



**LIFE-NoPest
Phase-II
Project**

**Report on the baseline surveys on
Farm production and income
Marketing practices
Accessibility to common natural resources
and mainstream extension services**

J U L Y 2 0 0 3

**CARE Bangladesh
20-21 Karwan Bazar, Progoti Center
Dhaka, Bangladesh
Phone 8114207-09, E-mail carebang@bangla.net**

Table of content

Section -I: Introduction

1.1. Project Background	3
1.2. Operational Strategies of the ongoing sub-phase	4
1.3. Objective of the baseline study	4
1.4. Study Methodology	5
1.5. Data collection procedure	5
1.6. Quality Control	6
1.7. Sample Size for the baseline Survey	6
1.8. Major information captured by the baseline survey	8
1.9. Data processing analysis	8

Section-II: Findings on farm production, marketing and income.

2.1. Participant enrollment	10
2.2. Land ownership Patten	11
2.5. Food security status	14
2.6. 1. Aus paddy (Involvement, use of Fertilizer and pesticide, crop husbandry and yield)	14
2.6.2. Transplanted Amon Cultivation (Involvement, use of Fertilizer and pesticide, crop husbandry and yield)	16
2.6.3. Boro Paddy (Involvement, use of Fertilizer and pesticide, crop husbandry and yield)	17
2.7. Vegetable Cultivation	18
2.8. Field Crop Cultivation Status (excluding Paddy)	19
2.9. Fish Farming Practices	20
2.9.2. Rice cum Fish Culture	22
2.10. Tree plantation and fruit tree management	22
2.11. Poultry and livestock rearing	23
2.12. Agricultural Marketing and Off-farm income generating activities	24
2.13. Off-farm activities	27
2.14. Other source of Income	28
2.15. Average household income of the participants	28

Section-III: Organization Development Process and Organizational activities including increasing common natural reasons and services

3.1.	General information of the CBOs and Evolving organization	30
3.2.	Type and membership of the organization	30
3.4.	Constitutions	31
3.5.	Governance of the organization	32
3.6.	Resource mobilization and utilization	33
3.7.1.	Grants received by the organization	35
3.7.2	Linkage with mainstream service providers	36
3.7.4.	Accessing common natural resources	37
3.7.5.	Establishment of Women Market Corners	37

Section-IV: Annexes	40-
58	

Section - I

Introduction

1.1. Project Background

LIFE-No Pest Phase-II project is a merger of previously phased-out ‘Locally Intensified Farming Enterprises (LIFE)’ and ‘New Options for Pest Management (No Pest)’ projects. LIFE-No Pest Phase-II project started operation on April 1, 2001 and is scheduled to end in June 2004. The project’s first sub-phase ended on 31st March 2003 and the second sub-phase with the saved up money from the first sub-phase started on 1st April 2003. The project is funded by the European Commission (EC) and implemented by CARE Bangladesh.

The first sub-phase of the project adopted the Farmer Field School (FFS) as an extension methodology, which helped farmers to undergo experiential learning processes and becoming more analytical in analyzing location-specific agro-ecological conditions and testing and innovating sustainable technical solutions to problems that inhibit enhancement of farm productivity. The project in its first sub-phase assisted food insecure farmers to better understand their agro-ecological conditions and to seek out innovations that can ease constraints to enhance farm productivity. The first sub-phase also saw two pilots implemented—the first one on facilitating FFS groups to evolve into community-based farmers’ organizations so that they can better address constraints (ranging from technical to social and institutional) to achieve food security. The second pilot was to build capacity of evolving farmers’ organizations on marketing agricultural produces so that they can fetch better prices for their produces and cost save in procuring agricultural inputs. The current sub phase of the LIFE-No Pest Phase-II project facilitates farmers’ groups to form and/or strengthen their own organizations, assists them consolidating gains made in productivity, promotes secondary adoption of improved farm technologies, builds capacity of the participant farmers’ organizations/groups on marketing agricultural produces and off-farm products. It also empowers farmers’ organizations to access common property natural resources and mainstream extension services. Common natural resources include *khas* land, open water bodies, roadside slope land and extension services include services from mainstream extension agents such as Department of Agricultural Extension and Department of Livestock.

More than 63,000 farm households benefited from the first sub-phase of the project as direct participants and secondary adopters. The targeted beneficiaries of the project are the food insecure farm households, who primarily depend on agriculture for their livelihoods. A total number of 25,000 farm households (selected from the participants of the first sub phase) are now benefiting from the current sub-phase of the project. Half of them (i.e. 12,500 farm households) are directly participating in the project and the remaining 12,500 households are expected to benefit from lateral spread of improved farm technologies adopted by the direct participants and form the community development activities undertaken by the existing and evolving farmers’ organizations. The direct beneficiary

farmers are organized in 500 groups, 100 of them have evolved into community-based farmers' organizations and the remaining 400 are in the process of evolution into organizations. The project works with the targeted farmers directly and through locally rooted partner NGOs. The project entered into partnership with eight qualified NGOs and provides them technical support and financial resources to implement project activities. The project operates in the districts of Mymensingh, Sherpur, Kishoreganj, Rajshahi and Chapai Nowabganj covering 19 Upazillas. A list of Upzilla is given in Annex-1

1.2. Operational strategy for the ongoing sub phase of the project

On consolidating gains in agricultural productivity, the ongoing sub phase of the project adopted two-pronged strategy. Firstly, the project and the PNGO staff members provide technical services to the participant farmers. Secondly, it facilitates sustainable linkages between the participant farmers and the mainstream agricultural extension service providers (e.g. Department of Agricultural Extension and Department of Livestock) so that they are continuously exposed to new ideas and technologies and can receive advice regularly. On promoting secondary adoption, the project made it obligatory for the direct participants to share what he/she learns about improved technologies and practices by participating in the project with at least one neighboring farmer. In addition, the project organizes farmers' field days, farmers' science congress and facilitates the participant farmers to take part in agricultural fairs. On enhancing cash income of the participant farmers, the strategic focus is to build farmers' capacity on marketing so that they can fetch higher prices for their agricultural produces and non-farm products. And on enhancing access to common property natural resources the strategic focus is to empower farmers by raising their awareness on their legitimate right to access *khas* land, water bodies and road side slope land. As a vehicle to achieve the stated objectives of the ongoing sub phase, the project facilitates formation, strengthening and empowerment of farmers' organizations. The current sub-phase of the project facilitates as many as 400 farmers' groups to evolve into community-based organizations and another 100 farmers' organizations to further consolidate gains made earlier during the first sub phase of the project. As a result of enhanced technical and marketing capability, greater access to common natural resources, mainstream extension services and farm production and income of the beneficiary households are likely improve food security significantly by the end of the ongoing sub-phase of the project.

1.3. Objective of the Baseline Study

The overall objective of the baseline study is to gather and analyze information on where the participants stand at the beginning of the on going sub-phase of the project with respect to farm production and income, marketing practices and access to common property resources. The baseline study is to give us benchmark against which successes of

the project interventions can be measured. The specific objectives of the survey are the following:

To ascertain the current levels of production and income obtained by the participants;
To get an impression of the current marketing practices adopted by the participants; and
To determine the present status of CBOs and evolving organizations and their accessibility to common property natural resources and mainstream services.

