorded clinic/hospital: _____

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 207)

205. Have you ever visited that office/hospital/clinic?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 207)

206. Why did you visit that place? (PROBE)

207. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

Sterilized in the recorded clinic only 1 Sterilized in both recorded clinic and other clinic 2
(SKIP TO 301)

Sterilized in other than the recorded clinic 3 Not sterilized 4
(SKIP TO 301) (SKIP TO 804)

208. It is evident that you have had two operations. Do you agree? (PROBE)

Yes 1 No 2
(SKIP TO 301)

209. Why did you go for double operation?

210. Which were those clinics where you got sterilized for the first and the second time? (PROBE)

Name of clinics:

First operation _____

Second operation _____

(SKIP TO 307)

Time Verification Section

301. How long ago were you sterilized? (PROBE)

Date _____

or _____ Days/Months/Years ago.

302. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

Within the quarter 1 Before the quarter 2

(SKIP TO 401)

303. Did you visit any clinic any time within the last _____ month(s)?

Within the quarter (Yes) 1 Before the quarter (No) 2

(SKIP TO 404)

304. Why did you visit the center? (PROBE)

305. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

For sterilization 1 For other purposes 2

306. Did you undergo operations twice?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 401)

100

307. It is evident that you have had two operations. How long ago did you have the first operation and how long ago the second? (PROBE)

First operation:

Within the quarter

Before the quarter

(Month/year ago)

Second operation:

Within the quarter

Before the quarter

(Month/year ago)

(SKIP TO 408)

406. Why did he take you to the clinic? (PROBE)

407. (Tick the appropriate box)

For sterilization 1 For other purposes 2
(SKIP TO 501) (SKIP TO 501)

408. a) Did _____ take you to clinic for the first
(Recorded referrer)
operation? (PROBE)

Yes 1 No 2 Does not know 3

↓

| |
|---|
| With whom did you go? Name _____ Type of referrer _____ Address _____ |
|---|

b) Did you go with _____ (also) to clinic for
(Recorded referrer)
the second operation? (PROBE)

Yes 1 No 2 Does not know 3

↓

| |
|---|
| With whom did you go? Name _____ Type of referrer _____ Address _____ |
|---|

507. How many times? _____ times.

508. Was the food served free of cost or did you have to pay any money for that?

Free of cost 1 Paid for it 2

509. How did you go to the clinic?

On foot 1 Using some transport 2

(SKIP TO 512)

510. Was the fare for the transportation paid by yourself/referrer/office?

Paid by self 1 Paid by referrer 2

Paid by office 3 Paid by other person (Specify) _____

511. How much money was paid? _____ amount.

Does not know 1

512. For how many days/hours did you stay in the center?
_____ Days/hours.

513. Do you know the prescribed amount that is paid to each sterilization client as food charge, transport allowance and wage-loss?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 517)

514. What is the prescribed amount? _____
(amount)

515. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

Same as the reported amount 1 Different from the reported amount 2

(SKIP TO 517)

516. Why were you paid less/more?

(SKIP TO 601)

517. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

Received any amount 1 Did not receive any amount 2

(SKIP TO 601)

518. Did you receive the money Tk. _____
(reported amount)
directly from the office or through somebody?

From office 1 Through somebody 2

(SKIP TO 601)

519. Who was the person? (PROBE)

Surgical Apparel Verification Section

601. You have said that you underwent sterilization operation. Did you receive any saree (for tubectomy client) or lungi (for vasectomy client)?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 701)

602. Did you receive any saree or lungi before the operation?

Yes 1 No 2

115

Informed Consent Form Verification Section

701. Did you give your consent before undergoing operation for sterilization?

Yes 1

No 2

(SKIP TO 703)

702. Did you sign or put thumb impression on any paper/form to indicate your consent before undergoing the operation?

Yes 1

No 2

(SKIP TO 801)

703. (Interviewer: Please show the I.C. Form and ask)

Do you remember signing (putting your thumb impression) on a form like this before the operation?

