

REPORT  
ON THE  
EVALUATION OF THE VOLUNTARY  
STERILIZATION PROGRAM  
FOR  
OCTOBER-DECEMBER QUARTER  
1984



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

# C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
Section-1 : INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background information	1
1.2. Objectives of evaluation	2
Section-2 : METHODOLOGY	4
2.1. Sample for the evaluation	4
2.1.1. Upazila sample	4
2.1.2. Client sample	4
2.1.3. Service provider (physician and clinic staff)/referrer sample	6
2.2. Field activities	8
2.2.1. Field work	9
2.3. Data processing	10
Section-3 : RESULTS OF ATTEMPTS ON LOCATING AND INTERVIEWING THE CLIENTS	11
3.1. Locating the clients	11
3.2. Interviewing the clients	12
Section-4 : RESULTS OF FIELD SURVEY OF CLIENTS	14
4.1. Clinic verification	16
4.2. Time verification	18
4.3. Cross verification of clinic and time	20
4.4. Verification of informed consent forms	22
4.5. Verification of surgical apparel	23
4.6. Payment verification	27
4.7. Verification of referrer	29
4.8. Demographic characteristics	31
4.8.1. Age	33
4.8.2. Number of living children	33

	<u>Page</u>
Section-5 : RESULTS OF SERVICE PROVIDERS/ REFERRERS INTERVIEW	37.
5.1. Interviewing of the service providers/referrers	37
5.2. Payment verification	38
Section-6 : REPORTING VARIATION	39
6.1. Clinic performance data	39
6.2. Upazila performance data	39
6.3. NGO performance data	39
6.4. District performance data	40
6.5. MIS performance data	40
6.6. Comparison among the verified BDG performance data, upazila data, district data, and MIS data	41
6.7. Estimates of BDG component ratios of verified BDG performance data and MIS data	53
6.8. Reported and estimated national, BDG, and NGO performance	55
Section-7 : FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	63
7.1. Estimated overreporting/underreport- ing of performances in the MMR of MIS reported data	63
7.2. Estimated proportion of clients actually sterilized	63
7.3. Estimated proportion of actually sterilized clients who had signed or put thumb impression on the USAID approved informed consent form	64
7.4. Estimated average amount paid to clients actually sterilized	64
7.5. Estimated proportion of actually sterilized clients who had received surgical apparel	65

7.6. Estimated proportion of actual referrers	65
7.7. Estimated average amount received by service providers/referrers	65

APPENDIX

Appendix-A Tables

Appendix-B The interviewing schedules and  
forms

B1

11

Section - 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background information:

Under a grant agreement signed between USAID and the Government of Bangladesh, USAID reimburses the Government of Bangladesh for selected costs of the Voluntary Sterilization (VS) Program. These costs include: fees paid to service providers (physicians, clinic staff, and fieldworkers), as well as payments made to clients for food, transportation and wage-loss compensation. USAID also reimburses the costs of sarees and lungis (surgical apparel) at a fixed rate. The following table gives the USAID-approved reimbursement rates for female sterilization (tubectomy) and male sterilization (vasectomy). These rates have been in effect since October 25, 1983.

USAID-reimbursed sterilization costs by type of operation

<u>Selected costs</u>	<u>Tubectomy (Taka)</u>	<u>Vasectomy (Taka)</u>
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 any client undergoing sterilization does so voluntarily, being fully informed of the outcome and risks of the

operation. To ensure this, it has been made a condition that for each sterilization client, a USAID-approved informed consent form should be completed prior to the operation.

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, including both Bangladesh Government (BDG) and Non-Government Organization (NGO) performances, are contained in the "MIS Monthly Performance Report" which is usually issued within four weeks of the end of the month.

Under a contract signed between USAID, Dhaka and M/s. M.A. Quasem and Co., M/s. M.A. Quasem and Co. was appointed auditor to conduct six quarterly audits/evaluations of the Bangladesh Government Voluntary Sterilization Program. The contract period however was extended for one quarter with a set of modified objectives for conducting an evaluation of the VS reimbursement program. The present report is the evaluation of the VS program for October-December, 1984 quarter, based on the findings obtained from a nationally representative sample survey. Thus, in this report, the term 'reference quarter' means 1984 October-December evaluation quarter.

#### 1.2. Objectives of evaluation:

The specific objectives of the evaluation are as follows:

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

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

## Section - 2

### METHODOLOGY

#### 2.1. 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, a sub-sample of service providers/referrers was drawn from the client sample.

##### 2.1.1. Upazila sample:

In the first stage, 50 upazilas were selected with PPS (Probability Proportional to Size) from the July-September, 1984 quarter. The size of an upazila was defined as the total number of sterilizations done during that quarter.

The MIS monthly computer printout for the 1984 July-September quarter was used as the sample frame for the selection of the upazila sample. The MIS printout contains information on the month-wise sterilization performances of districts and upazilas, classified as tubectomy, vasectomy, and total.

##### 2.1.2. Client sample:

At the second stage of the sample, the client sample was drawn from the 50 upazilas selected in the first stage. For the second stage selection, the list of the recorded clients at upazila level, sterilized during the reference quarter, was used as the sampling frame. Before preparing the list all recorded clients 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. 'Outside upazila' cases were excluded from the selection of client sample.

A selected upazila was divided into a number of equal-sized clusters of sterilization cases recorded during the reference quarter, excluding the outside cases. The number of clusters to be formed in an upazila was pre-determined on the basis of the preceding quarter's performance. This was done with a view to keeping the overall sampling fraction constant. Thus the number of clusters was not the same for all the upazilas, as it was dependent on the size of performance which varied by upazila. One cluster was randomly selected from among those constructed for each selected upazila, and the recorded clients belonging to the selected cluster were included in the sample. A cluster usually covered an area equivalent to one rural union.

The number of clusters for the selected upazilas was determined on the basis of the sterilization performance of the preceding quarter (1984 July-September quarter) as shown in the MIS monthly print-out. While calculating the sampling fraction on the basis of that quarter's performance the target sample size was 2000 clients rather than 1500. In the quarterly audits of the VS reimbursement program conducted by the firm during April '83-September '84, the ultimate client samples varied significantly, and most of the time the actual sample size was less than the desired size of 1500 clients. This was mainly due to two reasons: (a) the predetermined number of clusters was formed on the basis of the BDC sterilization performance excluding the outside cases, and (b) there was a decline in the overall sterilization performance in the country.

Therefore, the client sample was selected using 0.01619 as the sampling fraction so that there were 2000 sterilized clients included in the sample. After the end of the quarter the actual client sample, therefore, stood at 1457 clients. This report is based on the findings of the sample of those 1457 clients selected from the recorded 'within upazila' cases only.

Numbers of selected upazilas and selected clients for the reference quarter are shown by districts in Table-1.

In the approved audit/evaluation methodology, cases coming from outside the upazila were not to be verified because of the distances involved. However, considering the increasing trend of the outside cases (Table-1: Appendix-A), a special survey on the outside cases of three selected upazilas for the 1984 April-June quarter was conducted during January, 1985. The special survey revealed no significant difference between the within and outside cases. In other words, findings on both the within and the outside clients were similar and therefore the exclusion of outside clients from this evaluation is not likely to bias the results.

2.1.3. 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.

Table - 1: The number of selected upazilas and the number of clients, physicians, clinic staff, and referrers included in the sample.

District	Number of selected upazilas	Sample size			
		Client	Physician	Clinic staff	Referrer
Dinajpur	3	102	7	10	17
Thakurgaon	1	31	2	3	5
Nilphamari	2	88	3	5	16
Rangpur	1	37	3	3	6
Kurigram	1	30	1	2	7
Gaibandha	1	15	1	1	4
Lalmonirhat	1	15	3	3	4
Bogra	1	13	2	1	4
Naogaon	1	12	3	3	3
Rajshahi	1	64	5	2	11
Natore	1	21	2	3	5
Pabna	1	22	2	6	6
Kushtia	1	40	3	2	8
Magura	1	11	2	1	3
Narail	1	38	4	4	5
Jessore	1	9	2	2	2
Khulna	3	37	6	5	6
Bagerhat	2	41	3	5	7
Satkhira	1	20	3	1	3
Barguna	2	74	5	7	8
Patuakhali	3	46	7	6	11
Barisal	2	53	5	4	10
Bhola	1	41	3	2	7
Pirojpur	1	14	2	2	4
Gopalganj	1	16	2	1	4
Madaripur	1	25	1	4	7
Faridpur	1	107	4	3	20
Dhaka	1	40	3	1	8
Munshigonj	1	46	4	2	9
Manikgonj	1	9	1	1	2
Tangail	1	50	2	2	7
Sherpur	1	39	2	2	6
Mymensingh	2	43	5	6	9
Netrokona	1	32	3	3	6
Sylhet	1	28	4	3	7
Sunamgonj	1	48	3	4	12
Comilla	1	39	5	2	9
Feni	1	49	1	1	8
Chittagong	1	12	2	2	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>1457</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>279</b>

The service provider/referrer sample for the evaluation quarter, October-December, 1984, included 121 physicians, 120 clinic staff, and 279 referrers. Table-1 shows the distribution by districts the sample size of the clients along with the size of the corresponding sample of physicians, clinic staff, and referrers included in the sample.

## 2.2. 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 categorized 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 has been 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 forms were 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.

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 Print-out (MMCP) showing sterilization performance by districts and upazilas, and the MIS Monthly Performance Report (MMPR) have been collected to ascertain whether there is any discrepancy among these data sources and also to ascertain whether there is any overreporting or underreporting in the MMPR.

#### 2.2.1. Field work:

The field work for the 1984 October-December quarter was carried out during December 1984 and January 1985. Six interviewing teams were deployed to collect the data from the field survey. Each interviewing team included 7 members - one male supervisor, one female supervisor, one male interviewer, two female interviewers, one field assistant and one record verifier. 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 record verifier 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.

2.3. 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.

11  
Section - 3

RESULTS OF ATTEMPTS ON LOCATING AND  
INTERVIEWING THE CLIENTS

3.1. Locating the clients:

Interviewers made vigorous attempts to locate and interview the clients included in the sample. If necessary several attempts were made by interviewers and also by supervisors to locate individual clients during their field work. They first tried to locate the clients by themselves or by asking villagers. If the first attempt failed, assistance was sought from the local family planning fieldworkers, ward members, and from referrers in locating the client. Interviewers noted down reasons and documented evidence from the person 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-2 below shows the percentage distribution of clients by status of locating them. Among the clients selected in the sample, 93.6 percent could be located in the field, which included 95.8 percent of the tubectomy clients and 90.7 percent of the vasectomy clients.

The clients who could not be located consisted of five categories; 'client permanently left the address', 'client temporarily visiting the address', 'incomplete address', 'client died', and 'address not found'. The 'client permanently left the address' group constituted 0.4 percent of the tubectomy clients and 2.2 percent of the vasectomy clients, while the 'client temporarily visiting the address' group constituted 3.3 percent of the tubectomy clients and 0.8 percent of the vasectomy clients. Another 0.2 percent of the vasectomy clients could not be located in the field due to incomplete address. The interviewers also failed to locate 0.2 percent of the vasectomy clients as they were reported to have died.

