

STATE OF DEVELOPMENT IN CHITTAGONG HILL TRACTS



**Chittagong Hill Tracts
Development Facility (CHTDF)**

*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*



EMBASSY OF DENMARK
DANIDA | INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION



STATE OF DEVELOPMENT IN CHITTAGONG HILL TRACTS



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Submitted to

Chittagong Hill Tracts Development Facility (CHTDF) UNDP, Bangladesh

IDB Bhaban (7th Floor) E/8-A Begum Rokeya Sharani
Sher-e-Bangla Nagar, Dhaka-1207
Bangladesh

Prepared by

Abul Barkat, *Ph.D*¹
Syed Mansoob Murshed, *Ph.D*²
Avijit Poddar, *Ph.D*³
Muhammad Badiuzzaman, *MSS, MA*⁴
Matiur Rahman, *Ph.D*⁵
Md. Abdullah, *MA*⁶
Murtaza Majid, *MBBS, Dip in MCH-FP*⁷
Susmita Chakma, *LLM*⁸

Human Development Research Centre

House 05, Road 08, Mohammadia Housing Society
Mohammadpur, Dhaka 1207, Bangladesh
Phone: (88 02) 811 6972, 5815 7621, Fax: (88 02) 58157620
E-mail: info@hdc-bd.com, Web: www.hdc-bd.com

Dhaka: 30 January, 2014



¹ Professor, Department of Economics, University of Dhaka, & Chief Advisor (Hon), Human Development Research Centre (HDRC)

² Professor, Economics of Conflict and Peace, ISS, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Professor, Economics: Faculty of Business, Environment and Society, Coventry University, UK.

³ Research Director; Human Development Research Centre

⁴ Research Consultant, Human Development Research Centre

⁵ Senior Consultant, Human Development Research Centre

⁶ Former Joint Chief, Government of Bangladesh & Senior Consultant, Human Development Research Centre

⁷ Director, Public Health, Human Development Research Centre

⁸ Consultant, Human Development Research Centre

Copyright© 2013
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)



Chittagong Hill Tracts Development Facility (CHTDF)
UNDP, Bangladesh

IDB Bhaban (7th Floor) E/8-A Begum Rokeya Sharani
Sher-e-Bangla Nagar, Dhaka-1207, Bangladesh

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors alone and do not necessarily represent the views of CHTDF of UNDP, Bangladesh.

Acknowledgement

Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) was mostly populated by ethnically distinct indigenous/tribal peoples prior to the mass settlement of the Bangalees in the late 1970s. Here, a decade-long insurgency occurred, continuing from 1976 to 1997 and resulting in a peace accord in December, 1997. Under post-conflict reconstruction and recovery initiatives, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) through its Chittagong Hill Tracts Development Facility (CHTDF) has been working in the field of promotion of peace and confidence building since 2003. CHTDF, is a multi-sectoral confidence building and overall development programme for all inhabitants in CHT, is being executed through UNDP with a wide range of collaborating institutions (government, regional council and local government).

As part of the initiatives, motivated towards assessing and tracking progress, attained through various interventions of CHTDF, Human Development Research Centre (HDRC) was commissioned to carry out the present household survey in the CHT. It was a pleasure to conduct this household survey since HDRC also conducted the first baseline survey of CHT initiated by CHTDF of UNDP in 2008. We are immensely thankful to CHTDF for providing us the opportunity to carry out the accompanying household survey in CHT.

Implementing the household survey in the CHT is a challenging a task because of linguistic and cultural barrier, remoteness in terms of accessibility and insecurity for data collection team. Moreover, a wide range of issues like demography and housing, employment, income-expenditure, food security and consumption, poverty, literacy and education, health, water-sanitation and hygiene, violence against women and peace-confidence building were included in the household questionnaire. As a consequence, it took a longer period of time than the stipulated timeframe to analyze the data comprehensively and ensure authenticity as much as possible. So, we are grateful to the management of CHTDF for the extension of the study duration.

This report is an outcome of joint effort of the researchers of HDRC along with its local partner NGOs in CHT, concerned officials of CHTDF and Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs (MoCHTA), Government of Bangladesh. In accomplishing the task we received encouragement from Honorable Minister Mr. Dipankar Talukdar at various stages of implementation. We are grateful to Mr. Naba Bikram Kishore Tripura, Secretary, MoCHTA for his encouragement towards the research team to prepare a comprehensive report on current status of development in CHT. We derived a great deal of pleasure from working in collaboration with CHTDF officials at Dhaka and Rangamati office. We are really thankful to Mr. Henrik Fredborg Larsen, Director, CHTDF for his proactive cooperation to accomplish the survey with high quality. The comments by Mr. Prasenjit Chakma, Deputy Director-CHTDF on the survey report during dissemination workshop at Rangamati, are highly appreciable. We are particularly grateful to Ms. Aiko Cakir, Team Leader-Planning, Reporting and Monitoring for her continuous support throughout the study process and reviewing the draft report in particular.

We are immensely grateful to Ms. Melina Nathan, Peace and Development Policy Specialist, CHTDF for her contribution in designing survey questionnaire and reviewing the draft report. Her intellectual insight and input have grown appreciable in that they proved efficacious in framing survey questionnaires on peace and confidence-building issue.

We are especially thankful to Mr. Jefarson Chakma, Project Officer-Planning, Reporting and Monitoring of CHTDF for his untiring support and effective coordination between the researchers and concerned staff of CHTDF at both Dhaka and CHT office. We highly appreciate his valuable inputs, comments and suggestions regarding survey design, data collection instruments, data analysis and report writing. We are grateful to him for his spontaneous participation in finalizing household survey questionnaire and imparting skilful training for to the survey team. In this regard, we are also indebted to Mr. Faruque Ahmed, Programme Officer-Reporting and Documentation who contributed a lot to the finalization of survey design and questionnaire, data analysis and reporting format.

We would like to express our gratitude to Barrister Raja Devashish Roy, Circle Chief, Chakma Circle for his valuable comments on study design and data collection instruments. We are greatly thankful to traditional leaders (*Headman and Karbari*) of the surveyed *para* for their cooperation toward the survey team during data collection period. We are thankful to Mr. Nikhil Kumar Chakma, Chairman, Rangamati Hill District Council for his cooperation toward the implementation of survey and comments on the draft report.

The survey completion and high quality data-collection would have been impossible without cordial and effective support of concerned CHTDF officials at CHT. We are particularly grateful to Mr. Rob Stoelman, Chief, Implementation, for his cooperation throughout the study, particularly for his role in launching meeting at Rangamati. Our special thanks to Ms. Oishwarja Chakma, District Manager-Rangamati; for her effective role in launching meeting of the survey at Rangamati to draw cooperation from the government, local government institutions and traditional leaders. We gratefully acknowledge cooperation of all the District Managers of CHTDF namely Mr. Khushiray Tripura, District Manager-Bandarban; Mr. PriyatarChakma, District Manager-Khagrachari; and Ms. Oishwarja Chakma, District Manager-Rangamati towards the survey team during the survey. We are also thankful to all the Upazila Coordinators of CHTDF under the survey area.

We are immensely indebted to Mr. Mizanur Rahman, Programme Officer-M&E of CEP&ED cluster; Mr. Golam Mostafa Kamal, Programme Officer-Governance; Mr. Kabir Ahmed, M&E Expert-Education; Mr. Sontosh Tripura, Human Rights Officer; Ms. Stamina Khyang, Programme Officer-CEP&ED; Dr. Md. Shaheen Akhtar, Programme Officer-Health; Mr. Sabbir Ahmed, Programme Officer- Education; Mr. Uchimong Chowdhury, Local Confidence Building Expert; and Ms. Jhuma Dewan, Gender Cluster Leader for their comments and suggestion on the data collection instruments and their contribution in the training of the survey staff.

We gratefully acknowledge all the unanimous reviewers of the draft report for their invaluable comments and high utility suggestions toward finalization of this report. Our special thanks to all the participants of dissemination workshop specially Mr. Md. Mostafa Kamal, Deputy Commissioner, Rangamati Hill District and Mr. Md. Erfan Sharif, Chief Executive Officer, Rangamati Hill District Council for their time-worthy comments on the survey findings. We are thankful to Mr. A. F. M. Saleh, District Governance Officer for his contribution in organizing and moderating the dissemination workshop.

We are highly indebted to Mr. Sudatta Bikash Tanchangya, Secretary General of *Movement for the Protection of Forest and Land Rights in CHT* and Mr. ZuamLian Amlai, Bawm community leader for their support and facilitation in the data collection during the survey. Their knowledge about local context of CHT helped the research team to understand various key indicators of the survey in the process of customization as well as translation of household questionnaire. We are immensely indebted to them for their active participation in the training session for the survey team and smooth implementation of the survey.

Our special thanks to our local partner NGOs namely Taungya and PAHRA from Rangamati, Hilly Homes from Bandarban, and Zabarang Kalyan Samity and CHT-HRDO from Khagrachari for providing logistic and institutional support to carry out the survey. We truly appreciate the cooperation of Mr. Abbas Uddin Chowdhury, Secretary General of PAHRA during our stay at Rangamati and in organizing the training session of the survey team.

Our heartfelt gratitude is to all the members of data collection team for their hard work and uncompromising commitment to ensure quality of the data. We are particularly grateful to Ms. Reshmee Chakma, Mr. Kishormoy Chakma, Ms. Arjita Khisha, Mr. Ratan Jyoti Chakma, Ms. Uchaching Chakma, and Krishnamoy Tanchangya for sharing their in-depth knowledge in finalizing survey questionnaire and managing the whole data collection activities smoothly.

We gratefully acknowledge the commitment and hard work of research associates of HDRC. Our special thanks to Mr. Md. Abu Bakkar Siddique, and Sacchidananda Majumder for their support in preparing data collection instruments, managing survey implementation, and data analysis. We are also grateful to Mr. Faisal Mohammad Ahmad for his contribution in finalization of sampling related activities. We are indebted to Mr. Kawsher Ahmed, Mr. Md. Nasir Uddin, Ms. Hasna Hena Shawaly and Mr. Mohammad Habibullah Pulok for their support in preparing the survey report.

Our special thanks to Prof. Subhash Kumar Sen Gupta, Senior Consultant, HDRC and Former Principal, Government Titumir College-Dhaka and to Mr. Md. Mahfuj Ali Milton, Report Editor, HDRC for their linguistic input that raised the standard of the report immensely.

We are immensely grateful to in-house staff of HDRC for their untiring support, at all the stages of the survey, particularly for data management and report preparation. We highly appreciate hard work and service, earned at the cost of sleepless nights of Mr. ASM Obaidur Rahman, System Analyst who coordinated all the data processing and analysis-related activities. We are immensely thankful to Mr. Abu Taleb, Director, Finance for his proactive support to format the report and presentation in addition to his finance and administrative tasks. We are grateful to Mr. Sabed Ali and Mr. Arif Miah for their long hours work to prepare the final manuscript of the report.

At the end but not least, we express our profound gratitude to all the respondents and participants who provided data and information during the survey. We are really indebted to them because of their time and hospitality rendered towards the survey team.