Yes 1

No 2

Direct Verification Section

801. (Interviewer: Check 107 and tick the appropriate box)

| | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Reported names are the same as those recorded (SKIP TO 808) | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Client's reported name is different from the recorded name (SKIP TO 802) | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| Husband's/father's name is different from the recorded name (SKIP TO 803) | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Others | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| | | Specify _____ _____ (SKIP TO 802) | |

802. Family planning office/clinic/hospital records show that you recorded your name as _____
Is that correct? Moreover, is that your name?

Yes 1 No 2
(SKIP TO 808) (SKIP TO 808)

803. Family planning office/clinic/hospital records show that you recorded your husband's/father's name as _____
Is it correct?

Yes 1 No 2
(SKIP TO 808) (SKIP TO 808)

804. Family planning records show that you were sterilized in _____ on _____. These records also (recorded clinic) (recorded date) show that you went to the clinic for sterilization with _____. Do you confirm that these (referrer's name) records are correct?

Yes 1 No 2
(SKIP TO 806)

107

805. It means that you are sterilized. Why did you not tell this first? (PROBE)

806. Perhaps you know that certain payments are made for food, transportation, wage-loss, etc. for undergoing sterilization operation. Have you received any such payment?

Yes 1

No 2

(SKIP TO 808)

807. Would you tell me how much money did you receive?

_____ Amount

808. Interviewer: Check 804, if 'No' is ticked, tick the not sterilized box, otherwise tick the sterilized box.

Sterilized 1

Not sterilized 2

(SKIP TO 901)

809. (Interviewer: Request for physical verification)
Can I see the cut mark of the sterilization operation?

Yes 1

No 2

(Request again, if disagrees,
SKIP TO 901)

810. (Interviewer: Make the physical verification and write the results below)

Sterilized 1

Not sterilized 2

For Clients Coming From Outside the
Selected Upazila

901. Now I would like to talk to you on a different subject. You belong to _____ upazila/thana whereas you have undergone sterilization in a clinic in _____ upazila/thana. May I know the reason? (PROBE)

902. How can one generally go from your house to that clinic/hospital? (PROBE)

(Interviewer: List the means of transport reported by the respondent in the 'Transport' column of the table below in order) _____ how far
(For each reported means of transport)
one has to travel and how much time does it take? (PROBE)

| Transport | Distance (in mile) | Time (in hours) |
|-----------|--------------------|-----------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

903. Do you know whether there is any clinic/hospital in your upazila/thana doing sterilization operations? (PROBE)

Yes 1 No 2
(SKIP TO 908)

904. Did you ever visit that clinic/hospital?

Yes 1 No 2
(SKIP TO 906)

905. Why did you visit that clinic/hospital? (PROBE)

906. How can one generally go from your house to that clinic/hospital? (PROBE)

(Interviewer: List the means of transport reported by the respondent in the 'Transport' column of the table below in order)

_____ how far one has to
(For each reported means of transport)
travel and how much time does it take? (PROBE)

| Transport | Distance (in mile) | Time (in hours) |
|-----------|--------------------|-----------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

907. Would you please tell me the reasons why you did not go to that clinic for sterilization operation? (PROBE)

908. In which clinic have most of the sterilization clients in your area undergone sterilization operation?

Name of the clinic _____

Address _____

909. If anybody from your area would desire to undergo sterilization operation in future, which clinic would you recommend for him/her?

Name of the clinic _____

Address _____

910. Why would you recommend this clinic for the sterilization operation?

APPENDIX - B2

Interviewing Schedule for the Physician

EVALUATION OF VOLUNTARY STERILIZATION PROGRAM
INTERVIEWING SCHEDULE FOR THE PHYSICIAN

| SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Quarter | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | |
| Converted No. | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Stratum | <input type="text"/> | | | |
| PSU No. | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | |
| TS | <input type="text"/> | ISU No. | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Type of clinic | <input type="text"/> | | Sample client No. | <input type="text"/> |

| PHYSICIAN IDENTIFICATION | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Name of the physician: _____ | |
| Name of the clinic : _____ | |
| Address : _____ | |
| Type of clinic: BDG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| BAVS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other NGO | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| CLIENT IDENTIFICATION | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Name of the client : _____ | Type of operation _____ |
| Name of the husband/father : _____ | |
| Occupation of the husband/father : _____ | |
| Address : _____ | |

| INTERVIEW INFORMATION | | | | |
|---|---------------|-----|------------------|-----|
| Interview Call | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Date | | | | |
| Result Codes* | | | | |
| Interviewer's code <input type="text"/> | | | | |
| <u>Result Codes*</u> | Completed | - 1 | Refused | - 3 |
| | Respondent | | Transfer | - 4 |
| | not available | - 2 | Others (specify) | - 8 |

1. I would like to ask you some questions concerning your participation in the family planning program. I hope you will extend your cooperation in answering my questions. Please, tell me, what duties you are required to perform in relation to the family planning program.