The 'address not found' group included both those clients who never lived at the address indicated and clients whose listed address did not exist. The 'address not found' group constituted 0.5 percent of the tubectomy clients and 5.9 percent of the vasectomy clients.

Table-2: Percentage distribution of clients by status of locating the clients

Status of locating the clients	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Client located	95.8	90.7	93.6
Client permanently left the address	0.4	2.2	1.2
Client temporarily visiting the address	3.3	0.8	2.3
Incomplete address	-	0.2	0.1
Client died	-	0.2	0.1
Address not found <sup>1</sup>	0.5	5.9	2.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.1 <sup>a</sup>
N	833	624	1457

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

<sup>a</sup> Percentage total is larger than 100 percent due to rounding error.

### 3.2. Interviewing the clients:

Once the clients were located, interviews were conducted by the trained male and female interviewers under the direct supervisio

of the field supervisors. Table-3 shows the percentage distribution of located clients by status of interviews. Among the located clients, 94.6 percent of the tubectomy clients and 84.3 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 (15.7 percent) than for tubectomy (5.4 percent).

Table-3: Percentage distribution of located clients by status of interviews

Interview status	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Interviewed	94.6	84.3	90.3
Not interviewed	5.4	15.7	9.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	798	566	1364

Section - 4

## RESULTS OF FIELD SURVEY OF CLIENTS

This section presents the findings of the field survey as obtained through the client interviews. Each of the selected clients was interviewed by using structured interviewing schedules. The schedules contained questions relating to the objectives of the evaluation. That is, 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 and if so whether other information shown in the clinic records was genuine. The items of information collected related to clinic, date of operation, referrer, payment, surgical apparel, and informed consent form.

Questions were asked independently for each of the items of information. 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 his/her reported information was found to be different from the corresponding recorded information, s(he) was asked some leading questions to ascertain the correct position. For example, for clinic verification, questions were asked concerning 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 himself/herself as not sterilized, (s)he was told that his/her 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.

Two sets of information were collected from this quarterly evaluation. The first set comprised recorded information from the clinic

records on the clinic, date of operation, referrer and informed consent forms. The second set included the reported information on clinic, time, referrer, payment, surgical apparel, and on informed consent forms. We will discuss the findings of the client survey based on both the recorded and reported information.

At the outset two separate tables have been prepared and analysed on the results of clinic and time verification. Attempts have been 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. Another table has, therefore, been prepared for the 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 those clients have been considered in this evaluation to be actual cases of sterilization.

Information on informed consent forms were 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 registers, the clinic records were considered to be the basis of analysis. In the relevant section of informed consent form verification 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 actually sterilized clients. The findings on referrer verification for the evaluation quarter have therefore been presented and analysed separately.

Limited demographic data were also collected from the interviewed clients. The findings on actually sterilized clients are presented at the end of this section.

#### 4.1. 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 if 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-4 shows the percentage distribution of the interviewed clients by reported clinics. Among the interviewed tubectomy clients, 99.6 percent reported the recorded clinics as the clinics of their operation. Of the remaining 3 clients (0.4 percent), 2 clients reported other than the recorded clinic as the clinic of their operation and one client reported that she had visited the recorded clinic for sterilization but was rejected due to her pregnancy.

Similarly, among the interviewed vasectomy clients, 97.7 percent reported the recorded clinics as the clinics of their operation.

Table-4: Percentage distribution of the interviewed clients by reported clinics

Reported clinic	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Recorded clinic	99.6	97.7	98.9
Other than the recorded clinic	0.3	1.3	0.6
<u>Sterilized twice</u>			
Recorded clinic and other than recorded clinic	-	0.6	0.2
<u>Never sterilized</u>			
Never visited the recorded clinic	-	0.2	0.1
Visited the recorded clinic for other purpose	-	0.2	0.1
Rejected	0.1	-	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	755	477	1232

Another 1.3 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 clients (0.6 percent) who reported that they had undergone sterilization operation twice - once in the recorded clinic and once in other than the recorded clinic. The remaining 2 clients (0.4 percent) reported that they had never visited the recorded clinic and the other one reported that he had visited the recorded clinic for some other purpose.

#### 4.2. Time verification:

Since all the selected clients of the sampled upazilas were those who were recorded to have been sterilized within the quarter, October-December, 1984, the date of operation for any of them must fall within the quarter. Accordingly, all the interviewed clients were asked questions to ascertain whether they had undergone sterilization operation during the reference quarter.

Table-5 shows the percentage distribution of interviewed clients by status of reported date of operation. Among the interviewed tubectomy clients, 99.2 percent reported that they had undergone sterilization operation within the reference quarter. Another 0.5 percent reported that they had undergone sterilization operation one to four years ago, while another 0.1 percent reported that they had undergone sterilization operation 4 months before the reference quarter. The remaining 0.1 percent (1 tubectomy client) reported that she had visited the recorded clinic within the quarter but was rejected for sterilization as she was pregnant at the time of visit.

Table-5: Percentage distribution of interviewed clients by status of reported date of operation

Status of date of operation	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
<u>Within the quarter</u>	<u>99.2</u>	<u>97.1</u>	<u>98.3</u>
<u>Before the quarter</u>	<u>0.7</u> <sup>a</sup>	<u>1.9</u> <sup>a</sup>	<u>1.1</u>
Before 4 months	0.1	0.4	0.3
"    5    "	-	0.2	0.1
"    1 year	0.3	-	0.1
"    2 years	-	0.2	0.1
"    3    "	0.1	0.2	0.1
"    4    "	0.1	0.2	0.1
"    5    "	-	0.2	0.1
"    10   "	-	0.2	0.1
"    15   "	-	0.2	0.1
<u>Sterilized twice</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.6</u>	<u>0.3</u>
(1st operation before the quarter and second operation within the quarter)			
<u>Never sterilized</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>0.4</u>	<u>0.3</u>
Never visited the recorded clinic within the quarter	-	0.2	0.1
Visited the recorded clinic within the quarter for other purpose	-	0.2	0.1
Rejected	0.1	-	0.1
<u>Total</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
N	755	477	1232

<sup>a</sup>The percentage is calculated on the overall figure of the category, and hence the sub-category total under the category does not add to it due to rounding error.

Similarly, among the interviewed vasectomy clients, 97.1 percent reported that they had undergone sterilization operation within the reference quarter. On the other hand, only 1.9 percent clients reported that they had undergone sterilization operation before the reference quarter. Of these 1.9 percentage points, 1.2 percentage points were accounted for by clients who reported that they had undergone sterilization operation before 2 to 15 years and the remaining 0.6 percentage points were accounted for by clients who reported that they had sterilization operation 4 to 5 months before the reference quarter. Another 0.6 percentage points were accounted for by clients who reported that they had undergone sterilization operation twice -- once before the quarter and the second within the quarter. The 'never sterilized' vasectomy clients constituted 0.4 percent of the interviewed vasectomy clients of whom 0.2 percent reported that they had never visited the recorded clinic within the reporting quarter, while another 0.2 percent reported that they had visited the recorded clinic in the reference quarter for some other purpose.

#### 4.3. 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 percentage distribution of the interviewed clients by status of reported date of operation and of reported clinic is shown in Table-6. It can be seen from the table that 99.2 percent of the tubectomy clients and 96.3 percent of the vasectomy clients reported their operation within the quarter and also in the recorded clinic. Another 0.4 percent of the tubectomy clients and 1.5 percent of the vasectomy clients reported the recorded clinic as the clinic of their operation but they reported having undergone the

Table-6: 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					A l l				
	Within quarter	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
Sterilized in recorded clinic	99.2	0.4	-	99.6	96.3	1.5	-	-	97.8	98.1	0.8	-	-	98.9
Sterilized in other than recorded clinic	-	0.3	-	0.3	0.8	0.4	-	-	1.2	0.3	0.3	-	-	0.6
Sterilized twice (Sterilized in recorded clinic and other than recorded clinic)	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.6	-	0.6	-	-	0.2	-	0.2
Never sterilized	-	-	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	0.4	0.4	-	-	-	0.2	0.2
Total	99.2	0.7	0.1	100.0	97.1	1.9	0.6	0.4	100.0	98.4	1.1	0.2	0.2	99.9 <sup>a</sup>
N				755					477					1232

<sup>a</sup>Percentage total does not add up to 100 percent due to rounding error.

sterilization operation before the quarter. It can also be seen from the table that reported clinic and reported time were different from those recorded for 0.3 percent of the tubectomy clients and 0.4 percent of the vasectomy clients. The clients who reported that they had been sterilized twice -- once within the quarter and once before the quarter -- were all vasectomy clients. Thus the proportion of actually sterilized clients was found to be 99.2 percent for tubectomy and 96.3 percent for vasectomy. The subsequent section deals with those actually sterilized clients only.

#### 4.4. 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 USAID-approved informed consent form had been filled in for each sterilized selected 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 Record Verifiers from the office records of the selected upazilas. The information obtained is presented in two separate tables - Table-7(a) and Table-7(b). In Table-7(a) all the selected clients are included but in Table-7(b) only the actually sterilized clients are covered. The first table gives an overall picture of use of USAID-approved informed consent forms. The purpose of the second table is to see whether, for each of the actually sterilized clients, a USAID-approved informed consent form was properly maintained.

According to Tables 7(a) and 7(b), it was found that 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.

These tables reveal no significant difference between the corresponding findings. 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 93.3 percent while it was 94.0 percent when only the actually sterilized clients were considered. Not USAID-approved and no consent form groups constituted about 5.0 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.

#### 4.5. 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 8 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, 99.9 percent of the tubectomy clients and 91.9 percent of the vasectomy clients reported receipt of the surgical apparel. When use of USAID-approved informed consent form was considered, 96.3 percent of the tubectomy clients and 84.3 percent of the vasectomy clients reported receipt of surgical apparel and had also signed the USAID-approved informed consent forms.

Table-7(a): 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	96.4	89.1	93.3
Not signed by clients	1.2	2.9	1.9
<u>Not USAID - approved</u>			
Signed by clients	1.1	3.5	2.1
Not signed by clients	-	-	-
<u>No informed consent form</u>	1.3	4.5	2.7
<hr/>			
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	833	624	1457

Table-7 (b): 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	96.4	90.0	94.0
Not signed by clients	1.2	2.6	1.7
<u>Not USAID - approved</u>			
Signed by clients	0.9	4.1	2.2
Not signed by clients	-	-	-
<u>No consent form</u>	1.5	3.3	2.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.1 <sup>a</sup>
N <sup>1</sup>	749	459	1208

<sup>a</sup>Percentage total is larger than 100 percent due to rounding error.

<sup>1</sup>Of 755 interviewed tubectomy clients, 6 were determined to be false (Table-6); of 477 interviewed vasectomy clients, 18 were determined to be false.

Table-8: 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		All
		Tubectomy	Vasectomy	
USAID-approved informed consent forms signed by client	Received	96.3	84.3	91.7
	Did not receive	0.1	5.7	2.2
Sub-total		96.4	90.0	94.0 <sup>a</sup>
Informed consent form not USAID-approved/informed consent form USAID-approved but not signed by clients/ no consent form	Received	3.6	7.6	5.1
	Did not receive	-	2.4	0.9
Sub-total		3.6	10.0	6.0
All	Received	99.9	91.9	96.8
	Did not receive	0.1	8.1	3.1
Total		100.0	100.0	99.9 <sup>b</sup>
N		749	459	1208

<sup>a</sup>Percentage sub-total does not add to 94.0 percent due to rounding error.