1.4. Study Methodology

Small-scale farming systems in Bangladesh are highly mixed. A typical small-scale farmer grows a combination of crops, including rice and vegetable, raise poultry and livestock and plant trees in the homestead. S/he also tends to grow fish depending on availability of pond (perennial or seasonal). Another important feature of small-scale farmers is that although they tend to produce mainly for their own household consumption, they are increasingly becoming responsive to price signals and they do sell a considerable part of their agricultural produces to meet need for cash. Highly mixed farming systems dictate that one takes into consideration various farm enterprises while estimating farm production and income. In order to estimate farm production and income, a semi-structured questionnaire was developed in consultation with the selected staff from the project and partner organizations and incorporating the learning of the first sub phase. The name of this questionnaire is “Participant Registration” given in **annex-III**, to collect socio-demographic, land ownership pattern and food security status of the participants. Another data collection format—Baseline Data Collection Questionnaire” was developed for collecting data on production and income from the farming activities and marketing practices of the participants, which is attached as **annex IV**. In addition, for collecting data on organizational development process and activities of the evolving organizations and CBOs including their access to common property resources, linkage-network with mainstream service providers and incorporation with the service providers as service recipient, another format was developed, which is attached in **annex V**. A comprehensive guideline was also developed to facilitate data collection and baseline data were collected using a two-stage random sampling techniques.

1.5. Data Collection Procedure

Field Trainers under direct service delivery and the Extension Facilitators under service delivery through partners collected data at the field level. All these frontline staff members were given an orientation on the questionnaire and data collection. Some of them were also involved in designing the questionnaire and field-testing.

1.6. Quality Control

The Project Coordinator and the Assistant Project Coordinator respectively provided the overall leadership and guidance in conducting the survey. The Project Development Officer (M&E), and the Monitoring Officers of Partner NGOs were responsible for the whole process of the survey. The team leaders (team leaders are the supervisors of the Field Trainers in case of direct service delivery and Field Extensionist in case of partnership service delivery) ensured authenticity of data collected by physically verifying a part (10%) of the filled in questionnaire. The Project Development Officers for Marketing and Organization Development and Technical Officers for Agriculture and Aquaculture were involved in cross checking data during the collection process.

1.7. Sample Size for the Baseline Survey or farm production, income and marketing.

Given the population size of the ongoing sub phase of the project and the time and efforts that can be invested in the baseline survey it was decided to conduct the baseline survey using a random sampling methods. The theoretical rationale behind determining the size of the sample for this baseline survey is elaborated below.

A statistically significant sample size, which represents the entire target population (within the confines as specified), is determined with the following equation

$$n = \frac{z^2 pq}{d^2}$$

Where

- n= the desired sample size when target population is greater than 10,000
- z= the standard normal deviate
- p= the proportion in the target population estimated to have a particular characteristics
- q= 1.0-p
- d= degree of accuracy desired

Following is a brief explanation of what each of the parameters shown above:

- n- in instances where our target population exceeds 10,000, 'n' represents the sample size which can represent the entire target population
- z- this relates to how confident we wish to be that the result obtained from the sample estimate are accurate. 'z' has been set at 1.96 which equates to a confidence level of 95% (this can be considered to be a customary figure)

p- this is the estimate of the percentage of the target population which will adopt 1 new practice and/or have an increase in return in Taka as specified in the Logical Framework. Hence, to ensure that we maximize the expected variance and therefore select a sample size that is sure to be large enough, an estimate of 50% has been taken.

D- this relates to the level of accuracy of the data retrieved from the sample population. This has been set at 5% that means the results obtained are within an accuracy of 5%.

Hence, using the above figures for the parameters defined in the equation for determining sample size, we see the following

$$n = \frac{(1.96)^2(0.5)(0.5)}{(0.05)^2}$$
$$= 384 \text{ (approx.)}$$

Distribution of samples according to interventions:

Production and income: As stated above, the sample size for the baseline survey was 384. However, in order to distribute workload evenly among the staff members (80 staff, including partnership delivery), a rounded up sample size (400) was chosen. In an attempt to ensure equal representation of respondents from the five projects sites each of the Field Trainers and Field Facilitators collected data from 5 households (3 households drawn from direct project participants and 2 households from buddy participants for each staff). Firstly they have randomly selected 3 organizations from 6-7 organizations they are facilitating. After getting the selected organizations they again randomly selected 3 direct participants and 2 buddy participants from these organizations.

Agricultural Marketing: On agricultural marketing data were collected from the sampled 400 households mentioned above. However, for selecting control farmers to collect data on agricultural marketing a total number 160 households of similar socio-economic characteristic, were selected from around the organizations.

Organizational Development and accessing common property resources: To collect information on the organizational development process and their activities e.g. accessing khas lands, linkage-network establishment with mainstream service providers as well incorporation with the service provider organizations as service recipient, a total number of 252 organizations were randomly selected (around 50%). Out of the 252 sampled organizations 50 are CBOs and 202 are evolving organization.

1.8. Major information captured by baseline survey

The baseline survey on **farm production and income** mainly captured information on the following:

- i. Family size of the respondent households and their rice provisioning ability;
- ii. Households' involvement in rice, vegetable, fish, rice-cum fish production and tree plantation, dyke cropping, poultry and livestock etc.
- iii. Yields, costs and return of *Aus*, Transplanted *Amon* and *Boro* paddy;
- iv. Costs and return of growing fish in ponds, rice-cum-fish production;
- v. Households' involvement in field crop production (here field crops refer to other crops grown in crop fields excepting rice and vegetables)
- vi. Major off-farm activities and income from these activities

The key information covered for **marketing** baseline survey includes:

- i. Households involvement in agricultural marketing activities.
- ii. Marketing practices of these households
- iii. Involvement of households in off farm activities e.g. food processing, handicrafts, animal raising etc.
- iv. Income from marketing of agricultural produces and off farm activities.

The baseline survey of the **organizational development process and activities of evolving organizations** captured the following information:

- i. General information of the community based organizations (CBOs) and evolving organizations (EOs)
- ii. Membership pattern of the organizations
- iii. Legal status and organizational structures of the organizations including state of constitutions
- iv. State of internal governance of the organizations
- v. Activities of the organizations including establishment of linkages networks with the mainstream service providers as well as incorporation of the organizations as service recipient with these service providers and accessing common property resources and involvement in marketing activities including establishment of women market corners.

1.9. Data Processing and analysis

After reviewing the filled out questionnaires and checking the validity of data collected, the data were entered and analyzed using software application package named MS Access. The Project Development Officer (M&E) guided the process of data entry and did the analysis using SPSS and MS Excel. The Project Coordinator and the Assistant Project Coordinator jointly prepared the report.

Section II

Findings on Farm Production,
Agricultural Marketing Practices
and Income

Basic information of the participants

2.1. Participant enrolment

In the ongoing sub phase, as many as 13,261 farm households (against a target of 12,500) were selected by CARE staff and partner organizations to work with from amongst the 63,000 households, who earlier participated in the first sub phase. These households are organized in 100 farmers' organizations and 400 groups who are evolving into organizations. CARE and PNGO staff members work directly with these participants and termed them as direct participants. Fifty one percent of the direct participants are female and the remaining 49% are male. Each of these direct participants selected at least one neighboring farmer as buddy participants. Thus the direct participants selected another 12,791 participant as buddy, of them 51% are male and 49% are female. Following table shows the field office-wise distributions of direct participants and buddy farmers served by the project and partner organizations.