The unwavering commitment and untiring efforts, on our behalf, in the completion of this report, will be meaningful only when the people of CHT will enjoy an opportunity to live without fear of hunger and insecurity. Last of all, we breathe out a hope that the existing life among the CHT population will bloom into a state of prosperity, respect and dignity in the future to come.

Abul Barkat, SM Murshed, Avijit Poddar,
Muhammad Badiuzzaman, Matiur Rahman,
Md. Abdullah, Murtaza Majid, and Susmita Chakma

Dhaka: January 2014

Abbreviations

ANC	Antenatal Care
BBS	Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics
BCG	Bacillus Chalmette-Guerin
BRDB	Bangladesh Rural Development Board
CBN	Cost of Basic Need
CEDAW	Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
CHT	Chittagong Hill Tracts
CHTDB	Chittagong Hill Tracts Development Board
CHTDF	Chittagong Hill Tracts Development Facility
CSBA	Community-Skilled Birth Attendant
CHSW	Community Health Service Worker
DCI	Data Collection Instrument
DCI	Direct Calorie Intake
DPT	Diphtheria, Pertussis and Tetanus
DDR	Demographic Dependency Ratio
DTW	Deep Tube-well
EPI	Expanded Programme on Immunization
FE	Field Enumerator
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FS	Field Supervisor
FWV	Family Welfare Visitor
GFS	Gravity Flow System
GoB	Government of Bangladesh
HDC	Hill District Council
HH	Household
HiB	Haemophilus Influenzae type-B
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IDP	Internally Displaced People
IGA	Income Generating Activities
KII	Key Informant Interview
LGI	Local Government Institution
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MICS	Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey
MLE	Multi-Lingual Education
MoCHTA	Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs

Abbreviations

MR	Measles Rubella
NGO	Non-Government Organization
OPV	Oral Polio Vaccine
PCJSS	<i>Parbatya Chattragram Jana Samhiti Samiti</i>
PDC	<i>Para</i> Development Committee
PIC	Project Implementation Committee
PNC	Post-Natal Care
PNDG	<i>Para Nari</i> Development Group
PSU	Primary Sampling Unit
QCO	Quality Control Officer
SCMC	Satellite Clinic Management Committee
SMC	School Management Committee
STD	Sexually Transmitted Diseases
STI	Sexually Transmitted Infection
STW	Shallow Tube Well
ToR	Terms of Reference
UH&FWC	Union Health and Family Welfare Centre
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UP	Union Parishad
UZAC	Upazila Advisory Committee
VAW	Violence against Women
VGD	Vulnerable Group Development
VGF	Vulnerable Group Feeding

CONTENTS

Sl. No.	Title	Page #
	<i>Acknowledgements</i>	
	<i>Abbreviations</i>	
	<i>Executive Summary</i>	<i>i-x</i>
	Fact sheet: Indigenous/tribal Household.....	xi-xiii
	Fact sheet: Bangalee Household	xiv-xvi
	Fact sheet: (Both Indigenous/tribal and Bangalee Household).....	xvii-xix
	CHAPTER 1: HOUSEHOLD SURVEY BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES.....	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Study Objectives	2
1.3	Chittagong Hill Tracts Development Facility (CHTDF): A Brief Overview	3
1.4	Organization of the Report.....	5
	CHAPTER 2: STUDY METHODOLOGY AND IMPLEMENTATION.....	6
2.1	Study Approach and Methodology	6
2.2	Sampling Strategy.....	7
2.2.1	Sample Design for Quantitative Survey.....	8
2.2.2	Sample Design for Qualitative Survey	14
2.3	Data Collection Instruments	14
2.4	Implementation of Survey.....	15
2.5	Data Management and Analysis	16
	CHAPTER 3: HOUSEHOLD PROFILE.....	18
3.1	Introduction	18
3.2	Demographic Characteristics	18
3.2.1	Household Size	18
3.2.2	Mean Age and Age Structure.....	19
3.2.3	Sex Ratio	19
3.2.4	Household Headship by Sex	19
3.2.5	Marital Status	20
3.2.6	Dependency Ratio.....	20
3.2.7	Disability	20
3.3	Socio-economic Characteristics	21
3.3.1	Educational Attainment	21
3.3.2	Occupation	22
3.3.3	Access to Electricity	22
3.3.4	Household Ownership of Communication Device	23
3.3.5	Use of Fuel	23
3.4	Relationship with CHTDF Intervention	24
3.4.1	Membership in Para Development Committee (PDC)	24
3.4.2	Membership in Para Nari Development Group (PNDG).....	24
	CHAPTER 4: EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME GENERATING ACTIVITIES.....	25
4.1	Introduction	25
4.2	Employment Status	25
4.3	Women Involvement in Income Generating Activities (IGA).....	30
	CHAPTER 5: HOUSEHOLD INCOME, EXPENDITURE, SAVINGS AND CREDIT	33
5.1	Introduction	33
5.2	Household Income	33
5.2.1	Income Sources	34
5.2.2	Household Annual Net Income.....	35
5.2.3	Increased Sale-Revenue: Household's Assessment.....	36
5.2.4	Increased Profit: Household's Assessment.....	37
5.3	Household Expenditure	37
5.3.1	Annual Expenditure	37

Sl. No.	Title	Page #
5.3.2	Annual Food Expenditure	38
5.3.3	Household Annual Education Expenditure.....	38
5.3.4	Household Annual Health Expenditure	39
5.4	Household Savings and Credit.....	40
5.4.1	Amount of Savings	40
5.4.2	Household Having Deposit in Community Based Saving Schemes	41
5.4.3	Amount of Credit	41
5.4.4	Household Taken Loan from Community Based Credit Schemes	43
CHAPTER 6: FOOD SECURITY AND FOOD CONSUMPTION.....		44
6.1	Introduction	44
6.2	Food Security	44
6.2.1	Access to Food throughout the Year	45
6.2.2	Food Deficiency Months.....	46
6.2.3	Food Deficiency Days.....	46
6.2.4	Coping Mechanism	47
6.3	Food Consumption.....	48
6.3.1	Food Basket	48
6.3.2	Per capita Daily Food Consumption	48
CHAPTER 7: HOUSEHOLD'S POVERTY SCENARIO		50
7.1	Introduction	50
7.2	Household's Poverty Status: DCI Method	50
7.3	Household's Poverty Status: CBN Method	51
CHAPTER 8: LITERACY AND EDUCATION.....		53
8.1	Introduction	53
8.2	Literacy Status	54
8.2.1	Literacy in 7 years and above Population	54
8.2.2	Literacy in 15 years and above Population	55
8.2.3	Literacy in Population of 15-24 years.....	56
8.3	Enrollment in Primary and Secondary School.....	58
8.3.1	Gross enrollment.....	58
8.3.2	Children's Access to Primary School	60
8.3.3	Household reported Gross and Net Enrollment in Secondary School	61
8.4	Primary School Completion and Class Repetition	62
8.4.1	Completion Rate	62
8.4.2	Repetition Rate	62
8.5	Drop-out in Primary Education	63
8.6	School Attendance of Girls.....	64
8.7	Language of Teaching in Primary School	65
8.8	Teaching Materials in Primary Education	67
8.9	Time Duration of Travel to School.....	67
8.10	Use of Electricity for Study	68
8.11	Government Assistance for Primary Education.....	69
CHAPTER 9: HEALTH: UNDERSTANDING AND PRACTICE		71
9.1	Introduction	71
9.2	Family Planning: Knowledge and Practice.....	71
9.3	Immunization: Knowledge and Practice	73
9.4	Status of Understanding about Nutrition related Issues.....	75
9.5	Maternal Health: Understanding and Practice	77
9.6	Understanding about STD/STI and HIV/AIDS	81
9.7	Understanding about Malaria: Symptoms and Prevention	83
9.8	Practice of Malaria Prevention.....	84
9.9	Time to Reach Health Service	84

Sl. No.	Title	Page #
CHAPTER 10: WATER-SANITATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HYGIENE		86
10.1	Introduction	86
10.2	Access to Safe Drinking Water	86
10.3	Access to Safe Cooking Water	88
10.4	Access to Safe Sanitation/Improved Latrine	90
10.5	Environmental Hygiene	91
CHAPTER 11: LOCAL GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS: ACCESS AND SATISFACTION		93
11.1	Introduction	93
11.2	Services Provided by Local Government Institutions at Various Levels	93
11.2.1	Local Government Institutions and It's Services	93
11.2.2	Knowledge about Types of Services Provided by Hill District Council (HDC)	94
11.2.3	Knowledge about Citizen Charter and Service Charge List at LGIs	95
11.3	Local Government Institutions: Services received and satisfaction	96
11.3.1	Regional and District Level Institutions	96
11.3.2	Upazila Level Institutions	96
11.3.3	Union Level Institutions	97
11.3.4	Traditional Governance Institutions	98
11.3.5	Services of HDC Managed Institutions	98
11.3.6	Services of Union Parishad	99
11.3.7	Services of Traditional Governance Institutions	100
11.3.8	Services and Assistances of NGOs	100
11.4	Household Receiving Services of Government Support Mechanisms	101
11.5	Household Receiving Services of NGO Support Mechanisms	102
11.6	Women Receiving Services of Government Support Mechanisms	103
11.7	Women Receiving Services of NGO Support Mechanisms	103
11.8	Household Access to Local Market Opportunities	104
CHAPTER 12: VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND HUMAN RIGHTS		105
12.1	Introduction	105
12.2	Understanding about Violence against Women	105
12.2.1	Knowledge of Violence against Women at Household	106
12.2.2	Knowledge about Violence against Women at Community	108
12.3	Incidence of Violence against Women	108
12.4	Prevention of Violence against Women	110
12.5	Knowledge of Human and Legal Rights	111
12.5.1	Knowledge about Constitutional Rights	112
12.5.2	Knowledge of Indigenous/tribal People's Rights	113
12.5.3	Knowledge of Human Rights of Female Citizen	114
CHAPTER 13: PEACE AND CONFIDENCE BUILDING		116
13.1	Introduction	116
13.2	Overview of Incidence of Violence	116
13.2.1	Incidence of Violence during Pre- and Post-CHT Accord Period	116
13.2.2	Severity of Incidence of Violence	123
13.2.3	Causes of Incidence of Violence	124
13.2.4	Actors of Incidence of Violence	125
13.2.5	Conflict Resolution Process	126
13.3	Implementation Status of CHT Accord	127
13.3.1	Knowledge about CHT Accord	127
13.3.2	Assessment of the CHT Accord Implementation	128
13.3.3	Role of Institutions in Implementing CHT Accord	132
13.4	Confidence Building Status	134
13.4.1	Status of Peace Consolidation	135
13.4.2	Perception of Threats of Insecurity	136
13.4.3	Status of Social Cohesiveness	137

Sl. No.	Title	Page #
13.4.4	Role of Police	139
13.4.5	Role of CHTDF: In promotion of Peace and Confidence Building	142
CHAPTER 14: KEY FINDINGS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS		143
14.1	Introduction	143
14.2	Summary of Some Noteworthy Findings	143
14.3	Policy Implications	146