<sup>b</sup>Percentage total is less than 100 percent due to rounding error.

#### 4.6. Payment verification:

The interviewed sterilized clients were asked questions about payments that they 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-9 shows the distribution of actually sterilized tubectomy clients by amounts that they reported to have received. Of the tubectomy clients, 92.0 percent reported that they had received the approved amount of Tk.175/-. The remaining 8.0 percent clients reported receiving less than the approved amount. Since these clients reported receiving less than the approved amount they were asked further questions whether they had received any facility or not. Of the 8.0 percent of the clients, 3.1 percentage points were accounted for by clients who reported receiving facility from the clinic while the remaining 4.9 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 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

Table-9: Distribution of actually sterilized tubectomy clients by amount reportedly received

Amount reportedly received in Taka	Number of clients		
	All	Received any facility	Received no facility
175.00	689	NA	NA
170.00	30	4	26
165.00	1	-	1
164.00	1	-	1
160.00	12	6	6
155.00	2	2	-
150.00	3	3	-
140.00	3	2	1
134.00	1	1	-
130.00	1	1	-
125.00	1	1	-
120.00	1	1	-
100.00	1	-	1
90.00	1	1	-
55.00	1	-	1
No payment	1	1	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>749</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>37</b>

Reported average amount : Tk.173.38

Estimated average amount considering the 'received any facility' category received the approved amount: Tk. 174.37

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

from the clinic. Thus the average amount for the first category is Tk. 173.38 and that for the second category is Tk.174.37.

Similarly, Table-10 shows the distribution of actually sterilized vasectomy clients by amounts that they reported to have received. Of the vasectomy clients, 93.5 percent reported that they had received the approved amount of Tk.175/-. The remaining 6.5 percent of the clients reported receiving less than the approved amount. Of the 6.5 percent clients, 0.7 percentage points were accounted for by clients who reported receiving facility from the clinic while the remaining 5.8 percentage points were accounted for by clients who 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 were found to be Tk.172.46 and that for all clients excluding those who had reported receiving less than approved amount and also no facility, were found to be Tk.175.55.

#### 4.7. 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-11 shows the distribution of actually sterilized tubectomy clients by their reported and recorded referrers. Out of 749 interviewed tubectomy clients the recorded referrers and reported referrers were found to be the same for 625 clients (83.4 percent). According to clinic records, the highest number of clients (382) were referred by family planning workers followed by Dais (220 clients). Members

Table-10: Distribution of actually sterilized vasectomy clients by amount reportedly received

Amount reportedly received in Taka	Number of clients		
	All	Received any facility	Received no facility
175.00	429	NA	NA
172.00	1	1	-
170.00	8	-	8
165.00	1	-	1
160.00	3	1	2
155.00	1	-	1
150.00	3	1	2
140.00	1	-	1
130.00	1	-	1
125.00	2	-	2
100.00	4	-	4
90.00	1	-	1
80.00	1	-	1
75.00	2	-	2
60.00	1	-	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>27</b>

Reported average amount: Tk.172.46

Estimated average amount considering the 'received any facility' category received the approved amount: Tk.172.55

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

of general public referred 147 clients to clinics for sterilization. On the other hand, information reported by clients reveal some discrepancy in the referrers. A total of 124 clients reported that they went to clinics with somebody other than the recorded referrer. Client interviews reveal that 11 clients went alone to clinics and were not referred by anybody, while the clinics recorded family planning workers as referrers of 3 clients, Dais as referrers of 4 clients and general public as referrers of another 4 clients.

Similar distribution of vasectomy clients is shown in Table-12. Out of 459 clients a total of 341 clients (74.3 percent) reported that they went for sterilization operation with their recorded referrers. The remaining 118 clients (25.7 percent) were found not to have gone with their recorded referrers. Of them, 51 mentioned that they went alone, 7 mentioned that they did not know the referrers as their referrers. It is evident from the table that the highest number of clients were referred by members of the general public followed by Dais and family planning workers.

#### 4.8. Demographic characteristics:

Demographic characteristics as obtained in the survey are very limited since the survey attempted to collect only selected demographic information. Data were collected from the interviewed clients only on age and living children. These were collected by asking very specific and simple questions to the clients. The findings on reported age of clients and spouse and on reported number of living children are discussed below. The findings will cover the actually sterilized clients only. Clients selected in the sample but subsequently not found to be sterilized have been excluded from the analysis.

Table-11: Distribution of actually sterilized tubectomy clients by recorded and reported referrers

Recorded referrer	Reported referrer					All
	FP worker	Dai	General public	Did not know the referrer	Went alone	
FP worker	314	13	49	3	3	382
Dai	3	172	38	3	4	220
General public	1	-	139	3	4	147
Did not know the referrer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Went alone	-	-	-	-	-	-
All	318	185	226	9	11	749

Table-12: Distribution of actually sterilized vasectomy clients by recorded and reported referrers

Recorded referrer	Reported referrer					All
	FP worker	Dai	General public	Did not know the referrer	Went alone	
FP worker	73	1	13	2	11	100
Dai	3	99	40	2	23	167
General public	3	-	169	3	17	192
Did not know the referrer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Went alone	-	-	-	-	-	-
All	79	100	222	7	51	459

#### 4.8.1. Age:

Table-13 shows the distribution of actually sterilized tubectomy clients by reported age of the client and that of their husband. It can be seen from the table that all the tubectomy clients reported their husbands' age either higher or equal to their own age except only one client who reported her age to be more than that of her husband. It can also be seen from the table that 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 age of the clients and their husbands were 29.9 years and 39.5 years respectively.

The distribution of actually sterilized vasectomy clients by their reported age and that of their wives is shown in Table-14. As the table shows, vasectomy clients were comparatively older. The mean age of vasectomy client was 43.7 years and that of their wives was 32.7 years. It can be seen from the table that there were 8 vasectomy clients whose wives were no longer in the reproductive age group.

#### 4.8.2. Number of living children:

Table-15 shows the distribution of actually sterilized clients by reported number of living children. The mean number of living children for tubectomy clients was 4.0 while for vasectomy clients it was 4.1. The proportion of clients having less than two children for tubectomy was 2.9 percent and for vasectomy, it was 4.1 percent.

Table-13: Distribution of actually sterilized tubectomy clients by reported age of client and husband

Age group of client (in years)	Age group of husband (in years)								Not reported	Total
	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50+		
15-19	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
20-24	-	-	13	33	21	9	3	1	-	80
25-29	-	-	1	85	135	52	13	9	-	295
30-34	-	-	-	1	69	125	46	6	-	247
35-39	-	-	-	1	31	36	33	1	-	102
40-44	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	17	-	20
45-49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2
50+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
<b>Total</b>	-	2	14	120	256	222	98	37	-	749

Table-14: Distribution of actually sterilized vasectomy clients by reported age of client and wife

Age group of client (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	Not reported	
15-19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20-24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25-29	2	14	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	17
30-34	-	17	31	-	-	-	-	-	-	48
35-39	-	4	71	13	2	-	-	-	-	90
40-44	-	3	17	59	23	1	-	-	-	103
45-49	-	-	2	36	51	5	-	-	-	94
50-54	-	-	1	9	19	23	1	-	-	53
55-59	-	1	2	2	4	14	5	1	-	29
60-64	-	-	1	-	2	3	8	4	-	18
65-69	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	1	6
70-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>459</b>

Table-15: Distribution of actually sterilized clients by reported number of living children

Reported number of living children	Categories of clients	
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy
0	2	3
1	20	16
2	126	70
3	192	102
4	161	92
5	102	79
6	77	52
7	40	26
8	20	13
9	7	5
10	1	1
11	1	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>749</b>	<b>459</b>

RESULTS OF SERVICE PROVIDERS/REFERRERS INTERVIEW

5.1. 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 366 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 were not the same. In all 121 physicians, 120 clinic staff, and 279 referrers were included in the sample. The sample selection procedure has already been discussed in the Methodology Section (2.1.3.).

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. The questionnaires for the service providers/referrers are given in Appendix-B.

Among the selected physicians, clinic staff, and referrers, interviews were conducted with 74.4 percent of the physicians, 84.2 percent of the clinic staff, and 77.1 percent of the referrers. The remaining 25.6 percent physicians, 15.8 percent clinic staff, and 22.9 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-16: Percentage distribution of service providers/ referrers by status of interview

Interview status	Categories of service providers/referrers		
	Physicians	Clinic staff	Referrers
Interviewed	74.4	84.2	77.1
Not interviewed	25.6	15.8	22.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	121	120	279

5.2. 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.

Payments to referrers: Table-17 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 167 tubectomy clients and 99 vasectomy clients. The referrers reported not to have received the referral fees for the remaining 7 tubectomy clients and 20 vasectomy clients.

Table-17: 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	167	99	266
Did not receive	7	20	27
Total	174	119	293

39

Section - 6

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.

6.1. Clinic performance data:

The clinic performance data refer only to BDG performance data recorded in the clinic register. These data were collected by the Record Verifier by using Form-A2 (shown in Appendix-B) from each sample upazila. These BDG performance data are hereinafter referred to as 'verified BDG performance data'.

6.2. 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 by the FP Officer of the upazila.

6.3. NGO performance data:

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

#### 6.4. 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.

#### 6.5. 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-18 shows the total performances as reported in the MMCP and in the MMPR for the 1984 October-December quarter. It can be seen from the table that there were no differences between these two data sources with respect to the total performance of vasectomy and tubectomy. 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.

Table-18: Total national performance according to the MMCP (MIS Monthly Computer Printout) and the MMPR (MIS Monthly Performance Report) for the quarter October-December, 1984

MIS reports	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
MMCP	79,946	84,760	164,706
MMPR	79,946	84,760	164,706

6.6. 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-19 and Table-20 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-21 which shows the levels of overall reporting discrepancy.

Table-21 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 9.6 percent higher than the verified BDG performance data, 1.1 percent higher in the upazila, and 10.7 percent higher in the district reports in comparison to the verified BDG performance data. In the case of vasectomy, the MIS reported data in the MMCP were 8.4 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-21, overall, BDG performance data in the MIS computer printout were over-reported for both tubectomy and vasectomy. The reason for this overreporting can be analysed with the help of Tables 19 and 20. The tables show for most of the upazilas there was no discrepancy among the different data sets. Only in case of some upazilas, such as Singra of Natore district, there were big differences. The difference was due to inclusion of NGO performance data and/or inclusion of cases done in other upazilas while reporting. This had been done by some of the upazilas and also by some districts, namely, Khulna and Bagerhat. 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 (October-December, 1984).