Table-1: Distribution of participants (direct and buddy) according to district based Field Offices and Partner Organizations

Team	Direct Participant					Buddy Participant				
	Male		Female		Total	Male		Female		Total
	%	#	%	#		%	#	%	#	
CARE Kishoreganj	72	947	28	366	1313	72	814	28	323	1137
CARE Mymensingh	56	882	44	689	1571	54	769	46	655	1424
CARE Sherpur	50	760	50	770	1530	48	671	52	718	1389
CARE Rajshahi	68	810	32	386	1196	74	882	26	314	1196
CARE Chapai Nawabgonj	23	279	77	921	1200	25	298	75	902	1200
Sub total										
POPI-Kishoreganj	44	358	56	453	811	44	358	56	453	811
RAC-BD Kishoreganj	51	407	49	393	800	51	406	49	394	800
PBK Kishoreganj	43	346	57	461	807	43	348	57	460	808
RDS Sherpur	48	389	52	418	807	48	385	52	420	805
LUSTRE Natore	41	327	59	474	801	41	327	59	474	801
PARTNER Rajshahi	43	351	57	456	807	44	353	56	454	807
POSD Rajshahi	43	351	57	461	812	45	366	55	441	807
ACD Rajshahi	32	254	68	552	806	30	241	70	565	806
Sub total										
Total	49	6461	51	6800	13261	49	6218	51	6573	12791

2.2. Land ownership pattern of direct participants

The participants of LIFE-No Pest Phase-II project are food insecure farm households, who primarily depend on agriculture for their livelihood. They are mostly marginal farmers. Earlier in the first sub phase the project participants were identified based on well-being analysis, where the project facilitated the villagers to identify food insecure households. In rural Bangladesh land ownership is an important determining criterion for food security.

The baseline survey revealed that about 87% of the direct participant farmers own no more than one acre of land inclusive of homestead. Another 5.5% of them own land ranging from 1.01 acres to 1.5 acres, 3.7% own land in between 1.5 acres to 2 acres and only about 0.8% of the participants own land in between 2.01acres to 2.5 acres and only about 1.3% participants own more than 2.5 acres of land. Land ownership of the buddy participants as evident from the following table exhibits similarity to that of direct participants. It is to be noted that as a result of engagement with the first sub phase of the project, some participants were able to increase their income and property resources.

Table 2: Land ownership of participants

Direct Participants						
Field Office	Land owned (in Decimal)					
	0-50	51-100	101-150	151-200	201-250	250>
CARE Kishoreganj	57.7	23.7	11.0	4.2	1.8	1.8
CARE Mymensingh	49.7	26.7	9.5	7.0	2.1	5.0
CARE Sherpur	62.6	20.8	6.3	4.8	1.7	3.7
CARE Rajshahi	61.5	32.4	3.4	1.4	0.2	1.2
CARE Chapai Nawabgonj	73.4	18.9	5.3	1.6	0.8	0.0
Partner Organization						
POPI-Kishoreganj	66.7	29.2	2.6	1.5	0.0	0.0
RAC-BD Kishoreganj	66.6	23.8	8.3	1.4	0.0	0.0
PBK Kishoreganj	70.4	18.6	7.6	2.7	0.5	0.2
RDS Sherpur	66.5	24.2	6.9	2.2	0.1	0.0
LUSTRE Natore	67.8	21.2	9.2	1.7	0.0	0.0
PARTNER Rajshahi	74.1	23.8	1.6	0.5	0.0	0.0
POSD Rajshahi	54.9	23.4	13.9	7.5	0.2	0.0
ACD Rajshahi	68.1	16.7	5.5	9.2	0.5	0.0
Average	63.5	23.5	7.1	3.7	0.8	1.3
Buddy Participant						
CARE Kishoreganj	62.5	21.9	10.6	3.8	1.0	0.2
CARE Mymensingh	52.5	29.9	8.1	5.6	1.5	2.3
CARE Sherpur	72.6	19.1	4.4	2.6	0.6	0.7
CARE Rajshahi	65.2	28.9	3.1	1.4	0.2	1.2

CARE Chapai Nawabgonj	79.7	13.9	4.2	1.8	0.4	0.0
POPI-Kishoreganj	65.8	33.0	0.6	0.4	0.1	0.0
RAC-BD Kishoreganj	58.1	30.4	10.4	1.0	0.0	0.1
PBK Kishoreganj	65.8	20.8	9.5	3.5	0.2	0.1
RDS Sherpur	64.2	25.6	7.5	1.9	0.2	0.6
LUSTRE Natore	69.5	24.0	4.0	2.5	0.0	0.0
PARTNER Rajshahi	72.1	22.2	3.0	2.7	0.0	0.0
POSD Rajshahi	59.1	23.9	9.7	7.2	0.1	0.0
ACD Rajshahi	69.2	19.6	3.3	7.8	0.0	0.0
Average	65.9	23.9	6.0	3.2	0.4	0.5

2.3. Family size of the participants

Among the direct participant the average number of members per household is 4.8, which is maximum 5.1 at Kishoreganj district and minimum 4.2 at Rajshahi district. Among the buddy participants, average members per family stands at 4.5, with 5 (maximum) in Kishoreganj and 4 (minimum) in Rajshahi. Following table presents the average family size according to districts and partner organizations.

Table-3: Family size of the participants

Team	Direct Participant		Buddy Participant	
	No. of family member	Standard Deviation	No. of family member	Standard Deviation
CARE Kishoreganj	5.1	2.1	5.0	1.8
CARE Mym Singh	5.0	1.8	4.8	1.8
CARE Sherpur	4.6	1.6	4.3	1.5
CARE Rajshahi	4.3	1.6	4.1	1.5
CARE Chapai Nawabgonj	5.0	1.9	4.7	1.8
POPI-Kishoreganj	5.1	2.0	4.8	1.9
RAC-BD Kishoreganj	5.1	1.9	4.8	1.8
PBK Kishoreganj	5.3	1.9	4.9	1.8
RDS Sherpur	4.6	1.6	4.6	1.6
LUSTRE Natore	4.4	1.6	4.2	1.5
PARTNER Rajshahi	4.4	1.6	4.3	1.5
POSD Rajshahi	4.4	1.7	4.2	1.5
ACD Rajshahi	4.2	1.5	4.0	1.5
Average	4.8	1.8	4.5	1.7

2.4. Distribution of participants according to religions

Muslim overwhelmingly dominates the participants as they make up 97% of the direct participants and 99% of buddy farmers. Among the selected participants only about 2% are Hindu and 1% are from an indigenous ethnic community named Santal. Table 4 below presents a distribution of participants according to region (district offices and partner organization wise).