List of Figures

Figure 2.1:	Distribution of CHDF programme implementation and non-implementation area.....	7
Figure 3.1:	Average number of household member	18
Figure 3.2:	Mean age of household member (in year).....	19
Figure 3.3:	Sex ratio of household population (number of male for 100 women)	19
Figure 3.4:	Female headed household (%)	19
Figure 3.5:	Dependency ratio of household population (%)	20
Figure 3.6:	Proportion of household with disabled member (%).....	20
Figure 3.7:	Average years of schooling (5 years and above)	21
Figure 3.8:	Household access to electricity (%).....	22
Figure 3.9:	Ownership of communication device (%).....	23
Figure 3.10:	Household reported benefits received from PDC (in %).....	24
Figure 3.11:	Household reported benefits received from PNDG (in %).....	24
Figure 4.1:	Employment status of overall household member in 2012 (%)	26
Figure 4.2:	Nature of employment among overall household member (%).....	27
Figure 4.3:	Nature of employment for male (%).....	28
Figure 4.4:	Nature of employment for female (%)	28
Figure 4.5:	Average number of employed member per household.....	29
Figure 4.6:	Income earning status of employed household member (%).....	29
Figure 4.7:	Women's involvement in IGAs in 2012 (%)	30
Figure 4.8:	Increased employment opportunities for women due to CHTDF intervention (%)	31
Figure 5.1:	Classification of household income sources.....	34
Figure 5.2:	Household's average yearly net income (Tk. in constant price 2012)	35
Figure 5.3:	Household reporting increased sales/revenue in 2012 (%).....	36
Figure 5.4:	Households reporting increased profit earned in 2012 (%)	37
Figure 5.5:	Household's average yearly basic needs expenditure (in Tk.).....	37
Figure 5.6:	Average amount of household savings (in Tk.).....	40
Figure 5.7:	Average amount of household credit (in Tk.).....	41
Figure 6.1:	Household having access to food throughout the year: 2008 and 2012 (%)	45
Figure 6.2:	Average number of food deficient months: 2008 and 2012	46
Figure 6.3:	Average number of food deficiency days by different categories of survey locations, and by IP and Bangalee household: 2012.....	46
Figure 6.4:	Household repaying the loan/credit after coping with food inadequacy (%)	47
Figure 7.1:	Poverty status of households in terms of DCI method (%)	50
Figure 7.2:	Poverty status of households in terms of CBN method (%)	51
Figure 8.1:	Literacy rate of household members (7 years and above) (%)	54
Figure 8.2:	Comparison of male-female literacy status (7 years and above population) (%)	54
Figure 8.3:	Literacy rate of household members (15 years and above) (%)	55
Figure 8.4:	Literacy rate of household members (15-24 years) (%)	56
Figure 8.5:	Gross enrollment rate (children 5-16 years) (%).....	58
Figure 8.6:	Net enrolment rate in primary school (%).....	59
Figure 8.7:	Primary education completion rate in CHTDF supported school (2008-2012) (%)	62
Figure 8.8:	Student having class repetition in CHTDF supported school in 2012 (%)	62
Figure 8.9:	Drop- out rate in CHTDF supported primary school (2012) and national (2009) (%).....	63
Figure 8.10:	Household reported use of electricity for study in the evening (%).....	68

Sl. No.	Title	Page #
Figure 8.11:	Receipt of government assistance for children's education (%)	69
Figure 9.1:	Distribution of respondents who heard about family planning (%)	71
Figure 9.2:	Contraceptive prevalence rate (%)	72
Figure 9.3:	Contraceptive use by methods (%)	73
Figure 9.4:	Understanding about immunization (%).....	74
Figure 9.5a:	Penta/DPT vaccine coverage (%)	74
Figure 9.5b:	Measles vaccine coverage (%)	75
Figure 9.6:	Understanding about issues related with nutrition (%).....	75
Figure 9.7:	Understanding about neo-natal and child nutrition (%)	76
Figure 9.8:	Understanding about maternal nutrition (%)	77
Figure 9.9:	Understanding about basic maternal health care services (%)	78
Figure 9.10:	Understanding about what pregnant women should practice (%).....	78
Figure 9.11:	Understanding about danger sign for pregnant mother (%)	79
Figure 9.12:	Participation of pregnant woman and mother at ANC/PNC class (%)	80
Figure 9.13:	Household access to skilled birth attendants (%)	80
Figure 9.14:	Women received antenatal care by medically skilled persons during last pregnancy (%). 80	
Figure 9.15:	Women assisted by medically skilled birth attendants during last delivery (%)	81
Figure 9.16:	Distribution of hospital deliveries during last pregnancy (%).....	81
Figure 9.17:	Distribution of respondents who heard about STD/STI: 2008 and 2012	81
Figure 9.18:	Understanding about HIV/AIDS (%)	82
Figure 9.19:	Understanding about symptoms of malaria (%)	83
Figure 9.20:	Understanding about prevention of malaria (%)	83
Figure 9.21:	Practice regarding prevention of malaria (%).....	84
Figure 9.22:	Household reach at least one facility with essential health services in 1 hour travel time (%)	84
Figure 9.23:	Household can reach a pharmacy in 1 hour travel time (%).....	85
Figure 10.1:	Access to safe drinking water round the year (in %)	86
Figure 10.2:	Access to safe cooking water round the year (%)	88
Figure 10.3:	Access to safe sanitation round the year (%)	90
Figure 10.4:	Household with waste management round the year (%)	91
Figure 10.5:	Household reported compost preparation in 2012 (%)	92
Figure 10.6:	Household reported having kitchen garden in 2012 (%)	92
Figure 11.1:	Display of citizen charter in front of LGIs at various levels (%)	95
Figure 11.2:	Observing notice board displaying amount of fees and rates for various services at Union Parishad office (%)	95
Figure 11.3:	Satisfaction with services received from HDC managed institutions (%)	99
Figure 11.4:	Access to local market opportunity (%)	104
Figure 12.1:	Knowledge about violence against women at household (all 12 issues)	106
Figure 12.2:	Knowledge about violence against women at household (at least 5 issues) (%)	107
Figure 12.3:	Knowledge about violence against women at household (any one issue) (%)	107
Figure 12.4:	Knowledge about violence against women at household (common 5 issues) (%)	107
Figure 12.5:	Knowledge about violence against women at community level (%)	108
Figure 12.6:	Knowledge about violence against women at community level (at least 3 issues) (%) ..	108
Figure 12.7:	Household reported incidence of VAW at household level in 2012 (%)	109
Figure 12.8:	Household reported incidence of VAW at community level in 2012 (%)	109
Figure 12.9:	Knowledge about place/person working to mitigate/ prevent VAW in 2012 (%).....	110
Figure 12.10:	Community initiative taken for reducing VAW in 2012 (%).....	110
Figure 12.11:	Knowledge score on legal and human rights (%)	112
Figure 12.12:	Knowledge about constitutional rights in 2012 (%)	113
Figure 12.13:	Knowledge about issues ensuring indigenous people's human rights (%)	114
Figure 12.14:	Awareness about human rights of female citizens (%)	115
Figure 13.1:	Experience of violence during pre and post CHT accord period (%).....	117
Figure 13.2:	Experience of at least three types of violence: Pre and post-CHT accord	123

Sl. No.	Title	Page #
Figure 13.3:	Experience of at least five types of violence: Pre and post-CHT accord	123
Figure 13.4:	Causes of violence during 2010-2012 (%)	124
Figure 13.5:	Actors involved in violence incidence during 2010-2012	125
Figure 13.6:	Person/institutions involved in conflict resolution in 2010-2012 (%).....	126
Figure 13.7:	Household's knowledge about CHT accord in 2012 (%)	128
Figure 13.8:	Assessment regarding implementation status of CHT accord (%)	129
Figure 13.9:	Community benefited most by current state of CHT accord implementation (%).....	132
Figure 13.10:	Household's evaluation about the Police (%)	139

List of Tables

Table 2.1:	Proposed sample upazila and union in the CHT.....	8
Table 2.2:	Distribution of sample para/village as primary sampling unit at a glance	9
Table 2.3:	Number of sample para by district at a glance	9
Table 2.4:	Sample para by type of locations.....	10
Table 2.5:	Final sample size of household by district.....	12
Table 2.6:	Number of sample household interviewed in implementation area by ethnicity	13
Table 2.7:	Number of sample household interviewed in non-implementation area	13
Table 2.8:	Number of FGD, KII and participatory observation	14
Table 3.1:	Household population distribution by age groups (in %).....	19
Table 3.2:	Marital status of household member (in %)	20
Table 3.3:	Education status of household population aged 5 years and above (%).....	21
Table 3.4:	Occupation of household population (%).....	22
Table 3.5:	Access to grid and solar panel as type of electricity connection (%)	22
Table 3.6:	Type of fuel used by households (%)	23
Table 3.7:	Source of firewood (%)	24
Table 4.1:	Employment status of members of age group 15 years and above in 2012 (%).....	27
Table 4.2:	Nature of employment for overall household members (%)	28
Table 4.3:	Income earning status of employed household member (%).....	30
Table 4.4:	Household reported women involvement in various types of IGAs (%).....	31
Table 5.1:	Household income sources in 2008 and 2012 (%)	35
Table 5.2:	Annual expenditure on food of a household (Tk. in constant price 2012)	38
Table 5.3:	Annual expenditure on education of a household (Tk. in constant price 2012)	39
Table 5.4:	Annual expenditure on health of a household (Tk. in constant price 2012)	39
Table 5.5:	Amount of savings by type of institutions (Tk. in constant price 2012)	40
Table 5.6:	Household having deposit in community based saving schemes (%)	41
Table 5.7:	Average amount of credit by institution (Tk. in constant price 2012).....	42
Table 5.8:	Household taken loan from community based credit schemes (%).....	43
Table 6.1:	Copping strategies for food inadequacy (%)	47
Table 6.2:	Household food basket by types of items (%)	48
Table 8.1:	Literacy rate of 7 years and above household population (%)	54
Table 8.2:	Literacy rate of 15 years and above household population (%)	56
Table 8.3:	Literacy rate of 15-24 years household population (%)	57
Table 8.4:	Children aged 5-16 years at household (%).....	58
Table 8.5:	Proportion of children enrolled aged 05-16 Years (%)	58
Table 8.6:	Household reported gross enrollment rate in primary school (%).....	59
Table 8.7:	Gross and net enrollment rate in primary school (6-10 years) in 2012 (%)	60
Table 8.8:	Children's access to primary school by types (%)	60
Table 8.9:	Reason for non-enrollment in primary school (%)	60
Table 8.10:	Household reported gross enrollment in secondary school (%)	61
Table 8.11:	Household reported net enrollment in secondary school (%).....	61
Table 8.12:	Household with child having class repetition in primary school in 2012 (%)	63
Table 8.13:	Drop- out rate in CHTDF supported schools in 2012 by grade (%)	63