Table-19: 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 upazilas<sup>1</sup>

Upazilas <sup>2</sup>	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>							
Kaharole	84	84	84	84	0	0	0
Sadar	352	352	352	352	0	0	0
Nawabgonj	75	75	75	75	0	0	0
<u>Thakurgaon</u>							
Sadar	148	148	148	148	0	0	0
<u>Nilphamari</u>							
Jaldhaka*	60	60	60	60	0	0	0
Kishoregonj*	232	232	232	232	0	0	0
<u>Rangpur</u>							
Badargonj*	153	153	153	153	0	0	0
<u>Kurigram</u>							
Ulipur*	66	66	66	66	0	0	0
<u>Gaibandha</u>							
Palashbari*	99	99	99	99	0	0	0
<u>Lalmonirhat</u>							
Patgram*	119	119	119	119	0	0	0

43

Upazilas <sup>2</sup>	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>							
Sadar*	34	34	33	33	0	-1	-1
<u>Naogaon</u>							
Sadar*	146	146	146	146	0	0	0
<u>Rajshahi</u>							
Bagmara	218	218	219	219	0	+1	+1
<u>Natore</u>							
Singra*	141	195	243	243	+54	+102	+102
<u>Kushtia</u>							
Bheramara	78	78	78	78	0	0	0
<u>Magura</u>							
Sadar	251	251	251	251	0	0	0
<u>Narail</u>							
Lohagora	264	264	264	264	0	0	0
<u>Jessore</u>							
Keshobpur	73	73	73	73	0	0	0
<u>Khulna</u>							
Daulatpur*	54	54	316	316	0	+262	+262
Dumuria*	21	21	399	399	0	+378	+378
Batiaghata*	3	3	77	77	0	+74	+74

Upazilas <sup>2</sup>	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>Bagerhat</u>							
Fakirhat	31	31	105	105	0	+74	+74
Rampal	169	169	227	227	0	+58	+58
<u>Satkhira</u>							
Tala	135	135	136	136	0	+1	+1
<u>Barguna</u>							
Bamna	158	158	157	157	0	-1	-1
Betagi	246	246	246	246	0	0	0
<u>Patuakhali</u>							
Sadar	1068	1068	1064	1064	0	-4	-4
Kalapara	307	307	307	307	0	0	0
Golachipa	337	337	332	332	0	-5	-5
<u>Barisal</u>							
Sadar*	301	301	301	301	0	0	0
Bakergonj*	952	952	952	952	0	0	0
<u>Bhola</u>							
Daulatkhan*	82	134	134	134	+52	+52	+52
<u>Pirojpur</u>							
Nazirpur*	167	167	165	165	0	-2	-2
<u>Gopalganj</u>							
Muksudpur	424	424	424	424	0	0	0

Upazilas <sup>2</sup>	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>Madaripur</u>							
Sadar	218	218	218	207	0	0	-11
<u>Faridpur</u>							
Nagarkanda	469	469	469	469	0	0	0
<u>Dhaka</u>							
Nawabgonj	292	292	292	206	0	0	-86
<u>Munshigonj</u>							
Sadar	160	160	160	160	0	0	0
<u>Manikgonj</u>							
Sadar	404	404	404	404	0	0	0
<u>Tangail</u>							
Modhupur	190	190	190	190	0	0	0
<u>Sherpur</u>							
Nalitabari	132	132	132	122	0	0	-10
<u>Mymensingh</u>							
Bhaluka	167	167	167	167	0	0	0
Haluaghat	192	192	227	227	0	+35	+35
<u>Netrokona</u>							
Atpara*	70	70	70	70	0	0	0

Upazilas <sup>2</sup>	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>Sylhet</u>							
Kanaighat	14	14	14	14	0	0	0
<u>Sunamgonj</u>							
Dowar Bazar	24	24	20	20	0	-4	-4
<u>Comilla</u>							
Muradnagar	232	232	232	232	0	0	0
<u>Feni</u>							
Sadar	219	219	181	181	0	-38	-38
<u>Chittagong</u>							
Sitakunda	61	61	138	138	0	+77	+77
<b>Total</b>	<b>9892</b>	<b>9998</b>	<b>10951</b>	<b>10844</b>			
Total cases overreported					+106	+1114	+1114
Total cases underreported					-	- 55	-162
<b>Balance</b>					<b>+106</b>	<b>+1059</b>	<b>+ 952</b>

<sup>1</sup>Upazila marked by asterisk shows two months' performance and those without asterisk shows three months' performance.

<sup>2</sup>Performance reports of Pabna district were not given to the interviewing team as such comparison for Chatmohor upazila is not shown in the table.

Table-20: 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 upazilas<sup>1</sup>

Upazilas <sup>2</sup>	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>							
Kaharole	80	80	80	80	0	0	0
Sadar	1676	1676	1676	1676	0	0	0
Nawabgonj	313	313	313	313	0	0	0
<u>Thakurgaon</u>							
Sadar	1891	1891	1891	1891	0	0	0
<u>Nilphamari</u>							
Jaldhaka*	67	67	67	67	0	0	0
Kishoregonj*	208	208	208	208	0	0	0
<u>Rangpur</u>							
Badargonj*	540	540	540	540	0	0	0
<u>Kurigram</u>							
Ulipur*	221	221	221	221	0	0	0
<u>Gaibandha</u>							
Palashbari*	534	534	534	534	0	0	0
<u>Lalmonirhat</u>							
Patgram*	234	234	234	234	0	0	0

Upazilas <sup>2</sup>	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>							
Sadar*	384	384	385	385	0	+1	+1
<u>Naogaon</u>							
Sadar*	270	270	270	270	0	0	0
<u>Rajshahi</u>							
Bagmara	106	106	109	109	0	+3	+3
<u>Natore</u>							
Singra*	182	294	414	414	+112	+232	+232
<u>Kushtia</u>							
Bheramara	2	2	2	2	0	0	0
<u>Magura</u>							
Sadar	356	356	356	356	0	0	0
<u>Narail</u>							
Lohagara	107	107	107	107	0	0	0
<u>Jessore</u>							
Keshobpur	199	199	199	199	0	0	0
<u>Khulna</u>							
Daulatpur*	185	185	592	592	0	+407	+407
Dumuria*	113	113	348	348	0	+235	+235
Batiaghata*	227	227	278	278	0	+ 51	+ 51

Upazilas <sup>2</sup>	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>Bagerhat</u>							
Fakirhat	601	601	642	642	0	+41	+41
Rampal	852	852	890	890	0	+38	+38
<u>Satkhira</u>							
Tala	38	38	37	37	0	-1	-1
<u>Barguna</u>							
Bamna	223	223	224	224	0	+1	+1
Betagi	237	237	237	237	0	0	0
<u>Patuakhali</u>							
Sadar	931	931	931	931	0	0	0
Kolapara	292	292	292	292	0	0	0
Golachipa	261	261	266	266	0	+5	+5
<u>Barisal</u>							
Sadar*	325	325	325	325	0	0	0
Bakergonj*	1240	1240	1240	1240	0	0	0
<u>Bhola</u>							
Daulatkhan*	120	120	254	254	0	+134	+134
<u>Pirojpur</u>							
Nazirpur*	148	148	150	150	0	+2	+2
<u>Gopalganj</u>							
Muksudpur	8	8	8	8	0	0	0

Upazilas <sup>2</sup>	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>Madaripur</u>							
Sadar	15	15	15	15	0	0	0
<u>Faridpur</u>							
Nagarkanda	503	503	503	503	0	0	0
<u>Dhaka</u>							
Nawabgonj	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Munshigonj</u>							
Sadar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Manikgonj</u>							
Sadar	31	31	31	31	0	0	0
<u>Tangail</u>							
Modhupur	24	24	24	24	0	0	0
<u>Sherpur</u>							
Nalitabari	103	103	103	113	0	0	+10
<u>Mymensingh</u>							
Bhaluka	584	584	584	584	0	0	0
Haluaghat	264	264	286	286	0	+22	+22
<u>Netrokona</u>							
Atpara*	52	52	52	52	0	0	0

Upazilas <sup>2</sup>	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>Sylhet</u>							
Kanaighat	46	46	46	46	0	0	0
<u>Sunamgonj</u>							
Dowar Bazar	24	24	27	27	0	+3	+3
<u>Comilla</u>							
Muradnagar	76	76	76	76	0	0	0
<u>Feni</u>							
Sadar	4	4	4	4	0	0	0
<u>Chittagong</u>							
Sitakunda	27	27	96	96	0	+69	+69
Total	14924	15036	16167	16177			
Total cases overreported					+112	+1244	+1254
Total cases underreported					-	-1	-1
Balance					+112	+1243	+1253

<sup>1</sup>Upazila marked by asterisk shows two months' performance and those without asterisk shows three months' performance.

<sup>2</sup>Performance reports of Pabna district were not given to the interviewing team as such comparison for Chatmohor upazila is not shown in the table.

Table-21: 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 1984 October-December quarter<sup>1</sup>

Reporting differences	Categories of clients	
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy
Verified BDG performance data for the selected upazilas - i.e., collected at the upazilas	9,892	14,924
Performance for the selected upazilas according to MMCP	10,844	16,177
Difference between verified BDG performance data and upazila reported data (net of underreporting and overreporting) <sup>2</sup>	+106 (1.1)	+112 (0.8)
Difference between verified BDG performance data and district reported data (net of underreporting and overreporting) <sup>3</sup>	+1059 (10.7)	+1243 (8.3)
Difference between verified BDG performance data and MIS reported data in the MMCP (net of underreporting and overreporting) <sup>4</sup>	+952 (9.6)	+1253 (8.4)

<sup>1</sup> Figures in the brackets are the percentage of the verified BDG performance data.

<sup>2</sup> From balance, column 6 in Tables 19 and 20.

<sup>3</sup> From balance, column 7 in Tables 19 and 20.

<sup>4</sup> From balance, column 8 in Tables 19 and 20.

6.7. 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 size

$m_i$  = 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:

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

where  $N$  = total number of program upazilas<sup>1</sup> = 497

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

The results of the computation are displayed in Table-22. As can be seen from the table, the ratio of the verified BDG performance data to MMCP data for the BDG component was 91.2 per 100 MIS reported tubectomy cases, while for vasectomy, it was 87.7. The standard errors of the estimate as found by using formula (2) are 0.073 and 0.121 respectively.

---

<sup>1</sup>Program upazilas were those that were listed in the MMCP during the quarter, July-September, 1984.

Table-22: Estimates of BDG component ratios of the verified BDG performance data and MIS data in the MMCP

Estimates	Categories of clients	
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy
Ratio <sup>1</sup>	91.2	92.3
Standard errors	0.073	0.121

<sup>1</sup>Verified BDG performance data/BDG data in the MMCP

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

Table-23 shows, by tubectomy and vasectomy for the reporting quarter (October-December, 1984), the reported and estimated sterilization performances for the national, the BDG, and the NGO program separately, as derived from the MMCP, the MMRP, 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-23 that the estimated actual BDG performance during the reporting quarter was 59,163 cases of tubectomy and 57,099 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 (October-December, 1984) by 5,709 cases of tubectomy and 4,763 cases of vasectomy.