Table 4: Distribution of the participants according to religions

Direct Participant							
District	Muslim		Hindu		Ethnic—Santal		Total
	%	#	%	#	%	#	
CARE Kishoreganj	98	1111	2	26	0	0	1137
CARE Mymensingh	98	1394	2	30	0	0	1424
CARE Sherpur	99	1376	1	13	0	0	1389
CARE Rajshahi	99	1179	1	17	0	0	1196
CARE Chapai Nawabgonj	93	1117	3	36	4	47	1200
POPI-Kishoreganj	96	780	4	31	0	0	811
RAC-BD Kishoreganj	100	800	0	0	0	0	800
PBK Kishoreganj	98	792	2	16	0	0	808
RDS Sherpur	100	801	0	4	0	0	805
LUSTRE Natore	95	757	4	29	2	15	801
PARTNER Rajshahi	95	763	1	9	4	35	807
POSD Rajshahi	100	804	0	3	0	0	807
ACD Rajshahi	94	754	4	35	2	17	806
Total	97	12428	2	249	1	114	12791
Buddy Participant							
CARE Kishoreganj	97	1271	3	42	0	0	1313
CARE Mymensingh	98	1545	2	26	0	0	1571
CARE Sherpur	99	1517	1	13	0	0	1530
CARE Rajshahi	98	1172	2	22	0	2	1196
CARE Chapai Nawabgonj	87	1043	3	41	10	116	1200
POPI-Kishoreganj	94	766	6	45	0	0	811
RAC-BD Kishoreganj	100	800	0	0	0	0	800
PBK Kishoreganj	97	786	3	21	0	0	807
RDS Sherpur	98	793	2	14	0	0	807
LUSTRE Natore	95	759	3	26	2	16	801
PARTNER Rajshahi	98	792	1	9	1	6	807
POSD Rajshahi	99	805	1	7	0	0	812
ACD Rajshahi	92	739	6	50	2	17	806

Total	97	12788	2	316	1	157	13261
-------	----	-------	---	-----	---	-----	-------

2.5. Food security status of the participants

As high as 94% of the direct participant households are still food insecure. Food insecurity ranges from 1 to 11 months. Only 6% of the direct participant reported to be food secured around the year. It is to be noted that the participants of the current sub phase of the project took part in project activities during the first phase and improved food security. Among the buddy participants 97% are food insecure for 1 to 11 months. However, a majority (62% for direct participants and 66% for buddy participants of the project participants) is still considerably food insecure and can meet household food requirement from their own production for a period of only 1-6 months only.

Table 5: Extent of food security of the participants (by months)

Service Delivery	Teams	Direct Participant (% HH)					Buddy Participant (% HH)				
		Months of food availability from own production					Months of food availability from own production				
		1-3	4-6	7-9	10-11	12	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-11	12
Direct by CARE Staff	CARE Kishoreganj	33	29	18	9	11	33	32	18	15	3
	CARE Mymensingh	21	26	19	16	18	25	29	18	18	9
	CARE Sherpur	34	32	17	9	7	44	31	14	10	2
	CARE Rajshahi	26	31	22	20	1	30	26	20	20	3
	CARE Chapai Nawabgonj	19	31	24	22	4	29	36	22	13	0
Through Partner NGO Staff	POPI-Kishoreganj	42	27	17	8	6	36	30	18	11	5
	RAC-BD Kishoreganj	26	40	20	14	0	23	39	24	13	1
	PBK Kishoreganj	39	32	14	7	8	43	28	12	12	6
	RDS Sherpur	43	26	15	14	2	44	25	13	14	5
	LUSTRE Natore	43	31	17	9	0	47	27	15	10	1
	PARTNER Rajshahi	38	37	16	4	4	46	31	13	7	2
	POSD Rajshahi	33	29	22	12	5	43	24	20	14	0
	ACD Rajshahi	23	39	16	20	2	28	37	15	19	2
Average	31	31	18	13	6	36	30	17	14	3	

Agriculture Production, Marketing and Households Income

2.6. Cost and return of rice production

2.6.1. Aus Paddy

Involvement of participants in Aus paddy cultivation

Among the three major rice crops grown namely, Boro (irrigated), Aus, and Transplanted Amon (rain fed) Aus lost ground in overall terms significantly. With the spread of

irrigation Boro paddy is leading in terms of acreage and production. However, in some places of the project sites the farmers tend to produce Aus paddy. The baseline survey revealed that on an average 33% of the direct participants and 27% of the buddy participants cultivated Aus rice during the immediate past last year from the date of the survey. The incidence of Aus rice cultivation was highest among the farmers of Chapai Nawabgonj (50%) district and lowest in Sherpur (5%). In the case of buddy participants, farmers of both the Chapai Nawabgonj and Mymensingh districts ranked top (50%) and consistently the farmers of Sherpur were at the bottom (4%) when it came to cultivating Aus paddy.

Table 6: Yield, use of fertilizers (organic and chemical) and application of pesticides in Aus paddy cultivation (April –August 2002)

Direct Participant (Direct delivery and partnership taken together)						
District	Involved HH (%)	Fertilizer applied		Pesticide used		Production (kg/acre)
		Inorganic (kg/acre)	Organic (kg/acre)	HH %	Frequency	
CARE Kishoreganj	35	69	1317	17	1.0	926
CARE Mymensingh	44	78	73	33	1.0	934
CARE Sherpur	5	40	0	0	0.0	750
CARE Rajshahi	37	103	620	47	1.7	1289
CARE Chapai Nawabgonj	50	144	894	25	1.3	1138
Average	33	102	766	32	1.4	1093
Buddy Participant (Direct delivery and partnership taken together)						
Kishoreganj	23	74	1133	40	1.3	897
Mymensingh	50	69	92	33	1.0	916
Sherpur	4	75	0	100	1.0	955
Rajshahi	28	118	580	80	1.8	1262
Chapai Nawabgonj	50	132	731	25	1.5	1086
Average	27	99	621	51	1.5	1065

Crop husbandry

Aus growers used an average of 102 kg/acre (direct participant) and 99 kg/acre (buddy participant) chemical fertilizers (Urea, Triple Super Phosphate, Murate of Potash, Zinc and Sulphur. The amount of using organic (mainly cow dung) fertilizer was average 766 kg/acres for direct participant, which is 877 kg/acre for buddy participants. The higher amount of organic fertilizer use among direct participants than the buddy is the result of project facilitation about LEISA in the preceding season. Among the Aus farmers 32% (direct participants) and 51% (buddy) found in using pesticide.

Yield

The average production in Aus was recorded as 1093 kg/acre and 1065 kg/acre for direct and buddy participants respectively while the national average is 1000-1120 kg/acre (BBS, 1998). The higher yield of direct participants over the buddy participants was due to the

facilitation of the project during the previous sub-phase of the project where they received services from the project.

2.6.2. Transplanted Amon Paddy

Involvement of participants in Transplanted Amon Cultivation

The baseline survey revealed that during the last Transplanted Amon season (2002), average 72% and 66% direct and buddy participants were involved in Transplanted Amon cultivation respectively. Among the direct participants the highest (94% HH) involvement was for farmers from Rajshahi and lowest involvement (51% HH) was for farmers for Kishoregonj Districts. On the other hand among the buddies, the highest figure (94 %) was found in Mymensingh and the lowest 48% in Rajshahi districts. In Rajshahi district comparatively less number of HH cultivated Transplanted Amon rice due to major portion of rice field remains under water.