Sl. No.	Title	Page #
Table 8.14:	Reasons for drop-out in primary education (%)	64
Table 8.15:	Household reported regular attendance of girls in primary school (%).....	65
Table 8.16:	Language of education for primary school going children (%)	66
Table 8.17:	Household head considering language as a barrier to understand lesson for children (%)	66
Table 8.18:	Household reported use of multi-lingual education materials in school (%)	66
Table 8.19:	Opinion on introduction of multi-lingual education in primary school (%).....	67
Table 8.20:	Household reported use of innovative teaching materials in school (%)	67
Table 8.21:	Type of innovative teaching materials used in school (%).....	67
Table 8.22:	Household reported proportion of student live within 1 hour travel to a primary school (%).....	68
Table 8.23:	Average time needed to travel (round trip) to primary school (minute).....	68
Table 8.24:	Household reported use of electricity for study in the evening (%)	69
Table 8.25:	Type of government assistance received for child education (%).....	70
Table 9.1:	Understanding about types of family planning methods in 2012 (%).....	72
Table 9.2:	Understanding about different types of EPI vaccines (%).....	74
Table 9.3:	Understanding about how people get infected with STD/STI (%)	82
Table 10.1:	Household reported access to safe drinking water round the year (%)	87
Table 10.2:	Household reported access to safe cooking water round the year (%).....	89
Table 10.3:	Household reported main types of latrine used (%)	90
Table 11.1:	Knowledge about types of services provided by HDC (%)	94
Table 11.2:	Respondents' know about citizen charter of LGIs at various levels (%)	95
Table 11.3:	Household visited regional and district level institutions, received services and expressed satisfaction (%)	96
Table 11.4:	Household visited Upazila level institutions, received services and expressed satisfaction (%).....	97
Table 11.5:	Household visited Union level institutions, received services and expressed satisfaction (%).....	98
Table 11.6:	Household visited local level traditional institutions, received services and expressed satisfaction (%).....	98
Table 11.7:	Households received services from Hill District council (HDC) (%).....	98
Table 11.8:	Satisfaction with different services received from Union Parishad (%).....	99
Table 11.9:	Households received services from Union Parishad (UP) (%).....	100
Table 11.10:	Satisfaction with different services received from traditional governance institutions (%)	100
Table 11.11:	Respondents expressed satisfaction with different services received from NGOs (%)....	101
Table 11.12:	Households received services from NGOs support mechanism (%).....	101
Table 11.13:	Household taking services of HDC and Union Parishad (%).....	102
Table 11.14:	Households receiving services of NGO support mechanism (%)	102
Table 11.15:	Women taking services of government support mechanism	103
Table 11.16:	Women taking services of NGO support mechanism (%).....	103
Table 13.1:	Experience of any type of violence during pre and post-CHT accord period (%)	118
Table 13.2:	Actors involved in violence during 2010-2012 (%) [Multiple Response]	126
Table 13.3:	Household's satisfaction regarding issues related to CHT Accord (%)	130
Table 13.4:	Knowledge about CHT land (disputes settlement) commission (%).....	133
Table 13.5:	Household's knowledge and evaluation about role of IDP&R taskforce (%).....	134
Table 13.6:	Status of peace consolidation (%)	135
Table 13.7:	Perceptions of threats of insecurity during 2010-12 (%).....	136
Table 13.8:	Assessment about social relation between indigenous/tribal and Bangalee (%).....	138
Table 13.9:	Economic relations between indigenous/tribal and Bangalee community (%)	138
Table 13.10:	Household's evaluation about role of police (%).....	140
Table 13.11:	Opinion about introduction of Mixed Policing in CHT (%).....	141

Sl. No.	Title	Page #
---------	-------	--------

List of Boxes

Box 1.1:	Programme focus of CHTDF	3
Box 1.2:	Programme coverage in CHT	4
Box 4.1:	Key definitions regarding employment status	26
Box 10.1:	Sources of drinking water round the year (%).....	88
Box 10.2:	Sources of cooking water round the year (%)	89
Box 10.3:	Major reasons of using hanging latrine and open defecation	91
Box 12.1:	Knowledge indicator on human and legal rights	111
Box 13.1:	Top five violence incidents in intervention area during 2010-2012 and 1975-1997	120
Box 13.2:	Top five violence incidence in control area during 2010-2012 and 1975-1997	121
Box 13.3:	Top five types of violence reported in non-implementation area during 2010-2012 and 1975-1997.....	122

ANNEXURE

Annex 1:	Data Tables.....	150-227
Annex 2:	Data Collection Instruments	228-280
Annex 3:	Survey Locations	281-285
Annex 4:	Study Team Members	286-289

Executive Summary

Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) region is situated in the southeastern part of Bangladesh. It is inhabited by people having diverse ethnic origin: 11 indigenous communities and Bangalee. Due to the prolonged conflicts, rural and predominantly indigenous communities remained outside the mainstream development process for over two decades and un-served and/or under-served in terms of many indicators. An insurgency demanding autonomy, occurring in this region between 1976 and 1997, officially came to an end after a signing of CHT Accord on 2nd December 1997. And it was recognized as a significant political achievement for the region which is home to 11 distinctive indigenous groups and Bangalees. It raised high expectations that it would serve as the cornerstone of a successful peace building process and as a means for opening up new opportunities for development. Relevant CHT institutions (the Regional Councils and Hill District Councils) have been established to support this process and represent the interests of the ethnically diverse population and to adopt national policies and programmes to local condition.

Since 2003, in partnership with the Government of Bangladesh including the Local Government as well as CHT communities and NGOs, UNDP through Chittagong Hill Tracts Development Facility (CHTDF) has supported the Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in CHT and consequently the implementation of the CHT Accord.

CHTDF operates in all 3 districts of CHT, 20 upazilas (out of 25) and 3,257 paras/ villages (out of 6,087), prioritizing remote and underserved areas. CHTDF supports the CHT institutions to effectively manage and deliver services, and communities to take charge of their own development based on the principles of local participation and decentralized development.

The programme focus include: Policy Advocacy and Confidence Building, Capacity Development of CHT institutions, Community Empowerment, Economic Development, Natural Resource Management, Agriculture Extension and Food Security, Education, Health, Gender and Local Peace Building, and Knowledge Management. CHTDF engages directly with 104,711 households out of 343,500 under 20 Upazilas of CHT through 3,257 Para/village Development Committees (PDC); 1,685 Para/village Nari/women Development Groups (PNDG), 300 CHTDF supported schools, 886 Community Health Service Workers (CHSW), 81 Community Skill Birth Attendants (CSBA): 80 Satellite Clinics, 1,750 Rice Banks, 690 Farmer Field School (FFS), 9 Market infrastructure facilities, and 25 Multi-purpose Community Centers.

Methodology

The survey has been designed as an operations research with pre and post test with control. A Probabilistic sampling strategy has been adopted. For sampling purpose CHT was divided into implementation area (20 Upazilas) and non-implementation area (5 Upazilas). In implementation area all unions were covered by CHTDF. However, within unions, there were number of paras/villages¹ which were not covered by CHTDF. Thus, in implementation area, Paras/villages covered by CHTDF were treated as intervention Paras/villages, and non-covered (no direct intervention) Paras as control Paras. Households located in intervention, control and non-implementation paras/villages are respectively considered as intervention, control and non-implementation households.

¹ CHTDF intervention Para List

To capture all possible scenarios of socio-economic status of people living in CHT, a para/village is considered to be primary sampling unit (PSU) and a household as data collection unit. A total of 10 implementation Upazilas out of 20 and 3 non-implementation Upazilas out of 5 were purposively selected as sample Upazilas keeping the availability of ethnic groups in the sample. Within each Upazila at least 30% of unions have been selected given the availability of ethnic groups. A total of 24 unions have been brought under the survey covering 224 paras (133 interventions, 50 controls and 41 non-implementation) and 2,524 households (1,335 interventions, 622 controls and 567 non-implementation). A sample size of paras and households is determined using appropriate statistical formula and using 95% confidence level.

Data was collected by trained and skilled enumerators, belonging to all the ethnic communities and Bangalee of the CHT. Both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods and instruments were used in the survey.

A total of 72 survey staff was employed for 21 days. Among the survey staff, there were 3 Survey Facilitators (SF), 3 Quality Control Officers (QCO), 10 Field Supervisors (FS) and 56 Field Enumerators (FE). The total survey staffs were divided into 13 teams where each team was headed by a FS. Each QCO was deployed for quality control of data collection in each district. To coordinate the whole data collection process, 3 Survey Facilitators were assigned for the data collection activities during the survey and they were roving in respective districts. To ensure quality of data collection in the household survey, field supervisors (FS) were entrusted with the task of checking the entire filled-in household interview schedule. Field supervisor applied both spot and back check techniques with equal proportion. Quality control officers (QCO) were assigned the task of checking 5% of filled-in household interview schedule in the back. In case of any inconsistency, error and wrong information found in the filled-in HH interview schedule both FS and QCOs instructed the field enumerator (FE) to correct the inconsistency, error and wrong information by visiting the particular sample household if needed. FS and QCO regularly provided coaching to enumerators on ensuring quality of data. Study team members supervised and oversaw the whole activities of data collection.

Data was analyzed by location (intervention, control and non-implementation), district and ethnicity. To get an overall picture of CHT in terms of various selected indicators, a separate set of data tables is generated and placed in annex-1. Baseline survey data set-2008 is also analyzed for the purpose of comparison. Regarding economic data on income, expenditure, savings and credit, baseline data of 2008 has been adjusted with price level of 2012 to make it comparable with the same data of 2012.

Key Findings

Household Profile

Household size is around 5 across the study locations (intervention, control and non-implementation). The mean age of household members across the study locations is around 25 years. Around 22% of household members across the locations are involved in cultivation. About 46% population in intervention and control, and 43% in non-implementation areas are married. About 50% households in the intervention area have access to electricity (23% grid and 27% solar), 32% in the control (20% grid and 12% solar) and 34% non-implementation (8% grid and 26% solar) areas. About 85% of the households in intervention area have

received benefits from the Para/ village Development Committees (PDC) supported by CHTDF, and 43% of the households reported that at least one female member of their family have engagement with Para/village Nari/women Development Group (PNDG) – women community-based organizations supported by CHTDF.

Employment and Income Generating Activities

A 79% of household members in intervention, 75% in control and 80% in non-implementation areas are employed. About 60% household population is self-employed across the locations. More than one fifth of the household members (20-25%) regardless of location are unemployed. The proportion of unemployed in study area is substantially higher than that of the country as a whole (4.5%). Higher proportion of women in intervention areas (43%) compared to that of control (30%) and non-implementation (38%) areas. are involved in Income Generating Activities (IGA) such as gardening, poultry rearing, cattle rearing, fire wood selling, food processing, weaving, and sewing. Lower proportion people are involved in wage labor in the intervention area (6%) compared to control (10%) and non-implementation (9%) areas. Higher rate of women's participation in IGA, and lower rate of wage labor are attributable to CHTDF support

Income, Expenditure, Savings and Credit

Indigenous/tribal people depend more on agriculture is the major source of income and Bengalees depend more on business as major source of income. Annual net income of a household in intervention area is Tk. 101, 426, and Tk. 88,365 in control and Tk. 93,107 in non-implementation areas. The same for all households surveyed in 2008 was Tk. 85,050 (in constant price 2012). Annual household expenditure in intervention, control and non-implementation areas constitutes Tk. 89,742 and Tk. 80,459 and Tk. 91,088 respectively. In 2008, it was Tk. 80,434 (in constant price 2012). Irrespective of study location the share of food expenditure is substantially large against overall expenditure. In intervention area about 89% of all expenditure is made for food, in control and non-implementation it is 87% and 86%. An average household in intervention, control and non-implementation areas has spent yearly Tk. 2,608, Tk. 2,280 and Tk. 2,065 for meeting health expenses. The same in 2008 was Tk. 781 only (in constant price 2012). In intervention, control and non-implementation areas yearly expenditure on education per household has constituted Tk. 1,511, Tk. 1,338 and Tk. 1,256 respectively which was only Tk. 514(in constant price 2012) in 2008.