The other programs' (all NGOs) performance for the reporting quarter, as indicated in the MMCP, was 15,074 cases of tubectomy and 22,898 cases of vasectomy (line 6, Table-23). The performance of major NGOs alone during the reporting quarter as obtained from the annex of the MMPR was 14,330 cases of tubectomy and 22,235 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 performance, found from the annex of the MMPR for the reporting quarter is shown in the second line of Table-23. As can be seen from Table-23, 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 to the MMPR). For tubectomy, the difference was 744 cases (15,074-14,330) and for vasectomy, the difference was 663 cases (22,898-22,235). As such, the differences of 744 cases of tubectomy and 663 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-23 shows the basis for adjustment of MMPR to obtain the actual NGO performance. The ratio confirms that 5.2 percent of tubectomy and 3.0 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 744 cases (65,616-64,872) and

in the case of vasectomy, the difference was for 663 cases (62,525-61,862) which was just equal to the performance of the local NGOs.

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-23 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 9.8 percent for tubectomy and 8.7 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 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-23 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 7.1 percent in the case of tubectomy; while for vasectomy, it was 5.6 percent.

Table-23: Reported, estimated national, BDG, NGO performances  
as derived from different sources

Performances	Categories of clients	
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy
1. National performances as reported by MMPR = $Z_1$	79,946	84,760
2. Performance of major NGOs in the MMPR (from annex) = $Z_2$	14,330	22,235
3. Estimate of BDG performance in the MMPR = $Z_3 = Z_1 - Z_2$	65,616	62,525
4. National performance in the MMCP = $Z_4$	79,946	84,760
5. BDG performance in the MMCP = $Z_5$	64,872	61,862
6. Other programs (all NGOs) performances in the MMCP = $Z_6$	15,074	22,898
7. Verified BDG performance collected at the selected upazilas = $Z_7$	9,892	14,924
8. Performance for the selected upazilas according to MMCP = $Z_8$	10,844	16,177
9. Estimated BDG component ratio based on verified BDG clinic performance data and MIS data in the MMCP = $Z_9 = Z_7 / Z_8$	0.912	0.923
10. Estimated actual BDG performance based on estimated BDG component ratio = $Z_{10} = Z_5 \times Z_9$	59,163	57,099
11. Estimated actual national performance = $Z_{11} = Z_6 + Z_{10}$	74,237	79,997
12. Proportion of actual BDG performance in the MMPR = $Z_{12} = Z_{10} / Z_3$	0.902	0.913
13. Basis for adjustment of MMPR to obtain actual NGO performance = $Z_{13} = Z_6 / Z_2$	1.052	1.030
14. Basis for adjustment of MMPR to obtain actual national performance = $Z_{14} = Z_{11} / Z_1$	0.929	0.944
-----		
15. Overreporting (+)/underreporting (-) of performance in the MMPR:		
i. BDG performance ( $1 - Z_{12}$ )	+ 0.098	+ 0.087
ii. NGO performance ( $1 - Z_{13}$ )	- 0.052	- 0.030
iii. National performance ( $1 - Z_{14}$ )	+ 0.071	+ 0.056

In addition, the interviewing teams also collected the NGO performance reports from the UFPO and from the district by using form A 2. The NGO performance data were also collected directly from the NGO offices of the selected upazilas. The NGO clinics were found functioning in 8 of the 50 selected upazilas. The list of the NGOs by selected upazilas are shown in Table - 24.

Table - 24: Distribution of the NGOs by selected upazilas

Upazilas	Name of NGOs			
	BAVS	FPAB	CHCP	Others
<u>Dinajpur</u>				
Sadar	x	x		
<u>Manikganj</u>				
Sadar				x
<u>Naogoan</u>				
Sadar	x			
<u>Kurigram</u>				
Ulipur	x			x
<u>Mymensingh</u>				
Haluaghat			x	
<u>Bogra</u>				
Sadar	x	x		
<u>Barisal</u>				
Sadar	x	x		
<u>Patuakhali</u>				
Sadar		x		

The data collected were presented separately for tubectomy and for vasectomy in Table - 25 and Table - 26 respectively, to ascertain whether the BDG performance had been inflated by inclusion of the NGO data. Columns 11 and 12 of Tables 25 and 26 show the difference between the district reported BDG performance and the verified BDG performance, and the difference between the district reported NGO performance and that collected from the NGO offices respectively.

It can be seen from the tables that the NGO performances were properly shown in all the performance reports filed by upazila and districts except in case of 2 upazilas which were Haluaghat of Mymensingh district and Sadar of Manikgonj district. The NGO performances were overreported by 2 vasectomy cases in Haluaghat and underreported by 13 vasectomy cases in Manikgonj Sadar. It appears from the table that the NGO performances were double counted in the case of tubectomy and vasectomy in the reported district performance report of Mymensingh.

The upazila reported NGO performances are shown in Column-5 of Tables 25 and 26. Evidently, there are discrepancies between the upazila reported NGO performance (Column-5) and the NGO performance collected by the interviewing teams from the NGOs (Column-3) for the same upazila. These discrepancies are partially due to the fact that the upazila reported NGO performances refer only to the clients residing in the said upazila, while the NGOs report the total performance done in their clinics in that upazila irrespective of the fact that some of the clients might be residing outside the said upazila.

Table-25 : Comparison between BDG and NGO tubectomy performance statistics by sample upazilas

Upazilas	Verified BDG performance	NGO performance collected from the NGOs	Upazila reported performance			District reported performance			BDG performance in the MMCP	Difference between district reported performance and verified BDG performance	
			BDG	NGO	Total	BDG	NGO	Total		BDG	NGO
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)=(7)-(2)	(12)=(8)-(3)
<u>Dinajpur</u>											
Sadar	352	290	352	290	642	352	290	642	352	0	0
<u>Barisal</u>											
Sadar*	301	585	301	585	886	301	585	886	301	0	0
<u>Mymensingh</u>											
Haluaghat	192	34	192	34	226	227	34	261	227	+35	0
<u>Manikganj</u>											
Sadar	404	276	404	276	680	404	276	680	404	0	0
<u>Patuakhali</u>											
Sadar	1068	1018	1068	-	1068	1064	1018	2082	1064	-4	0
<u>Bogra</u>											
Sadar*	34	57	34	-	34	33	57	90	33	-1	0
<u>Kurigram</u>											
Ulipur*	66	0	66	-	66	66	0	66	66	0	0
<u>Naogaon</u>											
Sadar*	146	97	146	-	146	146	97	243	146	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2563</b>	<b>2357</b>	<b>2563</b>	<b>1185</b>	<b>3748</b>	<b>2593</b>	<b>2357</b>	<b>4950</b>	<b>2593</b>		
Total cases of NGO performance included in the BDG performance										+35	
Total BDG performance underreported										-5	
Total NGO performance overreported											-
Total NGO performance underreported											-

<sup>1</sup>Upazilas marked by single asterisk show two months' performance and those without asterisk show three months' performance.

Table-26 : Comparison between BDG and NGO vasectomy performance statistics by sample upazilas

Upazilas	Verified BDG performance	NGO performance collected from the NGOs	Upazila reported performance			District reported performance			BDG performance in the MMCP	Difference between district reported performance and verified BDG performance	
			BDG	NGO	Total	BDG	NGO	Total		BDG	NGO
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)=(7)-(2)	(12)=(8)-(3)
<u>Dinajpur</u> Sadar	1676	519	1676	519	2195	1676	519	2195	1676	0	0
<u>Barisal</u> Sadar*	325	561	325	561	886	325	561	886	325	0	0
<u>Mymensingh</u> Haluaghat	264	18	264	20	284	286	20	306	286	+22	+2
<u>Manikganj</u> Sadar	31	55	31	18	49	31	42	73	31	0	-13
<u>Patuakhali</u> Sadar	931	1098	931	-	931	931	1098	931	931	0	0
<u>Bogra</u> Sadar*	384	175	384	-	384	385	175	560	385	+1	0
<u>Kurigram</u> Ulipur*	221	12	221	-	221	221	12	233	221	0	0
<u>Naogoan</u> Sadar*	270	55	270	-	270	270	55	325	270	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>4102</b>	<b>2493</b>	<b>4102</b>	<b>1118</b>	<b>5220</b>	<b>4125</b>	<b>2482</b>	<b>5509</b>	<b>4125</b>		
Total cases of NGO performance included in the BDG performance										+23	
Total BDG performance underreported										-	
Total NGO performance overreported											+2
Total NGO performance underreported											-13

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

Section - 7

## FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

7.1. Estimated overreporting/underreporting of performances in the MMPR of MIS reported data:

NGO performance: The evaluation findings show that the total NGO performance in the MMPR has been underreported by an estimated 5.2 percent, in the case of tubectomy and 3.0 percent in the case of vasectomy.

BDG performance: The overreporting of total BDG performance in the MMPR is estimated at 9.8 percent for tubectomy, and 8.7 percent for vasectomy.

National performance: The overreporting of total national performance in the MMPR is estimated at 7.1 percent in the case of tubectomy, while for vasectomy, the overreporting is 5.6 percent.

7.2. Estimated proportion of clients actually sterilized:

Tubectomy: The interview of the tubectomy clients revealed 1 client who was not sterilized, 3 clients who were sterilized before the quarter in the recorded clinic, and 2 clients who were sterilized before the quarter in other than the recorded clinic. Four 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 10/833 or 1.2 percent.

The standard error<sup>1</sup> of the estimate is 0.0103. Thus, the proportion actually tubectomised is estimated at 98.8 percent of the upazila level data.

Vasectomy: Among the interviewed vasectomy clients, 2 were found to be not sterilized, 37 clients were 'address not found' cases, 4 clients were sterilized within the quarter but in other than the recorded clinic, 7 clients were sterilized before the quarter in the recorded clinic, 2 clients were sterilized before the quarter in other than the recorded clinic, and 3 clients were sterilized twice. It is thus found that the number of false cases among the 624 vasectomy clients in the sample was 55 or 8.8 percent. The standard error<sup>1</sup> of the estimate is 0.027. So, the proportion actually sterilized is estimated at 91.2 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.

7.3. 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 of clients who had signed or put thumb impression on the USAID approved informed consent form is estimated at 96.4 percent, while for vasectomy, it is 90.0 percent.

7.4. Estimated average amount paid to clients actually sterilized:

While calculating the average amount paid to the actually sterilized clients, referred to sub-section 7.2 above, those

---

<sup>1</sup>The formula used for the calculation of the standard error is  $V(P) = (1-f) \frac{S^2}{a}$

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. 174.37 for tubectomy clients and Tk.172.55 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.

7.5. 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 99.9 percent, while for vasectomy, it is 91.9 percent.

7.6. Estimated proportion of actual referrers:

Estimation of these statistics is based on the clients survey data. Accordingly, it is estimated that 83.4 percent of tubectomy clients and 74.3 percent of vasectomy clients had actual referrers, that is, both the recorded referrer and the reported referrer were the same.

7.7. 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 were reported to have received fees of the approved amount for each of the sterilized clients.

The interviewed referrers of 96.0 percent tubectomy clients and 83.2 percent vasectomy clients were reported to have received referral fees of the approved amount.

Comparison of the key findings from the current quarter evaluation with those from the audit/evaluation of the previous quarters are shown in Table-27. It may be noted that the findings relate only to the surveys excluding the audit results.

Table-27: Comparison of the key findings from the current quarter evaluation with those from the audits/evaluations of the previous quarters.