Table-7: Fertilizer and pesticide use in producing transplanted amon paddy (July-December 2002)

Direct Participants (Direct and partnership service delivery)						
District	% of households involved	Fertilizer applied		Pesticide used		Production (kg/acre)
		Inorganic (kg/acre)	Organic (kg/acre)	% of households involved	Frequency of pesticide use	
Kishoregonj	94	107	419	27	1.18	1326
Mymensingh	89	80	238	13	1.33	923
Sherpur	71	54	62	17	1.20	1231
Rajshahi	51	132	1799	61	1.68	1347
Chapai Nawabgonj	67	138	1174	44	1.29	1426
Average	72	103	729	33	1.42	1268
Buddy Participant (Direct and partnership service delivery)						
Kishoregonj	73	88	153	22	1.57	1308
Mymensingh	94	63	0	29	1.00	884
Sherpur	64	75	199	28	1.00	1217
Rajshahi	48	156	1114	73	1.63	1342
Chapai Nawabgonj	75	130	1472	33	1.50	1392
Average	66	104	525	38	1.45	1242

Crop husbandry

It has been recorded in the baseline survey that the involved farmers used an average of 103 kg/acre and 102 kg/acre chemical fertilizer (Urea, Triple Super Phosphate, Murate of Potash, Zinc and Sulphur). On average the direct participants and the buddy participants respectively applied organic manure (mainly cow dung) 729 kg/acre and 525 kg/acre. The higher amount of organic manure used by the direct participants as compared to the buddy could be attributed to their enhanced understanding on benefits of using organic manure due to facilitation of project during earlier sub-phase. Among the Transplanted Amon growers, only 33% of direct participants and 40% of the buddies applied pesticide in their Transplanted Amon paddy cultivation.

Yield

The average production of Transplanted Amon paddy was registered as 1263 kg/acre and 1242 kg/acre for the direct participants and buddy participants respectively whereas the national average of Transplanted Amon production was 1200-1400 kg/acre (BBS, 1998).

2.6.3. Boro Paddy (January - June 2002)

Household involvement

The base line survey revealed that during Boro season of 2002, on average 78% of direct participants and 71% of buddy participants cultivated Boro paddy. It was observed that among the direct participants the highest involvement was in Mymensingh (96% HH) and lowest involvement was in Rajshahi (63%). On the other hand among the buddy participants the highest involvement was recorded in Mymensingh (89 %) and the lowest involvement was in Chapai Nawabgonj (50% HH).

Crop husbandry

In Boro cultivation, the direct participants and buddy farmers used 193 kg/acre and 189 kg/acre of chemical fertilizer (Urea, Triple Super Phosphate, Murate of Potash, Zinc and Sulphur) respectively. The amount of inorganic (mainly cow-dung) fertilizer averaged 1855 and 1328 kg/acre respectively for direct participants and buddies. Among the Boro farmers 57% and 68% were found using pesticides in Boro paddy cultivation.

Table-8: Fertilizer use and pesticide application in producing Boro paddy and yield (January –June 2003)

Direct Participant (Direct and Partnership Service Delivery)						
District	% of household involved	Fertilizer applied		Pesticide used		Production (kg/acre)
		Inorganic (kg/acre)	Organic (kg/acre)	% of household involved	Frequency of pesticide use	
Kishoregonj	91	159	1757	57	1.2	1867
Mymensingh	96	138	2186	15	1.3	1610
Sherpur	79	177	2276	45	1.1	1999
Rajshahi	63	264	1310	82	2.0	2012
Chapai Nawabgonj	67	205	2550	69	1.6	1746
Average	78	193	1855	57	1.5	1884
Buddy Participant (Direct and Partnership Service Delivery)						
Kishoregonj	73	185	1348	53	1.2	1808
Mymensingh	89	149	1537	38	1.0	1580
Sherpur	82	188	1524	30	1.6	1950
Rajshahi	63	212	846	94	2.0	1990
Chapai Nawabgonj	50	196	2322	88	1.6	1680
Average	71	189	1328	61	1.6	1850

Yield

However, the average production of Boro paddy recorded 1884 kg/acre and 1850 kg/acre respectively for the direct participants and buddies, while the national average is 1400-1600 kg/acre (BBS, 1998). The higher yield of direct participants was due to the lower input cost which is a result of project facilitation during the earlier sub-phase.

2.7. Vegetable cultivation

Involvement of households in vegetables, cultivation and major vegetables grown

As high as 98% of the direct participants and 94% of the buddy participants are involved in vegetable cultivation. They grow vegetables in and around homestead, farmlands that are comparatively high in elevation. Roadsides land and crop field dikes are also used for vegetable cultivation. However, homestead gardening appeared to be most popular for vegetable cultivation among the participants as well as buddies. The baseline study revealed that 85% of the direct participants and 81% buddies are involved in homestead vegetables production. However, it is interesting that involvement in vegetables cultivation in the field is higher among the direct participants as compared to buddies. It can be claimed as an impact of the project's previous phase. Also, the number of crop species/varieties was higher among the direct participants due to the internalization of the

concept of diversification of crops to minimize risk of crop loss and optimize options of more profits.

Table-9: District wise HH involvement in vegetable cultivation.

Direct Participant (Direct and Partnership Service Delivery)							
District	% of household involved	% HH involved in vegetable production by location of cultivation plot				# of vegetable species cultivated by HH (%).	
		Homestead	Field	Dike	Road side	1-4 crops	More 4 crops
Kishoregonj	100	86	65	56	11	58	42
Mymensingh	100	96	33	59	11	30	70
Sherpur	100	81	40	38	5	57	43
Rajshahi	94	86	42	13	1	63	37
Chapai Nawabgonj	100	96	21	21	0	50	50
<i>Average</i>	<i>98</i>	<i>87</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>45</i>
Buddy Participant (Direct and Partnership Service Delivery)							
Kishoregonj	98	93	37	33	5	65	35
Mymensingh	94	76	18	47	0	65	35
Sherpur	89	80	40	32	4	72	28
Rajshahi	93	80	30	6	2	86	14
Chapai Nawabgonj	100	100	19	6	0	81	19
<i>Average</i>	<i>94</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>25</i>

Yield

The average yield of vegetables was found higher for the direct participants that is 132 kg/decimal while the yield of vegetables for the buddy participants is 77 kg/Decimal. The value of the production during the data collection period is average 580 taka/decimal for the direct participants and 341 taka/decimal for the buddies. Detailed on production cost, yield and value of production are given in Annex-7.

2.8. Field crop cultivation status (Excluding Paddy)

From the table-10, it is evident that average 48% and 32% household was involved in field crop cultivation. The commonly field crop cultivated are sugarcane, mustard, onion etc. From field crop cultivation farmers get yield of 3200kg (direct participants) and 3100 kg/acre (for buddy participant) that can fetch a return of Tk 17500 and Tk. 15100/acre.