An average amount household savings in intervention, control and non-implementation areas reportedly are Tk. 22,549, Tk. 8,755 and Tk.9, 706 respectively. The same in 2008 was Tk. 4,575(in constant price 2012). Large increase in saving in intervention area is attributable to CHTDF interventions. At present an average household in intervention areas outstanding credit amounting Tk. 28, 189. In control and non-implementation areas the amount are Tk. 42,423 and Tk. 27,103 respectively. During survey 2008, the same was Tk. 8,597. The increase in outstanding credit amount is a plausible reflection of increased business activities especially among the Bangalees.

Food Security and Food Consumption

About 56% households in intervention area reportedly have access to food round the year in 2012, while in control the same is 50% and in non-implementation 54%. In 2008, about 36% of all households had reported having access to food round the year. The access to food in

CHT has increased in general. Number of food deficiency months and days in intervention areas decreased substantially. In intervention area, average number of food deficit months in 2012 is 1.2, while the same in control and non-implementation areas respectively are 1.3 and 2.7 months. The same during 2008 was 2.7 months. In intervention area, an average household mentioned 15 days as food deficit period in 2012 spread over food deficit months. The respective duration in control and non-implementation areas is 16 and 18 days. Irrespective of study areas households still depend upon loans from relative/family as the most major coping mechanism during food deficiency.

Although per capita daily food energy intake across the study areas has increased since 2008, it is still below the level of absolute poor (2,122 kilo-calorie). In intervention area, per capita daily food energy intake for an average household has increased to 2,023 kilo-calorie from 1,797 kilo-calorie since 2008. In 2012, per capita daily food energy intake in control and non-intervention areas respectively are 1971 and 1998 kilo-calorie. CHTDF interventions in Community Empowerment (CEP) such as agriculture related training imparted through PDC, facilitation of new technologies, rapid spread of horticulture (especially fruit gardening), in addition to increased communication facility and increased freedom of movement as a result of CHT Accord have contributed to creating enabling atmosphere in CHT for ensuring food security (availability, access and utilization).

Household Poverty Scenario

Household poverty in CHT at present has declined substantially across the study locations compared that of 2008. However, the pace of poverty reduction is higher in intervention area than in other areas. About 60% households in intervention, 69% in control and 63% in non-implementation areas are absolute poor in terms of Direct Calorie Intake (DCI) method, while in 2008; about 75% households in rural CHT were absolute poor. At present, incidences of hardcore poverty in intervention, control and non-implementation areas have declined substantially and ranging between 24% and 31% while it was 60% in 2008. About 69% households in intervention, 77% in control and 70% in non-implementation areas are living below upper poverty line. The same in 2008 was 82%. The proportion households living below lower poverty line in intervention area is 45%, while the same in control and non-implementation areas are 55% and 49% respectively. The same was 64% in 2008.

Literacy and Education

In intervention area, overall literacy rate among the age group of 7 years and above is 58%. The same in control and non-implementation area is 50% and 53% respectively. In intervention area, the literacy rate among 15 years and above population is 57% while the same in control and non-implementation area is 49% and 52%.

As mentioned by households, net enrollment rate in intervention, control and non-implementation is 86% 70% and 83% respectively. The estimated net enrollment for CHTDF supported school in intervention area is 79%. In CHTDF supported school; primary education completion rate is 95%, while national level estimation is 80%. The overall class repetition rate in CHTDF supported schools is 11%. Primary school drop-out rate in intervention, control and non-implementation area is 7%, 9% and 10% respectively. The overall dropout rate in CHTDF supported primary school in 2012 is 3.4%, while the corresponding national figure is 1.2%.

About 33% of households (mostly indigenous/ethnic community) think that language is a barrier for their children to understand lesson. More than half of the households (of which more than 80% are indigenous) argued that multi-lingual teaching system along with mother tongue should be introduced in primary school. A 46% household in the intervention, 33% in the control and 35% in the non-implementation area have reported the use of multi-lingual teaching materials in school. A 69% household in intervention, 56% in control and 49% in non-implementation have mentioned the use of innovative teaching materials.

A 95% household in intervention, 90% in control and 97% in non-implementation live within 1 hour travel to their children's school.

Health: Understanding and Practice

Contraceptive Prevalence Rate (CPR) across the study area has increased substantially compared to that in 2008. At present about 73% of all eligible couples are using contraceptive in intervention area. The same is in control 63% and 62% in non-implementation areas. The Contraceptive Prevalence rate (CPR) in 2008 was 57%. The higher Contraceptive Prevalence Rate (CPR) in intervention area compared to control and non-implementation areas is one of the many success of CHTDF intervention.

In terms of crude vaccination coverage estimation (on the basis of mothers' reporting), about 93% of children aged 12-23 months have received all doses of DPT/Penta in intervention areas. 91% in control and 96% in non-implementation areas have reported the same. Valid DPT/Penta coverage (estimated on the basis of immunization cards) in intervention areas is found as 50%. The same in control is 55% and non-implementation is 45%. Measles vaccine coverage according to mothers' reporting is 92% in intervention areas, and 88% and 90% respectively in control and non-implementation areas. In terms of valid vaccination coverage estimates about 47% children aged 12-23 months in the intervention areas have received vaccine against measles. The same in control and non-implementation areas are 47% and 36% respectively.

About 70% of women in intervention areas systematically receive information on maternal health through ANC and PNC classes (through Uthan Baithak) during pregnancy and/or lactation period. A 28% household in intervention area has access to skilled birth attendants, while 15% households in both control and non-implementation areas have the same. About 42% of women in intervention areas during last pregnancy have received antenatal care services by medically skilled persons. About 22% of women in intervention, 15% in control and 13% in non-implementation areas were assisted by medically skilled birth attendants during last delivery, while the same in 2008 was 12%.

Understanding about Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STD)/ Sexually Transmitted Infection (STI) across the location categories is low, while the same on HIV/AIDS is comparatively high. The understanding of symptoms of malaria by indicators does not vary much across the areas. A 95% household in intervention area has stated high fever with shivering as symptom of malaria, while 92% in control and 94% in non-implementation has reported the same. About 96% of households use mosquito net during sleeping hours for preventing malaria. In both control and non-implementation areas the same practice is done by 94% households.

In intervention area, about 78% of households can reach at least one facility for essential health services within an hour, while 67% of households in control and 69% in non-

implementation area respectively can do the same. About 75% households in intervention, 73% in control and 72% in non-implementation area are within the proximity of 1 hour travel time between household and source of essential drug.

Water-sanitation and Environmental Hygiene

About 66% household in intervention, 57% in control and 51% non-implementation areas have access to safe drinking water, while the same was 31% in 2008. Shallow tube-well is the source of drinking water round the year for 41% household in intervention, 36% in control and 26% in non-implementation. For 19% of households in intervention, 20% in control and 21% in non-implementation area, deep tube-wells serve as the same.

Access to safe sanitation is still low across the study area. About 17% household in intervention, 11% in control and 9% in non-implementation area has access to hygienic latrine, while it was 11% in 2008.

A 19% household disposes waste regularly in a particular place in intervention area while it is 16% in control and 9% in non-implementation area. In area, in 2008, the same practice was done by 10% households. About 10% intervention household are involved in compost preparation, whereas 7% and 3% households in control and non-implementation areas are involved in the same activities. About 37% households in intervention areas have kitchen garden while 27% households in both control and non-implementation areas have the same.

Access to Local Government Institutions and Satisfaction

Among the households in intervention area, 17% has visited the HDC while 74% of those who visited have received services and 85% of the service recipients have mentioned satisfaction. The proportion of household visiting HDC in control area is 10%, 75% of those who visited received services, and 78% of service recipients is satisfied. In non-implementation area the respective proportions are 9%, 82% and 82%. The corresponding rates of “visits”, “receipt of services” and “satisfaction” are substantially lower for Circle Chief Office, Chittagong Hill Tracts Development Board (CHTDB), and Regional Council.

Among the institutions located at Upazila level, Upazila Parishad and Upazila Health Complex are two most commonly visited institutions. A 35% households in intervention area, 28% in control and 29% in non-implementation areas have visited Upazila Parishad (Sub-district Council). Of those who visited, the proportion receiving services is 86% in intervention, 83% in control and 90% in non-implementation areas. Among those who received services, about 92% in intervention, 90% in control and 97% in non-implementation are satisfied.

About 26% households have mentioned visiting Upazila Health Complex (UHC). A 96% of those who visited UHC has received services, and of them 88% is satisfied. For control area the respective figures are 23%, 94% and 88% respectively; while the same in the non-implementation area are 22%, 94% and 91%.

Among the institutions at Union level, the highest proportion of households has visited at Union Parishad (UP) Office. A 67% household in intervention, 55% in control and 65% in non-implementation area has visited UP. Among those who visited about 95% household in intervention, 90% in control and 92% in non-implementation has received services from UP.

About 96% service recipient households in both intervention and control, and 99% in non-implementation are satisfied with the service.

Union Health and Family Welfare Centre (UH&FWC) are visited by 34% household in intervention, 30% in control and 26% in non-implementation. Of those who visited, about 96% of households in intervention, 94% in control and 95% in non-implementation area have received services in UHFWC. Among service recipients 92% in intervention, 95% in control and 97% in non-implementation has expressed satisfaction.

As a part of receiving services of government support mechanisms, 60% household in intervention, 4% in control and 2% in non-implementation area have received at least one service from Hill District Council. However, 75% households in intervention, 64% in control and 69% in non-implementation have received at least one service from Union Parishad.

About 60% of households in intervention, 39% in control and 47% in non-implementation areas have received at least one service of NGO mechanisms.

A 6% woman in intervention area, 7% in control and 8% in non-implementation has received various assets in kind under transfer programme as a part of services of government support mechanism. About 4% of women in intervention, 3% in control and 1% in non-implementation have received cash under asset transfer programme under government support-mechanism.

A 4% woman in intervention area, 6% in control and 4% in non-implementation area have received credit/loan from NGO support mechanism. About 4% of women in intervention, 2% in control and 6% non-implementation area are the beneficiaries of asset transfer in kind services from NGO support-mechanisms.

Violence against Women and Human Rights

Overall knowledge status of women about VAW at household level (considering 12 indicators: *verbal abuse, battering and other forms of physical violence, sexual harassment of female child (verbal and physical), early marriage, compulsion of marriage, violence regarding dowry, compulsion of suicide, sexual violence, neglect through deprivation of food, neglect through deprivation of medical care, neglect through shelter deprivation, impediment towards access and mobility*) reveals that in intervention area, 18% household has knowledge about all the 12 indicators of VAW at household level whereas 9% household of control and 3% of non-implementation area reported their knowledge about the same. In 2008, about 1% has the same response.