Findings	P R E V I O U S   Q U A R T E R S						Current Quarter Oct.-December 1984
	April-June 1983	July-Sept. 1983	Oct.-Dec. 1983	January-March 1984	April-June 1984	July-Sept. 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

<sup>a</sup>Data were not collected for the quarter.

67

Findings	P R E V I O U S   Q U A R T E R S						Current Quarter Oct.-December 1984
	April-June 1983	July-Sept. 1983	Oct.-Dec. 1983	January-March 1984	April-June 1984	July-Sept. 1984	
4. Estimated average amount paid to service providers/referrers:							
Tubectomy	Tk.38.00	Tk.38.00	Tk.38.00; & Tk.50.00 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 Tk.47.00 (enhanced rate)	Tk.47.00	Tk.47.00	Tk.47.00	Tk.47.00
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%





Findings	P R E V I O U S   Q U A R T E R S						Current Quarter Oct.-December 1984
	April-June 1983	July-Sept. 1983	Oct.-Dec. 1983	January-March 1984	April-June 1984	July-Sept. 1984	
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

Findings	P R E V I O U S   Q U A R T E R S						Current Quarter Oct.-December 1984
	April-June 1983	July-Sept. 1983	Oct.-Dec. 1983	January-March 1984	April-June 1984	July-Sept. 1984	
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
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%

Findings	P R E V I O U S   Q U A R T E R S						Current Quarter Oct.-December 1984
	April-June 1983	July-Sept. 1983	Oct.-Dec. 1983	January-March 1984	April-June 1984	July-Sept. 1984	

16. Proportion of clients referred by (clinic record data)<sup>1</sup>:

Tubectomy

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%

Vasectomy

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%

17. Proportion of clients referred by (survey data)<sup>2</sup>:

Tubectomy

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%

Vasectomy

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%

<sup>1</sup> Dai payments were introduced in July 1983 and general public payments in mid August 1983.

<sup>2</sup> Tables were not prepared for first three quarters.

Table-1: Distribution of the sterilized clients in selected upazilas by audits/evaluations and their recorded residence<sup>1</sup>

Recorded residence of clients	Audit/evaluation quarters							Overall
	April-June quarter, 1983	July-Sept. quarter, 1983	Oct.-Dec. quarter, 1983	Jan.-March quarter, 1984	April-June quarter, 1984	July-Sept. quarter, 1984	Oct.-Dec. quarter, 1984	
Within the upazila	6983 (81.6)	6494 (88.0)	17602 (82.6)	17859 (73.3)	12521 (76.9)	17463 (75.3)	17396 (72.3)	96318 (77.0)
Outside the upazila	1575 (18.4)	884 (12.0)	3699 (17.4)	6503 (26.7)	3763 (23.1)	5732 (24.7)	6663 (27.7)	28819 (23.0)

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

Table-2: Distribution of not located clients by categories  
and persons providing evidences

Person providing evidences	Tubectomy			Vasectomy			
	Address not found/ not exist	Address found but client permanently left that address	Address found but client temporarily visiting there	Address not found/ not exist	Address found but client permanently left that address	Address found but client temporarily visiting there	Incomplete address and client died
Referrer	-	-	-	7	2	-	-
FP worker	-	-	-	25	6	1	1
Ward member	4	-	-	5	-	-	-
Relative	-	-	27	-	3	2	1
Villager	-	3	1	-	3	2	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>

4

Table-3: Distribution of clients who had no informed consent forms by selected upazilas

Upazilas	Selected sample size		No informed consent form	
	Tub.	Vas.	Tub.	Vas.
<u>Pabna</u>				
Chatmohor	9	13	-	1
<u>Gaibandha</u>				
Palashbari	1	14	1	14
<u>Rangpur</u>				
Badargonj	14	23	9	13
<u>Sunamgonj</u>				
Dowar Bazar	24	24	1	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>28</b>

Table-4: Estimated proportions of clients actually sterilized by selected upazilas

Upazilas	Selected sample size <sup>1</sup>			Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the sample <sup>2,3</sup>		
	Tub.	Vas.	All	Tub.	Vas.	All
<u>Dinajpur</u>						
Kaharole	39	11	50	0.97	0.91	0.96
Sadar	2	12	14	1.00	0.83	0.86
Nowabgonj	10	28	38	1.00	0.93	0.95
<u>Thakurgaon</u>						
Sadar	2	29	31	1.00	0.79	0.81
<u>Nilphamari</u>						
Jaldhaka	11	2	13	1.00	1.00	1.00
Kishoregonj	50	25	75	0.96	0.88	0.93
<u>Rangpur</u>						
Badargonj	14	23	37	1.00	0.91	0.95
<u>Kurigram</u>						
Ulipur	24	6	30	0.92	0.33	0.80
<u>Gaibandha</u>						
Palashbari	1	14	15	1.00	0.50	0.53
<u>Lalmonirhat</u>						
Patgram	11	4	15	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Bogra</u>						
Sadar	2	11	13	1.00	0.91	0.92
<u>Naogaon</u>						
Sadar	5	7	12	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Rajshahi</u>						
Bagmara	38	26	64	1.00	0.88	0.95
<u>Natore</u>						
Singra	16	5	21	0.94	1.00	0.95

11

Table- 4 contd.

Upazilas	Selected sample size <sup>1</sup>			Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the sample <sup>2,3</sup>		
	Tub.	Vas.	All	Tub.	Vas.	All
<u>Pabna</u>						
Chatmohor	9	13	22	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Kushtia</u>						
Bheramara	38	2	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Magura</u>						
Sadar	8	3	11	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Narail</u>						
Lohagora	35	3	38	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Jessore</u>						
Keshobpur	5	4	9	1.00	0.75	0.89
<u>Khulna</u>						
Daulatpur	0	3	3	-	1.00	1.00
Dumuria	0	5	5	-	0.80	0.80
Batiaghata	2	27	29	1.00	0.96	0.97
<u>Bagerhat</u>						
Fakirhat	1	2	3	1.00	0	0.33
Rampal	1	37	38	1.00	0.95	0.95
<u>Satkhira</u>						
Tala	18	2	20	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Barguna</u>						
Bamna	14	39	53	1.00	0.92	0.94
Betagi	16	5	21	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Patuakhali</u>						
Sadar	9	3	12	1.00	1.00	1.00
Kalapara	18	5	23	1.00	1.00	1.00
Golachipa	11	0	11	1.00	-	1.00
<u>Barisal</u>						
Sadar	2	3	5	0.50	0.67	0.60
Bakergonj	11	37	48	1.00	0.92	0.94

Table- 4 contd.

Upazilas	Selected sample size <sup>1</sup>			Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the sample <sup>2,3</sup>		
	Tub.	Vas.	All	Tub.	Vas.	All
<u>Bhola</u>						
Daulatkhan	15	26	41	1.00	0.92	0.95
<u>Pirojpur</u>						
Nazirpur	7	7	14	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Gopalganj</u>						
Muksudpur	16	-	16	1.00	-	1.00
<u>Madaripur</u>						
Sadar	25	-	25	1.00	-	1.00
<u>Faridpur</u>						
Nagarkanda	20	87	107	1.00	0.99	0.99
<u>Dhaka</u>						
Nawabgonj	40	-	40	0.95	-	0.95
<u>Munshigonj</u>						
Sadar	46	-	46	0.98	-	0.98
<u>Manikgonj</u>						
Sadar	9	-	9	1.00	-	1.00
<u>Tangail</u>						
Modhupur	45	5	50	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Sherpur</u>						
Nalitabari	19	20	39	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Mymensingh</u>						
Bhaluka	10	9	19	1.00	0.89	0.95
Haluaghat	9	15	24	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Netrokona</u>						
Atpara	18	14	32	1.00	0.93	0.97
<u>Sylhet</u>						
Kanaighat	9	19	28	1.00	0.95	0.96

Table-4 contd.

Upazilas	Selected sample size <sup>1</sup>			Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the sample <sup>2,3</sup>		
	Tub.	Vas.	All	Tub.	Vas.	All
<u>Sunamgonj</u>						
Dowar Bazar	24	24	48	1.00	0.83	0.92
<u>Comilla</u>						
Muradnagar	38	1	39	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Feni</u>						
Sadar	49	-	49	1.00	-	1.00
<u>Chittagong</u>						
Sitakunda	11	1	12	1.00	1.00	1.00
Total	833	624	1457	0.988	0.912	0.955

<sup>1</sup>The client sample was drawn on the basis of the total BDG sterilization performance of the reporting quarter (October-December, 1984) excluding outside cases.

<sup>2</sup>After field survey of clients, the clients excluding address not found, not sterilized clients, operations not done in the quarter, operation not done in recorded clinic, and double operations are considered actually sterilized.

<sup>3</sup>This proportional estimate will not be used to estimate upazila performance because of the small sample. Instead the aggregated estimates will be used.

EVALUATION OF VOLUNTARY STERILIZATION PROGRAM  
 HOUSE NO. 8/13, SIR SYED AHMED ROAD  
 MOHAMMADPUR, DHAKA-7.

SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION

Quarter	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	Converted client No.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
PSU No.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	ISU No.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	Sample client No.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Name of the client : \_\_\_\_\_

Name of the spouse/father : \_\_\_\_\_

Occupation of the spouse/father : \_\_\_\_\_

Address : Village/Block \_\_\_\_\_

Union \_\_\_\_\_

Upazila \_\_\_\_\_

District \_\_\_\_\_

Registration No.

INTERVIEW INFORMATION

Interview Call	1	2	3	4
Date				
Result Codes *				

Interviewer Code

\* RESULT CODE

Completed	1	Dwelling vacant	5
No competent Respondent	2	Address not found	6
Deferred	3	Address not existing	7
Refused	4	Other (specify) .....	8

1. Reported names of the respondent and those of the respondent's father/husband.

1 Same as recorded

2 Respondents reported name is different from the recorded name of the client

(Start the interview)

3 Respondent's father's/husband's reported name is different from that recorded

4 Both names are different/could not be traced

2. Interviewer: (a) If any of the boxes containing 2 or 3 is ticked, write here reasons for interviewing the respondent and then start the interview.  
  
(b) If the box containing 4 is ticked, probe and record the reasons clearly and terminate the interview.

Reasons : \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

GENERAL VERIFICATION (G.V.) SECTION

1.1. Please tell me your name . \_\_\_\_\_

1.2. Do you have any other names ?

Yes

No

Go to Q.1.4

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Client's all other reported names

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Husband's/father's name

1.5. Does he have any other names ?

Yes

No

Go to Q.1.7

1.6. Please tell me all his names .

\_\_\_\_\_  
Husband's/father's all other names

1.7. Now I want to ask you some personal questions. Are you now using any family planning method ?

Yes

No

Go to Q.1.10a.b

97

1.8. What is the method that you are using now ?

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of the method

1.9. (Interviewer: If the method mentioned is sterilization, go to Q.1.12 and tick the box labelled sterilized)

1.10a. 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 ?

1.10b. For male respondents 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 ?