2.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Include performing sterilization operation 1
(SKIP TO 4)

Do not include performing sterilization operation 2

3. Do you perform sterilization operation?

Yes 1

No 2

(SKIP TO 15)

4. Do you yourself conduct all the pre-operative tests pertaining to the client you operate?

Yes 1

No 2

(SKIP TO 6)

5. Who conducts the tests?

6. What are the pre-operative tests usually conducted pertaining to clients you operate? (PROBE)

174

7. Did you perform any sterilization operation during the period between _____ and _____ (or now)?
(beginning month) (ending month)

Yes 1

No 2

(SKIP TO 16)

8. Do you receive any money for performing sterilization operation?

Yes 1

No 2

(SKIP TO 15)

9. How much money do you receive for each client you operate?

(amount)

10.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

same as the approved amount 1

Less than the approved amount 2

(SKIP TO 16)

More than the approved amount 3

11. Do you know the prescribed amount that is paid to the operating physician for a client he/she operates?

Yes 1

No 2

(SKIP TO 16)

12. What is the prescribed amount?

(amount)

125

13.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Same as the reported amount 1

Different from the reported amount 2

(SKIP TO 16)

14. Why were you paid less/more?

(SKIP TO 16)

15. Do you know that there is a fee for the operating physician for each client he/she operates?

Yes 1

No 2

16. (But) Family planning records show that you operated Mr./Mrs. _____ during the month of _____ and received Tk. _____. Would you say that the information is true?

Yes 1

No 2

(SKIP TO 18)

17. Why it is not true?

18. Thank you very much for cooperation and for giving me your valuable time.

APPENDIX - B3

Interviewing Schedule for the Clinic Assistant

107

EVALUATION OF VOLUNTARY STERILIZATION PROGRAM
INTERVIEWING SCHEDULE FOR THE CLINIC ASSISTANT

| SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Quarter | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Converted No. |
| | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| | | | | Stratum |
| | <input type="text"/> | | | <input type="text"/> |
| PSU No. | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | TS |
| | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| | | | | ISU No. |
| | | | | <input type="text"/> |
| | | | | Type of clinic |
| | | | | <input type="text"/> |
| | | | | Sample client No. |
| | | | | <input type="text"/> |

| CLINIC ASSISTANT IDENTIFICATION | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Name of the Clinic Assistant : | _____ |
| Name of the clinic : | _____ |
| Address : | _____ |
| Type of clinic: | BDG <input type="checkbox"/> BAVS <input type="checkbox"/> Other NGO <input type="checkbox"/> |

| CLIENT IDENTIFICATION | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Name of the client : | _____ Type of operation _____ |
| Name of the husband/father : | _____ |
| Occupation of the husband/father : | _____ |
| Address : | _____ |

| INTERVIEW INFORMATION | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|-----|----------------------|-----|
| Interview Call | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Date | | | | |
| Result Codes* | | | | |
| | Interviewer's code <input type="text"/> | | | |
| <u>Result Codes*</u> | Completed | - 1 | Refused | - 3 |
| | Respondent | | Left the clinic | - 4 |
| | not available | - 2 | Other (specify)..... | 8 |

128

1. I would like to ask you some questions concerning your duties pertaining to sterilization operation. Please tell me what duties you are required to perform for sterilization of clients?