About 30% woman in intervention, 21% in control and 13% in non-implementation area has knowledge about VAW at community level such as abduction, rape, and sexual abuse, intimidation at workplace, burn/acid throwing, women trafficking, forced prostitution, and homicide. In 2008 less than 1% woman has the same.

A 57% woman at intervention, 54% in control, 61% in non-implementation area have reported verbal abuse as a type of VAW incidents at household level. Intimidation at workplace is reported by 9% woman in intervention, 8% in control and 7% at non-implementation as incident of VAW at community level.

The most pronounced person is UP Member to whom households are used to go for mitigation and /or prevention of VAW incidents in intervention, control and non-implementation areas. About 71% household in all three locations are reportedly aware of UP member's role in mitigation/or prevention of VAW.

The knowledge of constitutional rights has been assessed using some major rights selected from the Constitution (i.e., ensuring food, ensuring shelter, ensuring good health, ensuring primary education, ensuring freedom of profession or occupation, and ensuring freedom of thought and conscience and speech to its citizen). Almost 79% household in intervention, 63% in control and 67% in non-implementation areas have knowledge of access to food as a constitutional right. 72% household in intervention, 66% in control and 60% in non-implementation area have knowledge about freedom of movement as a constitutional right. 56% household in intervention, 39% in control, and 36% in non-implementation area have revealed their knowledge about women's equal rights with men in all spheres of the state and public life.

Confidence and Peace Building

The survey findings reveal that during 2010-2012, thereafter refers to as contemporary period, households were exposed to some sort of violence even after the signing of the CHT Accord. Post-conflict society is suffering from risk of resumption of conflict where this region is not an exception. For instance, 39% of households experience at least one type of violence in intervention area while 34% and 45% household experiences the same in control and non-implementation area respectively.

In comparison with pre-CHT accord period, it is noticed that the incidence of violence in CHT has reduced significantly during the contemporary period. The highest reduction in incidence of violence is noticed in the intervention area (from 69.4% to 38.5%) while it is only 14% lower (from 59% to 45%) in non-implementation area. Reduction in incidence of violence is relatively higher among indigenous households (21-55%) compared to that of the Bangalee households (4-48%) in the study areas.

Forms and the extent of violence are changing in the contemporary period compared to the pre-CHT Accord period. In intervention area, the most reported incidence of violence in contemporary period is extortion and restricted movement (21%) while during pre-CHT accord it was restricted movement (54%). In the control area, restricted movement is the prime type of violence during the pre (47%) and post-CHT accord period (20%). Extortion is the most frequent type of violence (31%) in the non-implementation area during the contemporary period while it was restricted movement (44%) during the pre-CHT accord period. In the contemporary period, extortion has increased (11-31% of households) across the study areas with the highest incidence in the non-implementation area (31%). Extortion appears as a new phenomenon among indigenous households (6-12%) in the CHT as there was no experience of this by indigenous households in the pre-Accord period.

Knowledge about the CHT Land Disputes Resolution Commission in terms of establishment and its initiatives is low among the households of CHT regardless of ethnicity. In the intervention area, only 13% household reported their knowledge about the existence of CHT Land Commission while it is 7% and 10.5% in control and non-implementation areas respectively.

Regarding knowledge about the role of Internally Displaced Person and Indian Repatriated Refugee (IDP&R) Taskforce, 15% of households in the intervention areas reported their knowledge while in control and non-implementation areas 12% and 8.5% households respectively mentioned the same.

A small number of households expressed their satisfaction regarding the implementation status of the CHT Accord across the study areas. It is observed that only 15-19% of households belong to *satisfied* segment of the population with the process and progress of the accord implementation. Ethnicity-based analysis reveals that a relatively higher number of Bangalee households (17-24%) expressed their satisfaction compared to that of indigenous households (9-11%) across the three study areas because Bangalee households perceive lack of progress on Accord implementation to be in their interest. Apart from this satisfied segment of the population, a large group of households are dissatisfied (23-24%) with and pessimistic (16-25%) about the implementation status of the CHT accord. Ethnicity-based analysis indicates that indigenous households (21-36%) are more pessimistic than Bangalee household (6-10%) across the study areas.

The status of peace consolidation has improved in terms of two indicators: feel confident to move everywhere outside own para, and feel comfortable to carry on daily business. During the post-CHT accord period (2010-12), a large number of households (60-75%) reported their confidence about moving everywhere outside their own community/para across the study locations while 34-41% household reported the same for the pre-CHT accord period. It is also observed that 70-82% households feel comfortable to carry on daily business in the contemporary period while it was 40-45% during pre-CHT accord period across the locations and ethnicities. The improvement in the status of peace consolidation in terms of both indicators is higher among the indigenous households (improved by 33-50%) compared to that of Bangalee households (improved by 13-26%) across the study areas because restricted movement was higher among indigenous households in the pre-Accord period.

Regarding social relations between indigenous and the Bangalee households, an improvement is found in the contemporary period as compared to the pre-CHT Accord period. For instance, in the contemporary period, 52-71% indigenous household opined *friendly and mostly friendly* social relation while 77-93% Bangalee household mentioned the same in the study areas. *Friendly and mostly friendly* social relation during pre-CHT accord period is reported by 39-44% indigenous household and 61-77% Bangalee across the study areas.

In the contemporary period, economic relations have improved across the study areas. It is noticed that 60-78% indigenous household reported most friendly economic relations with the Bangalee households while 80-93% Bangalee household expressed the same view in the study areas. During pre-CHT accord period, 44-47% indigenous household maintained *friendly and mostly friendly* economic relation with the Bangalees for economic activities while 61-78% Bangalee household stated the same.

Perception of threats of insecurity is observed among households but is significantly higher for indigenous households where high levels of insecurity are reported across all indicators. In the contemporary period, the biggest threat of insecurity is fear of communal violence (48-57%) irrespective of ethnicity and locations. Besides that, fear of eviction from homestead (42-51%), dispossession of cultivable land (35-45%) and repression by security forces (31-39%) are the other most reported threats of insecurity in contemporary periods.

Regarding 'receipt of expected support from the Police' survey findings show that a significantly higher number of Bangalee household (15-27%) reported receipt of expected support from the police while it is only 3-4% for indigenous households across the study areas.

'Women feel safe during visiting Police station' is reported by about one-third of households in intervention area (32.1%) while a relatively lower number of households mention the same in both control (26.7%) and non-implementation (17%) areas. The survey findings reveal that only 9-12% indigenous household mentioned that women of their households felt safe while visiting the police station for assistance whereas it is mentioned by 26-58% Bangalee households in the study areas.

Increasing the number of police from the indigenous community, or mixed policing, is supported by more than half of the households as a whole (55-58%) across the study locations. It is clearly noticed that relatively higher proportions of indigenous households (74-80%) expressed their opinion in favor of mixed policing in the study areas compared to that of the Bangalee households (26-38%) in the study areas.

Fact sheet: Indigenous/tribal Household

Indicators	Baseline	2012			
		Intervention	Control	Non-Implementation	
HOUSEHOLD PROFILE					
Average household size	5.1	5.0	4.8	5.3	
Dependency ratio of household population (%)	75.7	64.5	66.7	67.8	
Proportion of household with disabled member (%)	-	4.5	6.1	4.4	
Proportion of female headed household (%)	6.5	4.3	6.1	7.5	
Household with access to electricity (%)	Grid	6.9	46.9	29.5	24.6
	solar energy	1.8	27.5	12.9	20.1
EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME GENERATING ACTIVITIES					
Employment status of household population aged 15 years and above (%)	Both	-	78.4	73.3	77.6
	Male		79.6	73.7	79.5
	Female		77.1	72.8	75.6
Proportion of women engaged in income generating activities (%)	41.6	48	42.1	54.4	
Average number of employed member per household	-	2.7	2.4	2.5	
Income earning status of employed household member (%)	-	85.3	81.2	87.8	
HOUSEHOLD INCOME, EXPENDITURE, SAVINGS AND CREDIT					
Share of wage in total income (%)	13.4	8.4	15.6	11.7	
Annual net income per household (Tk.)	79,612	96,573	85,752	87,687	
Amount of annual savings per household (Tk.)	2,647	17,156	9,885	10,025	
Amount of annual credit per household (Tk.)	5,283	11,028	9,002	17,262	
Household reporting increased sales in 2012 compared to 2008 (%)	-	34.93	24.56	34.29	
Household reporting increased profit in 2012 compared to 2008 (%)	-	26.13	20.18	25.08	
Amount of annual expenditure per household (Tk.)	73,622	86,256	78,117	89,858	
Amount of annual expenditure on education (clothing, books, transport, fees, other) (Tk.)	503	1,419	1,242	793	
Amount of annual expenditure on health care (drugs, transportation, diagnostic fees, other) (Tk.)	605	2,407	2,012	2,104	
FOOD SECURITY AND FOOD CONSUMPTION					
Household access to food throughout the year (%)	36.7	65.3	58.8	64.1	
Per capita daily food consumption (in k.cal)	1,762	1,953	1,902	1,956	
Average number of food deficit months in a year	2.5	0.9	1.1	2.5	
Average number of food deficiency days in a year	-	12.6	13.9	11.5	
POVERTY STATUS					
Direct Calorie Intake (DCI) Method	Absolute poverty (below 2122 k.cal per day/ person)	75.1	64.3	71.6	62.9
	Hardcore poverty (below 1805 k.cal per day/ person)	60.2	26.4	38.9	34.9
Cost of Basic Needs (CBN) Method	Below upper poverty line (zu)	86.0	67.9	78.9	66.7
	Below lower poverty line (zl)	71.6	42.7	57.6	46.7
LITERACY AND EDUCATION					
Household reported children between 5-16 years of age enrolled in school (%)	-	78.8	50.8	68.7	
Household reported gross enrolment rate of the children (6-10 years) (%)	-	111.3	71.9	109.5	
Household reported net enrolment rate of the children (6-10 years) (%)	-	82.4	61.3	75.5	
Household reported literacy rate of household members (7 years and above) (%)	-	54.1	40.8	47.6	