Table-10 : District wise production cost and yield of field crop¹ (Excluding Rice) cultivation

Direct participant (direct and partnership service delivery)								
District	% of HH involved	Per HH Average			Per Acre Average			% of production sold
		Yield (kg)	Total production cost, excl. own labor (taka)	Gross sale value (taka)	Yield (kg)	Total production cost, excl. own labor (taka)	Gross sale value (Taka)	
Kishoregonj	56	545	1478	3649	2200	6500	21200	51
Mymensingh	52	248	840	2470	2000	7600	24900	42
Sherpur	36	358	787	2949	3800	8100	31400	49
Rajshahi	53	1731	4463	9827	4500	17200	36200	86
Chapai Nawabgonj	21	201	730	1932	900	2800	11500	40
Average	48	916	2402	5667	3200	10700	28200	62
Buddy participant (direct and partnership service delivery)								
Kishoregonj	20	102	661	1162	1600	6200	17800	44
Mymensingh	39	117	521	1494	1300	7400	22700	32
Sherpur	32	394	1101	2959	3600	8700	28900	84
Rajshahi	44	1313	5047	10764	4200	17500	34100	79
Chapai Nawabgonj	13	180	2500	3500	1100	13500	20200	76
Average	32	728	2855	6135	3100	12400	28200	67

2.9. Fish farming practices

The staff members of CARE and Partner staff facilitated various options for participants to produce fish using sustainable techniques. These options include improved fish culture practices for the ponds, fish cultivation in rice field, fish seed production and fish culture in the open or common water bodies using cages technologies. At the initiation of the project none of the sampled household (in baseline) was involved in those activities excepting pond fish culture. As a result launching fish production in rice field, fish seed production and cage culture in the household level brought opportunities for additional income. These activities were directly contributing in increasing their overall income.

2.9.1. Pond fish

The baseline study confirmed stocking of undersized fingerlings, inadequate carp polyculture, inadequate supplementary feeding and irregular use of inputs are common practices of the farmers. The main input used by the farmers were cow-dung, urea, TSP and lime. The sampled farmers stocked only 2-4 fish species in a pond. Mostly stocked

fish species were Indian major carps (Rohu, Catla and Mrigal), Chinese carps (Silver carps, Grass carps), Common carps and Tilapia. Those farmers who stocked smaller size of fish fry (1inch-2inch) had high fish mortality.

Table-11: Involvement, Pond size, Stocking density and production in pond fish cultivation

Direct Participant				
District	%of household involved	Pond size (decimal)	Average stocking density per decimal	Production (kg/dec)
Kishoregonj	42	13	126	14
Mymensingh	56	12	149	10
Sherpur	26	7	181	11
Rajshahi	17	15	57	8
Chapai Nawabgonj	33	20	137	11
Average	32	13	127	11
Buddy Participant				
Kishoregonj	30	17	271	12
Mymensingh	56	11	164	8
Sherpur	25	10	143	7
Rajshahi	4	7	120	11
Chapai Nawabgonj	19	9	42	6
Average	22	13	186	9

Direct participant: As many as 32% household was involved out of 400-sample size in pond fish culture. Pond size found smaller, on average 13 decimal. Excepting Rajshahi district the stocking density was found 2-3 times higher than the recommended amount.

Buddy Participant: Pond size also found too small (13 decimal), stocking density was much higher excepting Chapai Nawabgonj district. Fish production was 2 kg/decimal less compared to direct participant.

Participant income was slightly higher (51 Tk/decimal) as compared to Buddy Participant. In most cases farmers used cow-dung, urea, TSP, rice bran and oil cake. Buddy farmers also used cow-dung, urea and TSP in their pond. A few farmers used rice bran and oil cake. Dose of all inputs found much lower than the recommended amounts.

Fish seed production: Only one sampled farmer was found involved under this activity. The involved farmer was from Mymensingh district. This farmer stocked hatchling of Common carp, Ruhi and Mrigal in a pond. Pond size was 20 decimal. His total investment was 6550 taka and return was 23,450 taka.

2.9.2. Rice cum fish culture

The baseline study found that 2% of sampled direct farmers was involved in rice cum fish culture, in case of buddy it was 1 %. Mostly stocked fish species were Sharputi and Common carp. In case of direct participants the input cost found average 36 Taka/decimal less than the buddy farmers. But the production found nearer. All farmers spent money for fingerling as input cost which was 1199 taka less per household in case of direct participant compared to buddy participant. Return form rice cum fish culture was higher (1001 Taka/HH) for direct participant as compared to the buddy participant.

2.10. Tree plantation and fruit tree management

2.10.1. Tree Plantation

On an average a total of 73% and 63% household were involved in tree plantation activities by direct participants and buddy participants respectively. Each household was planted on an average number of 17 and 20 saplings by direct participants and buddy participant respectively

Table-12: District wise tree plantation and survival

District	Direct Participant					Buddy Participant				
	% of HH involved	Planted		Survived		% of HH involved	Planted		Survived	
		Average no.	Total no.	Average no.	Total no.		Average no.	Total no.	Average no.	Total no.
Kishoregonj	89	22	1289	18	1066	84	29	1072	22	797
Mymensingh	93	29	722	22	560	83	27	410	22	327
Sherpur	64	22	586	18	484	46	26	332	25	323
Rajshahi	54	7	321	6	261	48	5	118	4	96
Chapai Nawabgonj	79	6	115	5	99	56	4	34	3	31
Average	73	17	3033	14	2470	63	20	1966	16	1574

2.10.2. Fruit Tree Management

The baseline survey it was found that 45% participant HH involved with the activity and 31% Buddy. The management practices were Fertilizer, irrigation, pruning, Mulching and soil loosening etc.

Table 13: District wise fruit tree management

District	Direct Participant				Buddy Participant			
	% of HH involved	Average # of tree/HH	Input cost (taka/HH)	Sale value (taka/HH)	% of HH Involved	Average #.of tree/HH	Input cost (taka/HH)	Sale value (taka/HH)
Kishoregonj	56	8	89	2079	41	6	49	1155
Mymensingh	63	6	49	1175	50	5	36	648
Sherpur	31	5	60	852	18	6	38	2785
Rajshahi	42	9	89	2176	26	4	59	1039
Chapai Nawabgonj	29	5	40	512	19	2	25	373
Average	45	8	76	1718	31	5	47	1147

2.11. Poultry and Livestock Rearing

As high as 96% direct participants and 95% buddy participants were found to be involved with poultry and livestock rearing activities. Following table shows the detailed on their average input cost and gross value of production by districts.

Table-14: District wise investment and income from poultry and livestock rearing.

District	Direct Participant			Buddy Participant		
	% of household involved	Input cost (taka/HH)	Gross value of production (Taka/HH)	% of household involved	Input cost (taka/HH)	Gross value of production (Taka/HH)
Kishoregonj	98	5337	14696	95	3356	10998
Mymensingh	93	1530	13037	100	2687	12246
Sherpur	95	2559	12005	96	3242	11846
Rajshahi	98	5930	12951	93	6156	12953
Chapai Nawabgonj	92	1537	10653	94	1141	10404
Average	96	4285	13069	95	3959	11881

2.12. Agricultural Marketing and Off-farm income earning activities

2.12.1. Household involvement in agricultural marketing and off-farm income earning activities.

Since the project, in its earlier sub-phase, facilitated improved marketing practices among the participants of the evolving organizations as a pilot intervention, it has been observed that some of the improved practices have got popularity among other community members and a lateral adoption was visible. This has been reflected in this baseline study.

The baseline study revealed that not all of the sampled farmers produce surpluses that can be sold after meeting consumption needs. Only 53% project direct participants, 34% buddy and 53% control farmers sell their produces as well as undertake off-farm activities. (Annex-M1).