1 Heard

2 Did not hear

Go to Q.1.12 and tick the Box 'not sterilized'

1.11. Have you yourself undergone such operation ?

1 Yes

2 No

1.12.  1 Sterilized

2 Not sterilized

Go to C.V. Section

Fill in C.V. Form-I

84

CLINIC VERIFICATION (C.V.) SECTION

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

1

Knows

2

Does not know

Fill-in C.V. Form-II

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

Name : \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2.3. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

1

Sterilized in  
the recorded  
clinic

2

Sterilized in  
different clinic

Go to R.V. Section

Fill-in C.V. Form-III

45

REFERRER VERIFICATION (R.V.) SECTION

3.1. Did you go to the sterilization center alone or with somebody else ?

With somebody

Alone

Fill-in R.V. Form-II

3.2. With whom did you go ?

Name::

\_\_\_\_\_

Designation::

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3.3. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

Recorded  
referrer

Other than the  
recorded referrer

Go to T.V. Section

Fill-in R.V. Form-III

Does not know/remember  
the referrer

Fill-in R.V. Form-II

26

TIME VERIFICATION (T.V.) SECTION

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

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Month \_\_\_\_\_

Year \_\_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_\_ Ago

4.2. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

1

Within the  
quarter

2

Before the  
quarter

Go to P.V. Section

Fill-in T.V. Form-II

PAYMENT VERIFICATION (P.V.) SECTION

5.1. You have said that you underwent sterilization operation. Did you receive any money for that ?

1

Yes

2

No

Go to P.V. Form-I

5.2. How much money did you receive ? (PROBE)

\_\_\_\_\_ Amount

5.3. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

1

Received  
correct  
amount

2

Received less  
than the correct  
amount

Go to S.A.V. Section

Fill-in P.V. Form-I

3

Received more than  
the correct amount

Go to S.A.V. Section

SURGICAL APPAREL VERIFICATION (S.A.V.) SECTION

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

1

Yes

2

No

Go to I.C.F.V. Section

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

1

Yes

2

No

Go to I.C.F.V. Section

Go to I.C.F.V. Section

INFORMED CONSENT FORM VERIFICATION(I.C.F.V.) SECTION

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

1

Yes

2

No

GO to Q.7.3

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

1

Yes

2

No

Go to D.V. Section

7.3. (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 ?

1

Yes

2

No

Go to D.V. Section

Go to D.V. Section

DIRECT VERIFICATION (D.V.) SECTION

8.1. (Interviewer tick appropriate box)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Reported names are same as those recorded	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Client's reported name is different from recorded name
	Go to Q.8.8		Go to Q.8.2
<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Husband's/father's name is different from recorded name	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	Others
	Go to Q.8.3		Specify _____ _____
			Go to Q.8.2

8.2. Family planning office records show that you recorded your name as \_\_\_\_\_

Is it true ? i.e. is that correct ? plus, is that your name ?

1 Yes

2 No

Go to Q.8.8

Go to Q.8.4

8.3. Family planning record shows that you recorded your husband's/father's name as \_\_\_\_\_

Is it true ?

1 Yes

2 No

Go to Q.8.8

8.4. 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 records are true referrer's name \_\_\_\_\_.

Yes

No

Go to Q.8.5

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

---

---

---

8.6. 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

No

Go to Q.8.8

8.7. Could you tell me how much money did you receive ?

\_\_\_\_\_ Amount.

8.8. What is your age ?

\_\_\_\_\_ Age in completed years

92

8.9. What is your husband's/wife's age ?

\_\_\_\_\_ Age in completed years \_\_\_\_\_

8.10. How many children do you have ?

Total \_\_\_\_\_ Sons \_\_\_\_\_ Daughters \_\_\_\_\_

8.11. Interviewer: Check 8.4, if 'yes' is ticked, tick the sterilized box, otherwise tick the not sterilized box.

1 Sterilized       2 Not sterilized

(Terminate the interview)

8.12. Can I see the cut mark of the sterilization operation ?

1 Yes       2 No

(Request again. If disagrees, terminate the interview)

8.13. (Interviewer: make the physical verification and write the results below)

1 Sterilized       2 Not sterilized

(Terminate the interview with thanks)

C.V. Form-I: (For not sterilized clients)

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

Address of the recorded source \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

1

Yes

2

No

Fill-in R.V. Form-I

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

1

Yes

2

No

Fill-in R.V. Form-I

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2.7. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

1

Sterilized in  
the recorded  
clinic

2

Others

Fill-in R.V. Form-I

2.8. Although you are sterilized, you have mentioned earlier that you were not. Why did you not want to admit that you were sterilized ? (PROBE)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Go to R.V. Section

99

C.V. Form-II: (For reportedly sterilized client who does not know the clinic name)

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

Address of the recorded source \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

1

Yes

2

No

Go to R.V. Section

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

1

Yes

2

No

Go to R.V. Section

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2.7. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

1

Sterilized in  
the recorded  
clinic

2

For other  
services

Go to R.V. Section

93

C.V. Form-III: (For clients sterilized in clinic other than the recorded clinic)

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

Address of the recorded source \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

1 Yes

2 No

Go to R.V. Section

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

1 Yes

2 No

Go to R.V. Section

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2.7. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

1 Operated upon twice

2 Operated upon once

Go to R.V. Section

2.8. You have mentioned earlier that you were sterilized in \_\_\_\_\_ now it appears that you had the operation (reported clinic) also in \_\_\_\_\_. Why did you undergo operations (recorded clinic) twice ? (PROBE)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

96

R.V. Form-I: (For not sterilized client)

3.3. Do you know the following person ?

Name and address of the recorded referrer \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

1 Yes

2 No

Fill-in T.V. Form-I

3.4. Did he take you to any clinic any time ?

1 Yes

2 No

Fill-in T.V. Form-I

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3.6. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

1 For sterilization

2 For other services

Fill-in T.V. Form-I

3.7. Although you are sterilized, you have mentioned earlier that you were not. Why did you not want to admit that you were sterilized ? (PROBE)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Go to T.V. Section

R.V. Form-II: (For sterilization client who went alone to the clinic or who does not remember the referrer)

3.3. Do you know the following person ?

Name and address of the recorded referrer \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

1 Yes  2 No

Go to T.V. Section

3.4. Did he take you to any clinic any time ?

1 Yes  2 No

Go to T.V. Section

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3.6. (Tick the appropriate box)

1 Went with the recorded re-  
referrer for sterilization  
purpose  2 Other purposes

Go to T.V. Section

48

R.V. Form-III: (Other than the recorded referrer)

3.3. Do you know the following person ?

Name and address of the recorded referrer \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

1 Yes

2 No

Go to T.V. Section

3.4. Did he take you to any clinic ?

1 Yes

2 No

Go to T.V. Section

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3.6. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

1 Operated  
upon twice

2 Operated  
upon once

Go to T.V. Section

3.7. Why did you undergo operations twice ?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Go to T.V. Form-III

99

R.V. Form-IV: (For clients sterilized in two clinics)

3.3. Do you know the following person ?

Name and address of the recorded referrer \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3.4.  1 Yes  2 No

Go to T.V. Section

3.5. Did he take you any time to the steriilization center for the operation ?

1 Yes  2 No

Go to T.V. Section

3.6. You had two operations. Did he take you to the center for the first operation or the second operation or both ?

1 First operation  2 Second operation

Fill-in T.V. Form-III

Fill-in T.V. Form-III

3 Both

Fill-in T.V. Form-III

100

T.V.Form-I:(For not sterilized clients)

4.3. Did you visit any FP clinic any time within last \_\_\_\_\_ month(s) ?

1 Yes

2 No

Go to D.V. Section

4.4. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

1 Within the quarter

2 Before the quarter

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

---

---

---

4.6. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

1 Sterilized

2 Not sterilized

Go to P.V. Section

Go to 8.4(D.V. Section)

T.V. Form-II: (For clients sterilized before the quarter)

4.3. Did you visit sterilization clinic after you had accepted the family planning device ?

 1

Yes

 2

No

4.4. Did you visit any FP clinic any time within the last \_\_\_\_\_ months ?

 1

Yes

 2

No

4.5. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

 1

Within the quarter

 2

Before the quarter

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

---

---

---

4.7. (Interviewer: Tick the appropriate box)

 1

For sterilization

 2

Other services

4.8. Did you undergo operations more than once ?

 1

Yes

 2

No

Go to T.V. Form-III

Go to P.V. Section

T.V. Form-III: (For clients who underwent operations twice)

4.9. 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       1      Within the quarter       2      Before the quarter

Second operation       1      Within the quarter       2      Before the quarter

P.V. Form-I: (For sterilization client who received less than the correct amount)

5.4. Do you know for what items of expenses you were given the money ?

Yes

No

Go to Q.5.6

5.5. Please tell me what those items of expenses were.

Food charges

Wage-loss compensation

Transportation cost

5.6. Please tell me now how much were you paid for food.

\_\_\_\_\_ Amount.

Does not know

Paid less

Paid more

Paid correct amount

Go to Q.5.10

5.7. Were you served any food in the clinic ?

Yes

No

Go to Q.5.10

5.8. How many times ? \_\_\_\_\_ times.

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

Free of cost

Paid less

104

5.10. How much money were you paid as transportation cost ?

\_\_\_\_\_ Amount.

1 Does not know

2 Paid less

3 Paid more

4 Paid correct amount

Go to Q.5.15

5.11. (Interviewer: If the 'R' does not know) how did you go to the clinic and how did you come back from the clinic ?

1 On foot

2 Using some transport

Go to Q.5.14

5.12. Did you pay the fare for the transport yourself or was the fare paid by the office ?

1 Paid by self

2 Paid by office

Paid by other person

5.13. How much money was paid ? \_\_\_\_\_ Amount

1 Does not know

5.14. How much money were you paid for wage-loss ?

\_\_\_\_\_ Amount

1 Does not know

2 Paid less

3 Paid more

4 Paid correct amount

Go to S.A.V. Section

5.15. How many days did you stay in the center ? \_\_\_\_\_ Days

Go to S.A.V. Section

105

APPENDIX - BII



Sample  
Form-B2

B29

Evaluation of Voluntary Sterilization Program  
House No. 8/13, Sir Syed Ahmed Road  
Mohammadpur, Dhaka-7.

Sampling frame for selection of clients.

District \_\_\_\_\_ Upazila \_\_\_\_\_

Center \_\_\_\_\_ Quarter \_\_\_\_\_

Number of ISUs \_\_\_\_\_

ISU No.	Specifications	Number of clients	Cumulatives

Source \_\_\_\_\_

Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Sample  
Form-B3

B30

Evaluation of Voluntary Sterilization Program  
House No. 8/13, Sir Syed Ahmed Road  
Mohammadpur, Dhaka-7.

List of selected clients.

Quarter \_\_\_\_\_

District \_\_\_\_\_ Upazila \_\_\_\_\_

PSU No. 

--	--	--

ISU No. 

--	--

Registration No.	Name of Union	Name of Village	Name of the clients

Source \_\_\_\_\_

Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation of Voluntary Sterilization Program  
House No. 8/13, Sir Syed Ahmed Road  
Mohammadpur, Dhaka-7.

Recorded Information Sheet.

Quarter \_\_\_\_\_

District _____	Upazila _____
PSU No. <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	ISU No. <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

1. Client Registration No.:

2. Type of Sterilization: Tubectomy

Vasectomy

3. Name of the Sterilization Center/Clinic \_\_\_\_\_

4. Name of the referrer with address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. Date of admission \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Year

6. Date of operation \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Year

7. Date of release from  
the center \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Year

8. Name of the client \_\_\_\_\_

9. Age of the client \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_ Month

Contd.