Indicators	Baseline	2012			
		Interven- tion	Control	Non-Imple- mentation	
Household reported literacy rate of household members (15 years and above) (%)	-	52.3	39.2	46.8	
Household reported literacy rate of household members (15-24 years old) (%)	Both	-	77.2	62.7	70.1
	Male	-	83.9	72.3	73.6
	Female	-	71.1	54.5	66.5
Proportion of children's access to govt. primary school (%)	-	73.4	83.7	79.8	
Proportion of children's access to Non-government primary school (%)	-	7.5	3.7	8.0	
Proportion of children's access to Community school (%)	-	17.6	12.6	12.2	
Proportion of household with child having class repetition in primary school (%)	-	12.7	17.8	17.2	
Proportion of household with child dropped out from primary education (%)	-	7.4	12.1	9.0	
Proportion of children who attend schools where multi lingual education materials are actively used (%)	-	49.9	35.2	27.3	
Proportion of household head considering language is a barrier to understand lessons (%)	-	51.9	52.2	59.3	
Proportion of household head considering provision of MLE should be introduced in school (%)	-	82.4	81.5	80.0	
Proportion of students with electricity at home for evening study (%)	21.3	34.8	15.2	16.5	
Proportion of students within 1 hour travel of a primary school (%)	-	98.0	94.3	97.9	
Proportion of students benefiting from innovative teaching materials and play equipment, and engaged in classroom activities (%)	-	70.2	51.0	23.4	
Proportion of female students at household attend school regularly (%)	-	65.4	62.1	55.4	
Household received any type of government assistance for child education (%)	-	79.4	74.5	77.9	
HEALTH: KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE					
Proportion of household understanding importance of nutrition for infant and children (all 3 issues) (%)	-	57.3	52.0	52.4	
Proportion of household understanding importance of proper immunization for children (%)	19.8	34.5	29.2	13.6	
Proportion of household understanding of the importance of maternal nutrition (all 3 issues) (%)	-	47.5	34.3	20.8	
Proportion of household with access to skilled birth attendants (SBA) and/or nurses/doctors with skills to provide safe delivery (%)	-	28.8	18.8	30.8	
Proportion of women who assisted by skilled health workers at delivery (%)	5.4	28.1	16.7	12.2	
Proportion of household with understanding about family planning (%)	-	93.3	87.6	80.4	
Proportion of household currently using family planning methods (%)	56.1	69.6	54.9	58.8	
Proportion of household understanding about overall nutrition (all 5 issues) (%)	-	39.2	35.1	24.6	
Proportion of household understanding about maternal health care (all 10 issues) (%)	-	16.6	12.1	2.7	
Proportion of pregnant women reporting regular attendance at ANC/PNC classes (%)	-	33.3	-	-	
Proportion of women with children under 1 year, reporting regular attendance at ANC/PNC classes (%)	-	14.1	-	-	

Indicators	Baseline	2012		
		Interven- tion	Control	Non-Imple- mentation
DPT/Penta vaccine coverage (Showed card: valid coverage) (%)	-	47.6	53.1	65.6
DPT/Penta Vaccine Coverage (Mother reported: crude coverage) (%)	-	91.6	90.6	100
Measles Vaccine Coverage (Showed card: valid coverage) (%)	-	48.1	39.4	47.8
Measles vaccine coverage (Mother reported: crude coverage) (%)	-	91.0	84.9	91.3
Proportion of household within 1 hour travel of at least one health care services/facilities (%)	-	74.3	59.9	60.3
Proportion of household within 1 hour travel of a pharmacy and/or other facility for the provision of essential drug (%)	-	63.9	61.4	52.4
Proportion of household understanding about STD (%)	4.0	16.4	8.8	6.3
Proportion of household understanding about AIDS (%)	6.0	50.3	31.6	37.5
Proportion of household understanding about symptoms of malaria (all 3 issues) (%)	-	55.6	49.4	35.2
Proportion of household understanding about prevention of malaria (%)	-	11.9	11.4	2.9
Proportion of household understanding on use mosquito net (preferably permethrin impregnated) while sleeping as prevention of Malaria (%)	-	96.0	97.1	93.3
Proportion of household practice on prevention of malaria (%)	-	3.7	3.5	1.0
Proportion of household using mosquito net (preferably permethrin impregnated) while sleeping as prevention of malaria (%)	-	95.2	93.3	93.7
WATER-SANITATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HYGIENE				
Proportion of household with access to safe water for drinking (%)	26.9	54.8	39.2	42.9
Proportion of household access to safe water for cooking (%)	23.1	45.7	34.8	31.4
Proportion of household with access to safe sanitation/ improved latrine (%)	8.2	14.3	9.4	7.3
Proportion of household with kitchen garden (%)	-	33.5	23.7	23.2
Proportion of household with waste management (%)	7.9	9.7	5.6	2.9
Proportion of household with compost <i>preparation</i> (%)	-	5.5	3.2	0.6
VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND HUMAN RIGHTS				
Proportion of household reported community initiative taken for reducing VAW (%)	-	20.7	16.4	8.9
PEACE AND CONFIDENCE BUILDING				
Household having any experience of violence during 2010-2012 (%)	-	35.3	25.4	36.8
Household is comfortable to move everywhere outside own <i>Para</i> (%)	-	64.3	62.2	74.9
Household is comfortable to carry on daily business (%)	-	73.2	71.6	82.0
Opinion in favor of introducing mixed policing (%)	-	74.1	74.0	79.6

Fact sheet: Bangalee Household

Indicators	Baseline	2012			
		Intervention	Control	Non-Implementation	
HOUSEHOLD PROFILE					
Average household size	5.4	5.3	4.8	5.0	
Dependency ratio of household population (%)	90.83	76.6	73.7	75.9	
Proportion of household with disabled member (%)	-	6.6	6.8	2.7	
Proportion of female headed household (%)	12.1	10.7	15.3	8.1	
Household with access to electricity (%)	Grid	22.8	54.2	34.2	35.0
	solar energy	4.4	26.6	10.3	33.0
EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME GENERATING ACTIVITIES					
Employment status of household population aged 15 years and above (%)	Both		80.6	77.6	82.9
	Male		82.6	79.2	85.4
	Female		78.5	76.0	80.3
Proportion of women engaged in income generating activities (%)	28.1	37.6	15	16.7	
Average number of employed member per household	-	2.8	2.4	2.6	
Income earning status of employed household member (%)	-	67.1	57.8	60.6	
HOUSEHOLD INCOME, EXPENDITURE, SAVINGS AND CREDIT					
Share of wage in total income (%)	13.4	17.3	23.8	30.2	
Annual net income per household (Tk.)	91,739	107,747	91,545	99,723	
Amount of annual savings per household (Tk.)	4,643	29,547	7,379	9,316	
Amount of annual credit per household (Tk.)	12,674	50,457	83,098	39,117	
Household reporting increased sales in 2012 compared to 2008 (%)	-	13.57	8.19	14.36	
Household reporting increased profit in 2012 compared to 2008 (%)	-	11.42	4.27	12.02	
Amount of annual expenditure per household (Tk.)	88,764	94,266	83,311	92,589	
Amount of annual expenditure on education (clothing, books, transport, fees, other) (Tk.)	527	1,630	1,453	1,820	
Amount of annual expenditure on health care (drugs, transportation, diagnostic fees, other) (Tk.)	998	2,608	2,607	2,017	
FOOD SECURITY AND FOOD CONSUMPTION					
Household access to food throughout the year (%)	34.6	46.0	50.9	34.1	
Per capita daily food consumption (in k.cal)	1,842	2,114	2,055	2,049	
Average number of food deficit months in a year	2.8	1.6	1.7	2.8	
Average number of food deficiency days in a year	-	17.5	18.7	25.5	
POVERTY STATUS					
Direct Calorie Intake (DCI) Method	Absolute poverty (below 2122 k.cal per day/ person)	75.3	54.3	66.2	62.8
	Hardcore poverty (below 1805 k.cal per day/ person)	59.2	21.6	21.7	23.3
Cost of Basic Needs (CBN) Method	Below upper poverty line (zu)	76.1	69.7	73.7	73.3
	Below lower poverty line (zl)	55.1	47.1	52.7	51.2
LITERACY AND EDUCATION					
Household reported children between 5-16 years of age enrolled in school (%)	-	83.7	63.2	81.7	
Household reported gross enrolment rate of the children (6-10 years) (%)	-	129.3	87.7	128.4	
Household reported net enrolment rate of the children (6-10 years) (%)	-	89.4	77.4	90.0	
Household reported literacy rate of household members	-	62.8	61.1	60.5	

Indicators	Baseline	2012		
		Intervention	Control	Non-Implementation
(7 years and above) (%)				
Household reported literacy rate of household members (15 years and above) (%)	-	62.4	61.9	60.1
Household reported literacy rate of household members (15-24 years old) (%)	Both	89.7	92.2	90.0
	Male	88.6	90.8	90.9
	Female	90.8	93.5	89.2
Proportion of children's access to govt. primary school (%)	-	72.5	67.6	78.7
Proportion of children's access to Non-government primary school (%)	-	8.1	9.7	3.1
Proportion of children's access to Community school (%)	-	12.3	16.5	7.4
Proportion of household with child having class repetition in primary school (%)	-	23.3	25.4	20.5
Proportion of household with child dropped out from primary education (%)	-	6.0	8.1	11.2
Proportion of children who attend schools where multi lingual education materials are actively used (%)	-	42.5	31.9	41.1
Proportion of household head considering language is a barrier to understand lessons (%)	-	7.3	5.8	9.9
Proportion of household head considering provision of MLE should be introduced in school (%)	-	46.6	38.7	31.1
Proportion of students with electricity at home for evening study (%)	27.7	46.5	24.6	40.3
Proportion of students within 1 hour travel of a primary school (%)	-	92.4	86.1	96.9
Proportion of students benefiting from innovative teaching materials and play equipment, and engaged in classroom activities (%)	-	67.2	61.3	69.6
Proportion of female students at household attend school regularly (%)	-	63.7	60.3	45.1
Household received any type of government assistance for child education (%)	-	86.4	83.8	91.9
HEALTH: KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE				
Proportion of household understanding importance of nutrition for infant and children (all 3 issues) (%)	-	65.5	66.1	46.5
Proportion of household understanding importance of proper immunization for children (%)	22.2	26.9	21.1	20.2
Proportion of household understanding of the importance of maternal nutrition (all 3 issues) (%)	-	62.2	51.6	41.9
Proportion of household with access to skilled birth attendants (SBA) and/or nurses/doctors with skills to provide safe delivery (%)	-	61.3	54.3	60.4
Proportion of women who assisted by skilled health workers at delivery (%)	19.9	26.9	13.8	17.8
Proportion of household with understanding about family planning (%)	-	98.5	96.9	95.0
Proportion of household currently using family planning methods (%)	58.4	76.7	72.8	65.6
Proportion of household understanding about overall nutrition (all 5 issues) (%)	-	37.5	38.2	22.9
Proportion of household understanding about maternal health care (all 10 issues) (%)	-	16.5	9.8	3.3
Proportion of pregnant women reporting regular attendance at ANC/PNC classes (%)	-	57.9	-	-
Proportion of women with children under 1 year,	-	30.5	-	-