2.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Assists in the performance of sterilization operation 1
(SKIP TO 5)

Does not assist in the performance of sterilization operation 2

3. Do you assist in the performance of sterilization operation?

Yes 1

No 2

(SKIP TO 13)

4. What assistance do you usually offer? (PROBE)

5. Did you offer any assistance for sterilization operation done during the period between _____ and _____ (or now)?
(beginning month (ending month)

Yes 1

No 2

(SKIP TO 14)

6. Do you receive any money for offering assistance in the performance of sterilization operation?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 13)

7. How much money do you receive for each client?

_____ (amount)

8.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Same as the approved amount 1 Less than the approved amount 2 More than the approved amount 3

(SKIP TO 14)

9. Do you know the prescribed amount that is paid to the person assisting in the performance of sterilization operation?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 14)

10. What is the prescribed amount?

_____ (amount)

11.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Same as the reported amount 1 Different from the reported amount 2

(SKIP TO 14)

198

12. Why were you paid less/more?

(SKIP TO 14)

13. Do you know that there is a fee for the person assisting in the performance of sterilization for each client?

Yes 1 No 2

14. (But) Family planning records show that you assisted in the operation of the client Mr./Mrs. _____ on _____ and received Tk. _____. Would you say that this record is true?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 16)

15. Why it is not true?

16. Thank you very much for your cooperation and for giving me your valuable time.

121

APPENDIX - B4

Interviewing Schedule for the Referrer

EVALUATION OF VOLUNTARY STERILIZATION PROGRAM
INTERVIEWING SCHEDULE FOR THE REFERRER

| SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Quarter | <input type="text"/> | Converted No. | <input type="text"/> | Stratum | <input type="text"/> |
| PSU No. | <input type="text"/> | TS | <input type="text"/> | ISU No. | <input type="text"/> |
| | | Type of clinic | <input type="text"/> | Sample client No. | <input type="text"/> |

| REFERRER IDENTIFICATION | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Name of the referrer: _____ | Type of referrer: _____ |
| Name of clinic : _____ | |
| Address : _____ | |
| Type of clinic: BDG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| BAVS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other NGO | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| CLIENT IDENTIFICATION | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Name of the client : _____ | Type of operation _____ |
| Name of the husband/father : _____ | |
| Occupation of the husband/father : _____ | |
| Address : _____ | |

| INTERVIEW INFORMATION | | | | |
|---|-----|---------------------|---|-----|
| Interview Call | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Date | | | | |
| Result Codes* | | | | |
| <u>Result Codes*</u> Interviewer's code <input type="text"/> | | | | |
| Completed | - 1 | Address not found | | - 4 |
| Respondent not available | - 2 | Left the address | | - 5 |
| Refused | - 3 | Others(specify).... | | 8 |

1. Please tell me what is your main occupation. (PROBE)

(occupation)

2.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Govt. FP worker 1 NGO FP worker 2 Dai 3 Other occupation 4
(SKIP TO 4) (SKIP TO 4)

3. Are you a registered Dai/Agent in family planning program?

Yes No 2

(SKIP TO 6)

4. Please tell me your duties in the family planning program. (PROBE)

5.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Include referring of sterilization clients 1 Do not include referring of sterilization clients 2
(SKIP TO 8)

6. Do you refer sterilization clients to the _____?
(recorded clinic)

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 18)

7. Why do you refer sterilization clients to the clinic?

For earning an income 1 For other reasons 2

Specify _____

PH

8. Have you referred any sterilization client during the period between _____ and _____ (beginning month) (ending month) (or now)?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 19)

9. How many clients have you referred during that period?
_____ Number Don't recall _____

10. Was _____ one of your clients (name of the recorded client) that you referred?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 19)

11. Did you receive any money for referring _____? (name of the client)

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 18)

12. How much did you receive for referring the client?

_____ (amount) Don't know

(SKIP TO 19)

13.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

The approved amount 1 Less than the approved amount 2 More than the approved amount 3

(SKIP TO 21)

14. Do you know the prescribed amount that is paid to the referrer for a client he/she refers?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 18)

15. What is the amount?

_____ (amount) Don't know

(SKIP TO 19)

16.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Same as the reported amount 1 Different from the approved amount 2

(SKIP TO 21)

17. Why were you paid more/less?

(SKIP TO 21)

18. Do you know that the referrer of sterilization clients is paid a fee for each client he/she refers?

Yes 1 No 2

19. (But) Family planning records show that you referred the client Mr./Mrs. _____ during the month of _____, and received Tk. _____ for that reason. Would you say that the information is true?

Yes 1 No 2

(SKIP TO 21)

20. Why it is not true?

21. Thank you very much for your time.

136