10. Name of the husband (for female client)/  
father (for male client): \_\_\_\_\_

11. Age of the husband/wife: \_\_\_\_\_

12. Occupation: (a) Male (husband) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Female (wife) \_\_\_\_\_

13. Address: Bari No. or Bari Name \_\_\_\_\_

Village \_\_\_\_\_

Union \_\_\_\_\_

Upazila \_\_\_\_\_

P.O. \_\_\_\_\_

District \_\_\_\_\_

14. . Number of living children:

Total \_\_\_\_\_ Son \_\_\_\_\_ Daughter \_\_\_\_\_

Source \_\_\_\_\_ Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Name(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

///

APPENDIX - BIII

Form-A1

Evaluation of Voluntary Sterilization Program  
 House No. 8/13, Sir Syed Ahmed Road  
Mohammadpur, Dhaka-7.

Information sheet regarding consent forms.

District \_\_\_\_\_ Upazila \_\_\_\_\_ Center \_\_\_\_\_ Quarter \_\_\_\_\_

Sample ID No.	Registration No.	Completed informed consent forms									
		Type of forms	Signed by Client (C) Doctor (D) Witness (W)	Signed by D + W	Signed by D + C	Signed by W + C	Signed by			None signed	Re- marks
							D	W	C		

Source \_\_\_\_\_

Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

1/3

Form - A2

## Evaluation of Voluntary Sterilization Program

M.A. Quasem & Co.  
Chartered Accountants  
House No. 8/13,  
Sir Syed Ahmed Road  
Mohammadpur, Dhaka - 7

Performance of Sterilization Cases

Name of the Upazila \_\_\_\_\_ District \_\_\_\_\_

Month	Number of Sterilization cases reported to the district			Number of sterilization cases done by the Government clinic			Number of sterilization cases done by the NGO clinic		
	Tub	Vas	Total	Tub	Vas	Total	Tub	Vas	Total
Total									

Dated:

Signature of the Upazila  
Family Planning Officer  
with seal.

114

APPENDIX - BIV

115

EVALUATION OF VOLUNTARY STERILIZATION PROGRAM  
HOUSE NO. 8/13, SIR SYED AHMED ROAD  
Mohammadpur, Dhaka-7.

-----  
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"/>
PSU No.	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	ISU No.	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
		Sample client No.	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

PHYSICIAN IDENTIFICATION	
Name of the physician:	_____
Address:	_____
	_____
	_____
	_____

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION	
Name of the client :	_____
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 Code <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>			
	Completed	-1	Transfer	-4
	Respondent not available	-2	Others (specify)	-5
	Refused	-3		

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

Do not include  
performing  
sterilization  
operation

(SKIP TO 4)

3. Do you perform sterilization operation ?

Yes

No

(SKIP TO 22)

4. Does performing sterilization operation form an obligatory part of your family planning duty ?

Yes

No

(SKIP TO 6)

5. Would you have continued performing sterilization operation all the same, had it not been an obligatory part of your family planning duty ?

Yes

No

(SKIP TO 7)

6. Why (then) do you perform sterilization operation/why would you have continued doing that ?

For earning  
an income

For other  
reasons

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

Yes  1 No  2

(SKIP TO 9)

8. Who is the person conducting the tests ?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

9. What are the pre-operative laboratory tests usually conducted pertaining to clients you operate ?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

10. Did you perform any sterilization operation during the period between \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ (or now) ?  
(Beginning month) (Ending month)

Yes  1 No  2

(SKIP TO 21)

11. How many operations did you perform in that period ?

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Number)

12.

**INTERVIEWER: CHECK 6 AND TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX**

For earning an income  1 For other reasons  2

(SKIP TO 14)

118

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

Yes  1 No  2

(SKIP TO 22)

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

\_\_\_\_\_ ( the reported amount)

15. INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX CHECKING THE RECORDED PAYMENT MADE TO HIM/HER FOR THE SELECTED CLIENT

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

(SKIP TO 24)

16. 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 24)

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

Knows  1 Does not know  2

(SKIP TO 23)

18. What is the prescribed amount ?

\_\_\_\_\_ (the reported prescribed amount)

119

19. INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Same as the reported amount  1

Different from the reported amount  2

(SKIP TO 24)

20. Why were you paid less/more than \_\_\_\_\_ ?  
(the reported prescribed amount)

(SKIP TO 23)

21. INTERVIEWER: CHECK 6 AND TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

For earning an income  1

For other reasons  2

(SKIP TO 23)

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

Yes  1

No  2

23. Family planning records show that you operated the following client and received Tk. \_\_\_\_\_. Would you say that the information is false ?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

False  1

Not false  2

24. Thank you very much for your cooperation and for giving me some of your valuable time.

EVALUATION OF VOLUNTARY STERILIZATION PROGRAM  
HOUSE NO. 8/13, SIR SYED AHMED ROAD  
Mohammadpur, Dhaka-7.

INTERVIEWING SCHEDULE FOR THE CLINIC ASSISTANT

SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION			
Quarter	<input type="text"/>	Converted No.	<input type="text"/>
PSU No.	<input type="text"/>	Sample clinic Assistant No.	<input type="text"/>

CLINIC ASSISTANT IDENTIFICATION	
Name of the clinic Assistant:	_____
Address:	_____ _____ _____

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION	
Name of the client:	_____
Name of the husband/father:	_____
Occupation of the husband/father:	_____
Address:	_____ _____

INTERVIEW INFORMATION				
Interview Call	1	2	3	4
Date				
Result Codes*				
Interviewers code <input type="text"/>				
*RESULT CODES: Completed - 1      Refused - 3 Respondent not available - 2      Left the clinic- 4 Other(specify).....5				

101

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 clients ?

---

---

---

2.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Assists in the performance of sterilization operation  1

Does not assist in the performance of sterilization operation  2

SKIP TO 4

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

Yes  1

No  2

(SKIP TO 20)

4. What assistance do you usually offer ?

---

---

---

5. Does offering assistance in the performance of sterilization operation form an obligatory part of your duty ?

Yes  1

No  2

SKIP TO 7

6. Would you have continued offering assistance, had it not been an obligatory part of your duty ?

Yes  1

No  2

122

7. Why (then) do you offer assistance/why would you have continued doing that ?

For earning an income  1

For other reasons  2

8. Did you offer any assistance for sterilization operation during the period between \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ (or now) ? (beginning month) (ending month)

Yes  1

No  2

SKIP TO 19

9. In how many operations, did you offer assistance in that period ?

\_\_\_\_\_ ( number )

10.

INTERVIEWER: CHECK 7 AND TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

For earning an income  1

For other reasons  2

SKIP TO 12

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

Yes  1

No  2

SKIP TO 20

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

\_\_\_\_\_ ( the reported amount )

163

13.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX CHECKING THE RECORDED PAYMENT MADE TO HIM/HER FOR THE SELECTED CLIENT

Same as the recorded amount  1

Different from the recorded amount  2

SKIP TO 22

14.

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 22

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

Knows  1

Does not know  2

SKIP TO 21

16. What is the prescribed amount ?

( the reported prescribed amount )

17.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Same as the reported amount  1

Different from the reported amount  2

SKIP TO 22

124

18. Why were you paid less/more than \_\_\_\_\_ (the reported prescribed )  
amount ?

\_\_\_\_\_  
SKIP TO 21

19.

INTERVIEWER: CHECK AND TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

For earning  
an income

For other  
reasons

SKIP TO 21

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

Yes

No

21. Family planning records show that you assisted in the operation  
of the following client and received (the approved amount of)  
Tk. \_\_\_\_\_. Would you say that this record is false ?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

False

Not false

22. Thank you very much for your cooperation and for giving  
me some of your valuable time.

125

EVALUATION OF VOLUNTARY STERILIZATION PROGRAM  
 HOUSE NO. 8/13, SIR SYED AHMED ROAD  
 Mohammadpur, Dhaka-7.

INTERVIEWING SCHEDULE FOR THE REFERRER

SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION			
Quarter	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Converted No.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
PSU No.	<input type="text"/>	ISU No.	<input type="text"/>
		Sample referer No.	<input type="text"/>

REFERRER IDENTIFICATION	
Name of the referrer	_____
Address:	_____
	_____
	_____
	_____

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION	
Name of the client:	_____
Name of the husband/father:	_____
Occupation of the husband/father:	_____
Address:	_____
	_____

INTERVIEW INFORMATION				
Interview Call	1	2	3	4
Date				
Result Codes*				
	Interviewers code	<input type="text"/>		
*RESULT CODES:	Completed - 1	Address not found - 4		
	Respondent not available - 2	Address not existing - 5		
	Refused - 3	Other(specify) ..... - 6		

126

1. Please tell me what is your main occupation.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Occupation)

2.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Works in family  
planning  1

Other  
occupation  2

SKIP TO 5

3. Please tell me your duties in the program.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Include referring of  
sterilization  
clients  1

Do not include  
referring of  
sterilization  
clients  2

SKIP TO 7

5. Do you refer sterilization clients to the clinic ?

Yes  1

No  2

SKIP TO 25

6.

INTERVIEWER: CHECK 2 AND TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Works in family planning  1

Other  
occupation  2

SKIP TO 10

127

7. Does referring of sterilization clients form an obligatory part of your duty ?

Yes

No

SKIP TO 10

8. Will it affect your job if you do not refer sterilization clients ?

Yes

No

SKIP TO 10

9. Would you have continued referring sterilization clients had it not affected your job ?

Yes

No

SKIP TO 12

10. Why (then) do you refer sterilization clients/why would you have continued doing that ?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

11.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

For earning an income

For other reasons

12. Have you referred any sterilization clients during the period between \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ (or now) ?

(beginning month)

(ending month)

Yes

No

SKIP TO 24

128

13. How many clients have you referred during that period ?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Number)

14. Was \_\_\_\_\_ one of your  
( Name of the recorded client )  
clients (or the client) you referred ?

Yes  1 No  2

SKIP TO 24

15. INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

For earning an income  1 For other reasons  2

SKIP TO 17

16. Did you receive any money for referring \_\_\_\_\_ ?  
(Name of the client)

Yes  1 No  2

SKIP TO 25

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
(amount)

18. INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

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

SKIP TO 27

19.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

The approved amount

1

Less than the approved amount

2

More than the approved amount

3

SKIP TO 27

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

Knows

1

Does not know

2

SKIP TO 26

21. What is that amount ?

\_\_\_\_\_  
(the reported prescribed amount )

22.

INTERVIEWER: TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

Same as the reported amount

1

Different from the reported amount

2

SKIP TO 27

23. Why were you paid more/less than \_\_\_\_\_ ?

(the reported prescribed amount )

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

SKIP TO 26

24.

INTERVIEWER: CHECK AND TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX

For earning an income

1

For other reasons

2

SKIP TO 26

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

Yes  1 No  2

26. (But) Family planning records show that you referred the following client during the month of \_\_\_\_\_, and received Tk. \_\_\_\_\_ for that reason. Would you say that the information is false ?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

False  1 Not false  2

27. Thank you very much for your time.

12/1