2.12.2. Proportion of produces marketed by the participants and control farmers.

The baseline study revealed that on an average 58%, 48% and 52% of the total produces were sold by the direct participants, buddies and control farmers respectively. Produces include 2-3 major crop output only.

Table- : 1 Proportion of produces sold by the participants and control farmers

District	% of produces sold by Direct participant	% of produces sold by buddy participant	% of produces sold by Control farmer
Kishoregonj	58	44	54
Mymensingh	55	55	53
Sherpur	59	55	39
Rajshahi	59	51	54
Chapai Nawabgonj	50	46	46
Average	58	48	52

2.12.3. Improved marketing practices

a) Value addition to the produces

It has been revealed in the baseline study that considerable proportions of farmers are involved in adding value to their farm produces for fetching better prices by adopting marketing practices. It has been recorded that on average 50%, 40% and 24% of direct

participants, buddies and control farmers respectively are involved in grading (sorting out produces according to size and structure and texture). On average a total of 79% direct participants, 82% buddies and 63% control farmers respectively are involved in cleaning of their produces before marketing. In case of packaging, on an average a total of 9%, 12% and 3% of direct participants buddy participants and control farmers were involved respectively.

Table-: Marketing Practices--Value addition to the produces

District	Grading			Cleaning			Packaging		
	Direct participant	Buddy participant	Control farmer	Direct participant	Buddy participant	Control farmer	Direct participant	Buddy participant	Control farmer
Kishoregonj	33	20	9	79	85	69	13	20	0
Mymensingh	62	60	40	85	100	90	0	0	0
Sherpur	78	43	45	83	100	55	11	14	18
Rajshahi	56	60	32	75	50	58	8	10	0
Chapai Nawabgonj	0	33	20	100	67	0	0	0	0
Average	50	40	24	79	82	63	9	12	3

b) Early and late variety crop cultivation

The baseline study revealed that on average 44%, 32% and 33% direct participants, buddy and control farmers respectively produced early variety crops. On the other hand on average 16%, 14% and 8% of direct participants, buddy and control farmers, respectively, have produced late variety of vegetables. Needless to say that early and late varieties of some vegetables (e.g. tomato, cauliflower, cabbage etc.) fetch considerable high prices.

Table - : Early and late variety crop cultivation

District	Early variety			Late variety		
	Direct participant	Buddy participant	Control farmer	Direct participant	Buddy participant	Control farmer
Kishoregonj	52	45	29	21	30	9
Mymensingh	31	20	10	15	0	0
Sherpur	50	29	18	11	0	27
Rajshahi	36	30	58	11	10	0
Chapai Nawabgonj	0	0	40	0	0	0
Average	44	32	33	16	14	8

c) Market places

The baseline study revealed that on average of 32% direct participants, 22% buddy participants and 39% of control farmers' have sold their agricultural produces at the farm gates. As many as 88% direct participant, 80% buddy participant and 89% control farmers' have sold their produces in the local markets. In contrast, only 20% direct participant, 14% buddy participant and 16% control farmers' sold their produces in the secondary markets (e.g. thana market).

However, practices of selling produces in the Aarot are very low. Only 8%, 2% and 4% of the direct participants, buddy participants and control farmers, respectively, sold their products in Aarot.

Table-: Household involvement in selling agricultural products in different market place

District	Direct participant				Buddy participant				Control farmer			
	Home stead	Local marke t	Thana Marke t	Aarot	Home stead	Local marke t	Thana Marke t	Aarot	Home stead	Local marke t	Thana Marke t	Aarot
Kishoregonj	23	90	23	4	5	85	15	0	46	94	14	0
Mymensingh	38	92	23	0	60	80	20	0	40	70	10	0
Sherpur	22	89	11	6	29	71	14	14	18	100	18	0
Rajshahi	47	83	19	17	20	70	10	0	37	89	16	16
Chapai Nawabgonj	0	100	0	0	0	100	0	0	40	60	40	0
Average	32	88	20	8	22	80	14	2	39	89	16	4

d) Collective agriculture marketing initiatives:

The baseline study revealed that 5% of the direct participants have practiced collective marketing initiatives (jointly cultivating early/late variety crops, reduce transportation cost by assembling produces and transporting altogether to the markets, purchasing agricultural inputs collectively etc). However, none of the of buddy participants and control farmers were found involved in collective marketing initiatives.

From early/late variety crop cultivation, collective selling and buying agricultural inputs collectively, participants were able to earn additional income and or save input cost The baseline study revealed that on an average a household earned (additional) and/or saved Tk. 1787. .

e) Preventing distress sale:

Generally the poor farmers tend to sell their paddy immediately after the harvest (when the prices tend to fall drastically low) to meet the need for cash such as repaying loans, and meeting household expenses. If the farmers can store their paddy for a period of 2/3 months, they can get higher prices as compared to peak harvest time. The baseline study revealed that, on an average 4% direct participants were able to prevent distress sale of their produces, which enabled them to get higher prices during the lean periods. To prevent distress sale they have taken loan from their own organizations.

However, none of the households from the buddy participants and control farmers' taken such initiative to remain abstain from distress selling of their produces.

2.13. Off-farm activity

The baseline study revealed that on average 6% participants, 4% buddy participants and 4% control farmers' are involved in off farm activities to earn additional income. Here off-farm activities refer to non-agricultural income earning production-oriented activities that mainly take place at household level. These exclude labour sale to other farms. Among these farmers 88% are making handicrafts e.g. making baskets, embroidered quilts, fishing gears etc and only 12% are involved in food processing activities. Details are in annex--??

Average income from the off-farm activities of the direct participants was Taka 1850/HH/year for the buddy participants it was Taka 334/HH/year while for the control farmers it was Taka 697/HH/year.

Table- : Average yearly income from Off-farm activities

District	Direct participant		Buddy participant		Control farmer	
	Investment (taka/HH)	Income (taka/ HH)	Investment (taka/HH)	Income (taka/ HH)	Investment (taka/HH)	Income (taka/ HH)
Kishoregonj	1685	3375	350	200	0	0
Mymensingh	5000	20000	0	0	0	0
Sherpur	0	0	300	50	200	400
Rajshahi	83	776	39	439	25	783
Chapai Nawabgonj	1750	2970	0	0	0	0
Average	846	2697	134	334	50	729

2.14. Other sources of Income (except the sources mentioned above)

In the baseline study it has been observed that farmers are involved in many different kinds of income earning activities other than the activities mentioned above. These include labor sale, rickshaw pulling, small trading, grocery shop, vending door to door etc. The following table presents average income earned from other sources:

Table---: Income from sources other than agricultural production, marketing and off-farm activities

District	Direct Participant			Buddy Participant		
	% of household involved	Input cost (taka/HH)	Gross income	% of household involved	Input cost (taka/HH)	Gross income
Kishoregonj	3	1000	10200	2	0	6000
Mymensingh	19	2050	6600	0	0	0
Sherpur	12	2208	6650	25	381	10136
Rajshahi	36	6748	14947	33	3056	12610
Chapai Nawabgonj	13	5167	12000	6	0	10000
Average	18	5329	12639	17	2136	11627

2.15 Average Household income of the participants

The baseline survey revealed that the direct participants as well as buddy participants are involved in a multiple of activities that can be categorized as farm and non-farm. The following table represents the average annual income per households. It is worth to mention that a single household does not necessarily undertake all the income earning activities listed in the table.

