Baseline Findings: Comparing First and Second tier CPHHs of Cohort 2.2

Background

During its second phase, the Chars Livelihoods Programme (CLP) aims to assist 67,000 core participant households (CPHHs) to move out of extreme poverty. CPHHs will receive an integrated package of support that includes a significant income generating asset, access to social development modules and savings groups, clean water and a sanitary latrine as well as access to a raised plinth. However CPHHs must meet strict selection criteria. Essentially, they must be jobless, assetless, and landless.

The selection criteria were developed in 2005 and have not been radically adjusted since. One of the criteria, namely the asset threshold of Tk 5,000[1], is extremely low and has not been adjusted for inflation meaning that each annual recruitment of participants requires households to be poorer and poorer to qualify.

The CLP is therefore piloting a 'second tier' in which 1,000 CPHHs will receive a smaller package of support e.g. an income generating asset valued at Tk 9,000 instead of the Tk 15,500 that first tier households receive. Second tier households will also be able to own and share crop up to 5 decimals and 33 decimals of land respectively[2].

The initial pilot of 1,000 second tier households come from villages in Kurigram and Lalmonirhat and have been recruited by three implementing organizations (SKS, MJSKS and RSDA). Households will receive assets from February 2011.

The report, on which this brief is based, documents the baseline socio-economic and nutritional status of second tier households and compares these with the baseline status of first tier households. Both tiers come from cohort 2.2.

Methodology

Socioeconomic data were collected in January 2011 by CLP's Community Development Organisers and anthropometry and haemoglobin data by enumerators from an outsourced company. Empowerment related data will be collected during February from a sample of CPHHs.

Table 1 shows the sample sizes, which were drawn largely from the same villages.

[1] Selected households may not own more than 2 goats/sheep, 10 fowl & 1 shared cattle.
[2] 1 decimal is approximately 40M².

Table 1: Study sample sizes

	Socio-economic (CPHHs)	Nutrition	Empower-ment (CPHHs)
Tier 1	1,303 (or 31% of cohort 2.2 'additional')[3]	274 CPs* and 163 children <5 years	250
Tier 2	1,000 (or 100%)	272 CPs and 141 children <5 years	250

*Core Participants

Results

First and second tier households are similar in many respects:

- Average first and second tier households are well below the income poverty line of Tk 32 per person per day[4]. There are no significant differences between incomes with first tier having a mean income of Tk 22 pppd compared to Tk 23 pppd for the second tier. Thus both cohorts fall some 30% below the extreme poverty threshold.
- Very small proportions of both first and second tier households possess any savings (4.3% and 3.3% respectively).
- Education levels of first and second tier household heads and core participants themselves are minimal with no significant difference between the two tiers (77.4% of household heads in the first tier and 74.2% of the second tier have received no education).
- Daily wage labour is equally important for both tiers (84.8% of first tier and 83.8% of the second).
- Access to clean water and a sanitary latrine is low for both first and second tier households. Only 6.7% and 7.7% of first and second tier households respectively have access to a tubewell with a platform on a raised plinth. While only 10.4% and 13.8% of first and second tier households have access to a sanitary latrine.
- There is no difference in the nutritional status of mothers or children <5 years of age (with the exception of child anaemia being marginally less in the second tier). The mean Body Mass Index of mothers from first and second tier is 19.13 and 19.12 respectively. 41.1% of children <5 years old from first tier and 36.9% from second tier households are stunted.

[3] Cohort 2.2 comprises 7,443 'original' first tier CPHHs plus 4,169 'additional' first tier CPHHs. The 'original' CPHHs received their assets from November 2010 whilst the 'additional' CPHHs will receive their assets from February 2011. 'Additional' CPHHs were identified due to the availability of additional funding.
[4] CLP-2 Log Frame (as advised by DFID economists).

Case study: First Tier CPHH

Rezia (Khariza Natsala, Ulipur, Kurigram)

Rezia (72) lives in a jute stick house with a tin roof and shares a yard with her daughter and son-in-law. Rezia cooks separately. She earns Tk 60 a day working as a day labourer. During crisis periods, when there is no work available, she resorts to begging and struggles to get food for herself. Most of the time she eats rice with potatoes and leafy vegetables. She cannot afford meat, eggs, milk or fish.

Income: Tk 23.3 pppd
Expenditure: Tk 22.07 pppd
Savings: 0
Productive assets: 0
% of cash income spent on food: 97%
Mother's BMI: 18.82

However, given the differences in selection criteria, there do exist some differences between first and second tier households; the most important being:

- First tier households have less assets (averaging Tk 633) than the second tier (Tk 5,574). They also have lower savings (Tk 77 for first tier and Tk 108 for second tier).
- Fewer first tier households are share croppers (49.1% of second tier and only 0.9% of the first tier).
- First tier households are less likely to live on a raised plinth (52.9% of second tier compared to 44.4% of the first tier).
- The first tier has more female heads (21.5% compared to 10.5% of second tier) and a higher proportion of children of school going age with no education (48.7% compared to 37.8% respectively).
- Members of first tier households are more likely to practice open defecation e.g. 36.2% of adult males from the first tier report that they practice open defecation compared to 23.7% of second tier adult males.
- A higher proportion of first tier children <5 years are anaemic (47.8% compared to 35.5% of second tier children).
- First tier households are slightly more food insecure than the second tier, as indicated by mean monthly household expenditure on food (Tk 1,298 compared to Tk 1,431), the mean number of food groups consumed (5.8 to 6.1) and the mean number of coping strategies used (2.7 to 2.5) during the 7 days prior to the survey.

Case study: Second Tier CPHH

Bobita (Poshchim Holdibari, Hatibandha, Lalmonirhat)

Bobita (54) has a son (35) and four daughters (32, 30, 25 and 18), two of whom are married. One works as a maid in Dhaka. Bobita lives with her remaining daughter, son and daughter-in-law. Since her husband died, she has worked as a day labourer earning Tk 80-100 per day, sometimes with food for breakfast and lunch. Bobita rears a share-goat and owns a chicken. Usually her family eats rice with green leafy vegetables and has fish once a month but cannot afford milk or eggs.

Income: Tk 40 pppd
Expenditure: Tk 36.9 pppd
Savings: 0
Productive assets: Tk 1,000
% of cash income spent on food: 50%
Mother's BMI: 18.44

Prepared by IML
February 2011