Indicators	Baseline	2012		
		Interven- tion	Control	Non-Imple- mentation
reporting regular attendance at ANC/PNC classes (%)				
DPT/Penta vaccine coverage (Showed card: valid coverage) (%)	-	52.7	58.3	31.1
DPT/Penta Vaccine Coverage (Mother reported: crude coverage) (%)	-	94.5	91.6	93.3
Measles Vaccine Coverage (Showed card: valid coverage) (%)	-	46.7	61.1	30.0
Measles vaccine coverage (Mother reported: crude coverage) (%)	-	93.4	94.4	90.0
Proportion of household within 1 hour travel of at least one health care services/facilities (%)	-	82.4	76.5	78.7
Proportion of household within 1 hour travel of a pharmacy and/or other facility for the provision of essential drug (%)	-	90.7	86.4	95.0
Proportion of household understanding about STD (%)	7.1	6.9	3.9	2.7
Proportion of household understanding about AIDS (%)	10.2	72.4	60.0	60.5
Proportion of household understanding about symptoms of malaria (all 3 issues) (%)	-	43.3	43.1	31.8
Proportion of household understanding about prevention of malaria (%)	-	5.5	6.4	1.6
Proportion of household understanding on use mosquito net (preferably permethrin impregnated) while sleeping as prevention of Malaria (%)	-	98.1	97.5	96.9
Proportion of household practice on prevention of malaria (%)	-	2.6	1.8	0.8
Proportion of household using mosquito net (preferably permethrin impregnated) while sleeping as prevention of malaria (%)	-	97.2	95.7	95.3
WATER-SANITATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HYGIENE				
Proportion of household with access to safe water for drinking (%)	36.5	80.3	77.6	60.9
Proportion of household access to safe water for cooking (%)	30.4	69.9	71.2	55.4
Proportion of household with access to safe sanitation/improved latrine (%)	8.2	20.6	13.2	10.1
Proportion of household with kitchen garden (%)	-	40.7	32.4	32.6
Proportion of household with waste management (%)	13.2	30.4	27.8	17.1
Proportion of household with compost preparation (%)	-	15.7	12.8	6.2
VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND HUMAN RIGHTS				
Proportion of household reported community initiative taken for reducing VAW (%)	-	26.3	22.4	10.1
PEACE AND CONFIDENCE BUILDING				
Household having any experience of violence during 2010-2012 (%)	-	42.6	43.8	55.0
Household is comfortable to move everywhere outside own <i>Para</i> (%)	-	65.5	67.6	65.2
Household is comfortable to carry on daily business (%)	-	74.1	70.1	73.8
Opinion in favor of introducing mixed policing (%)	-	37.6	36.0	25.8

Fact sheet: All CHT (both Indigenous/tribal and Bangalee Household)

Indicators	Baseline	2012			
		Intervention	Control	Non-implementation	
HOUSEHOLD PROFILE					
Average household size	5.2	5.2	4.8	5.1	
Dependency ratio of household population (%)	82.1	69.7	73.7	75.9	
Proportion of household with disabled member (%)	-	5.4	6.4	3.7	
Proportion of female headed household (%)	9.0	7.1	10.3	7.5	
Household with access to electricity (%)	Grid	14.0	50.0	31.6	33.8
	solar energy	3.0	27.1	11.7	25.9
EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME GENERATING ACTIVITIES					
Employment status of household population aged 15 years and above (%)	Both	-	79.3	75.1	79.7
	Male	-	80.9	76.1	81.9
	Female	-	77.7	74.2	77.5
Proportion of women engaged in income generating activities (%)	35.8	43.4	30.0	38.5	
Average number of employed member per household	-	2.7	2.4	2.6	
Income earning status of employed household member (%)	-	77.3	70.7	76.4	
HOUSEHOLD INCOME, EXPENDITURE, SAVINGS AND CREDIT					
Share of wage in total income (%)	13.4	12.5	19.4	20.6	
Annual net income per household (Tk.)	85,050	101,436	88,365	93,106	
Amount of annual savings per household (Tk.)	4,575	22,549	8,755	9,706	
Amount of annual credit per household (Tk.)	8,597	28,189	42,423	27,103	
Household reporting increased sales in 2012 compared to 2008 (%)	-	25.98	17.17	24.96	
Household reporting increased profit in 2012 compared to 2008 (%)	-	19.73	13.00	19.20	
Amount of annual expenditure per household (Tk.)	80,434	89,742	80,459	91,088	
Amount of annual expenditure on education (clothing, books, transport, fees, other) (Tk.)	514	1,511	1,338	1,256	
Amount of annual expenditure on health care (drugs, transportation, diagnostic fees, other) (Tk.)	781	2,494	2,280	2,065	
FOOD SECURITY AND FOOD CONSUMPTION					
Household access to food throughout the year (%)	35.8	56.9	55.2	50.6	
Per capita daily food consumption (in k.cal)	1,797	2,023	1,971	1,998	
Average number of food deficit months in a year	2.7	1.2	1.3	2.7	
Average number of food deficiency days in a year	-	14.7	16.0	17.8	
POVERTY STATUS					
Direct Calorie Intake (DCI) Method	Absolute poverty (below 2122 k.cal per day/ person)	75.2	59.9	69.2	62.8
	Hardcore poverty (below 1805 k.cal per day/ person)	59.9	24.3	31.1	29.7
Cost of Basic Needs (CBN) Method	Below upper poverty line (zu)	81.6	68.7	76.6	69.6
	Below lower poverty line (zl)	64.2	44.6	55.4	48.7
LITERACY AND EDUCATION					
Household reported children between 5-16 years of age enrolled in school (%)	-	81.2	57.1	74.9	
Household reported gross enrolment rate of the children (6-10 years) (%)	-	119.9	80.0	119.2	
Household reported net enrolment rate of the children (6-10 years) (%)	-	85.7	69.6	83.0	
Proportion of overall (boys and girls) pupils starting grade 1 who reach grade 5 in project school catchment areas (%)	-	95.2	-	-	
Proportion of boys starting grade 1 who reach grade 5 in project school catchment areas (%)	-	95.5	-	-	
Proportion of pupils girls starting grade 1 who reach grade 5	-	94.8	-	-	

Indicators	Baseline	2012			
		Intervention	Control	Non-implementation	
in project school catchment areas (%)					
Household reported literacy rate of household members (7 years and above) (%)	-	58.0	50.0	53.1	
Household reported literacy rate of household members (15 years and above) (%)	-	56.7	49.0	52.2	
Household reported literacy rate of household members (15-24 years old) (%)	Both	-	83.1	75.4	77.6
	Male	-	86.2	80.4	79.8
	Female	-	80.1	71.0	75.4
Proportion of children's access to govt. primary school (%)	-	73.0	74.6	79.2	
Proportion of children's access to Non-government primary school (%)	-	7.8	7.1	5.3	
Proportion of children's access to community school (%)	-	14.9	14.8	9.6	
Proportion of students having class repetition in project school (%)	-	11.2	-	-	
Proportion of household with child having class repetition in primary school (%)	-	17.8	21.8	19.0	
Drop out rate in project school (%)	-	3.4	-	-	
Proportion of household with child dropped out from primary education (%)	-	6.7	10.0	10.1	
Proportion of school where multi lingual education materials are actively used (%)	-	53.3	-	-	
Proportion of children who attend schools where multi lingual education materials are actively used (%)	-	46.3	33.4	35.0	
Proportion of household head considering language is a barrier to understand lessons (%)	-	19.7	15.2	19.3	
Proportion of household head considering provision of MLE should be introduced in school (%)	-	65.1	59.1	54.2	
Proportion of students with electricity at home for evening study (%)	24.1	39.9	19.4	27.2	
Proportion of students within 1 hour travel of a primary school (%)	-	95.3	90.0	97.4	
Proportion of students benefiting from innovative teaching materials and play equipment, and engaged in classroom activities (%)	-	68.8	56.4	47.7	
Proportion of female students at household attend school regularly (%)	-	64.6	61.1	49.6	
Household received any type of government assistance for child education (%)	-	82.8	79.4	85.3	
HEALTH: KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE					
Proportion of household understanding importance of nutrition for infant and children (all 3 issues) (%)	-	61.0	58.4	49.6	
Proportion of household understanding importance of proper immunization for children (%)	20.9	31.2	25.6	16.6	
Proportion of household understanding of the importance of maternal nutrition (all 3 issues) (%)	-	54.0	42.1	31.0	
Proportion of household with access to skilled birth attendants (SBA) and/or nurses/doctors with skills to provide safe delivery (%)	-	42.0	32.6	40.0	
Proportion of women who assisted by skilled health workers at delivery (%)	12.0	27.6	15.4	14.9	
Proportion of household with understanding about family planning (%)	-	95.6	91.8	87.5	
Proportion of household currently using family planning methods (%)	57.2	72.8	63.0	62.1	
Proportion of household understanding about overall nutrition (all 5 issues) (%)	-	38.4	36.5	23.8	

Indicators	Baseline	2012		
		Intervention	Control	Non-implementation
Proportion of household understanding about maternal health care (all 10 issues) (%)	-	16.6	11.1	3.0
Proportion of pregnant women reporting regular attendance at ANC/PNC classes (%)	-	48.4	-	-
Proportion of women with children under 1 year, reporting regular attendance at ANC/PNC classes (%)	-	22.0	-	-
DPT/Penta vaccine coverage (Showed card: valid coverage) (%)	-	49.6	55.4	45.5
DPT/Penta Vaccine Coverage (Mother reported: crude coverage) (%)	-	92.8	91.1	96.1
Measles Vaccine Coverage (Showed card: valid coverage) (%)	-	47.5	47.1	36.5
Measles vaccine coverage (Mother reported: crude coverage) (%)	-	91.8	88.3	90.5
Proportion of household within 1 hour travel to at least one health care services/facilities (%)	-	77.8	67.4	68.6
Proportion of household within 1 hour travel of a pharmacy and/or other facility for the provision of essential drug (%)	-	75.5	72.7	71.6
Proportion of household understanding about STD (%)	5.4	12.3	6.6	4.7
Proportion of household understanding about AIDS (%)	7.9	59.9	44.4	48.0
Proportion of household understanding about symptoms of malaria (all 3 issues) (%)	-	50.2	46.5	33.7
Proportion of household understanding about prevention of malaria (%)	-	9.1	9.1	2.3
Proportion of household understanding on use mosquito net (preferably permethrin impregnated) while sleeping as prevention of Malaria (%)	-	96.9	97.3	94.9
Proportion of household practice on prevention of malaria (%)	-	3.2	2.7	0.9
Proportion of household using mosquito net (preferably permethrin impregnated) while sleeping as prevention of malaria (%)	-	96.1	94.4	94.4
WATER-SANITATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HYGIENE				
Proportion of household with access to safe water for drinking (%)	31.2	65.9	56.5	51.0
Proportion of household access to safe water for cooking (%)	26.3	56.3	51.2	42.2
Proportion of household with access to safe sanitation/ improved latrine (%)	8.2	17.0	11.1	8.6
Proportion of household with kitchen garden (%)	-	36.6	27.6	27.4
Proportion of household with waste management (%)	10.3	18.8	15.6	9.2
Proportion of household with compost preparation (%)	-	9.9	7.5	3.1
VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND HUMAN RIGHTS				
Proportion of household reported community initiative taken for reducing VAW (%)	-	23.1	19.1	9.4
PEACE AND CONFIDENCE BUILDING				
Household having any experience of violence during 2010-2012 (%)	-	38.5	33.7	45.0
Household is comfortable to move everywhere outside own Para (%)	-	64.8	64.6	70.5
Household is comfortable to carry on daily business (%)	-	73.6	70.9	78.3
Opinion in favor of introducing mixed policing (%)	-	58.3	56.9	55.4