Table- : Average Household Income from different kind of income earning sources.

Direct Participant									
District	Paddy	Vegetable	Field crop	Fish	Tree	Livestock	Off-farm	Other source*	Total
	Taka	Taka	Taka	Taka	Taka	Taka	Taka	Taka	Taka
Kishoregonj	6558	3262	1218	1334	1176	9089	51	279	22967
Mymensingh	5052	1279	845	2788	729	10654	556	843	22745
Sherpur	5832	1823	772	796	317	8997	0	529	19065
Rajshahi	2265	2180	2848	398	894	6848	85	2935	18453
Chapai Nawabgonj	4459	1177	251	1226	534	8357	102	854	16959
Average	4603	2213	1551	1077	816	8419	116	1340	20135
Buddy Participant									
Kishoregonj	3417	2360	102	1128	590	7294	5	136	15032
Mymensingh	3516	1458	378	1156	306	9560	0	0	16373
Sherpur	4792	1489	585	556	499	8297	2	2439	18658
Rajshahi	1841	1290	3050	72	254	6293	33	2922	15755
Chapai Nawabgonj	4239	2428	1316	394	65	8685	0	625	17752
Project	3219	1752	1334	601	376	7526	13	1513	16334

*(Van, Rickshaw, Mike service and Labor sale)

SECTION III

ORGANIZATION
DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND
ORGANIZATIONAL
ACTIVITIES INCLUDING
ACCESSING COMMON
NATURAL RESOURCES AND
SERVICES

3.1. General Information of the Community Based Organization and Evolving Organizations

The No Cost extension sub-phase of the LIFE NOPEST Phase-II Project is working with 100 Farmers organizations which were facilitated to be transformed into community based organizations during the last previous sub-phase of the project and **termed as CBOs (Community Based Organizations)** and with another 400 phased out farmers field schools to facilitate the process of transformation from farmers field schools to farmers organizations and, as such, **termed as Evolving Organizations (EOs)**.

The project has set different expectations on these two types of clientele groups. The project aimed at facilitating further development process to these 100 CBOs to be full-blown farmers' organizations and at the same time accessing GOB and Private sector extension services as well as common natural resources. On the other hand, the project intends to build capacities of members of the 400 groups to evolve into sustainable community based organizations as well as enhance their food security by means of consolidation of improved agricultural technologies and better marketing practices including off-farm income earning activities.

3.2. Type and membership of the Organization

The baseline study confirmed that realizing the benefits of becoming a member of organization, farmers were interested to organize under the organizational umbrella resulting in considerable variations in the number of members per organization. In this discussion three different types of organizations are referred-- first one is mixed where male and female members united together under the same organization, the second type is female organization where membership is limited within only female members and the third types is male organization, solely composed of male members.

Table 3.1 and 3.2 represents the number of organization the project works with and total number of members of the Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and Evolving Organizations (EOs) during the baseline study.

Table-3.1 : Type of CBOs and EOs

District	EO				CBO			
	Male	Female	Mixed	Total	Male	Female	Mixed	Total
Kishoregonj	40	52	19	111	10	1	19	30
Mymensingh		8	28	36	4	2	14	20
Sherpur	9	21	38	68	5	2	13	20
Rajshahi	52	79	12	143	17	3	10	30
Chapai Nawabgonj	8	32	8	48	-	-	-	-
Total	109	192	105	406	36	8	56	100

Table-3.2 : Total members of the EOs and CBOs by sex

District	EO					CBO				
	Male		Female		Total	Male		Female		Total
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
Kishoregonj	1339	47	1500	53	2839	719	81	173	19	892
Mymensingh	378	40	565	60	943	504	80	124	20	628
Sherpur	780	43	1049	57	1829	369	73	139	27	508
Rajshahi	1462	40	2163	60	3625	631	79	166	21	797
Chapai Nawabgonj	279	23	921	77	1200					
Total	4238	41	6198	59	10436	2223	79	602	21	2825

Note: There is no CBOs in Chapai Nawabgonj.

3.3. Legal status of the EO/CBOs

The baseline study found that 14% CBOs has been registered under different organizations/institutions and they have a legal entity. The registration giving department/institutions are social welfare department, youth development department and cooperative department of Bangladesh Government. However, none of the evolving organization yet registered with any institutions, they are undergoing the process of evolution into organizations.

3.4. Constitutions

The baseline study confirmed that all the CBOs have written constitutions reflecting their organizational goals, objectives and working strategies. It include rules and regulations for operation of the organizations e.g. membership procedures, organizational structure, roles & responsibilities and the functions of executive body, election/selection process for the members of the executive body, different type of meeting and executing process, etc. On the other hand, none of the EOs has written constitution at the time of baseline study, however, they have ad-hock management committee to formulate the constitution and march forward to place an elected executive body.

3.4. Executive Committee

Only CBOs have the executive committee and evolving organization yet not formed the executive committee, as mentioned above. The baseline study revealed that 36% CBOs went for election for their executive committee members and the rest 64% formed executive committee through participatory selection process.

Table -3.3: Executive committee formation process

District	Elected		Selected in a participatory manner	
	#	%	#	%
Kishoregonj	0	0	15	100
Mymensingh	5	50	5	50
Sherpur	9	90	1	10
Rajshahi	4	27	11	73
Total	18	36	32	64

The baseline study also revealed that in the executive committees 82% are male and only 18% are female, which is shown in the following table:

Table-3.4. Membership composition of executive committee by sex

District	Male		Female	
	#	%	#	%
Kishoregonj	102	83	21	17
Mymensingh	66	93	5	7
Sherpur	58	78	16	22
Rajshahi	72	76	23	24
Total	298	82	65	18

3.5. Governance of the organizations

The baseline study revealed that the practices of good governance internal to organization are fair with the CBOs, which is not traced yet with the evolving organizations. As mentioned above the CBOs have selected their executive committees through a process of formal election (36%) using ballots and the rest 64% have selected with the consensus of all the members of the organization. However, the EOs do not have any formal executive committee yet, rather they all have ad-hoc committee until they have the formal management or executive committees.

In case of the CBOs average 90% of the executive committee members attended their regular executive committee meetings. About 22% CBOs hold meeting at 15 days interval wherein 78% CBOs hold meeting once in a month.

General members' meetings are scheduled at 15 days interval for 12% CBOs, one month's interval for 86% CBOs and for 2% CBOs hold meeting in a weekly basis.. In the case of EOs the meeting intervals are weekly, fortnightly and monthly respectively for 2%, 38% and 33% evolving organizations. Attendance in the meeting by the general members of the organizations is 84% and 78% respectively for the EOs and CBOs. Also 78% of the CBOs

have conducted their Annual General Meetings where they have presented their activities and financial status in front of all members and community representatives.

The baseline study also found that 40% of the CBOs kept records of financial transactions and other activity records regularly, whereas 60% of the CBOs record keeping is found irregular. . Only 6% of the EOs has bank account of their own which is 84% for the CBOs.

The baseline study confirmed that the executive members are accountable to the general members of the CBOs/EOs, also they are to present all of their activities and financial status in general members meetings and in the Annual General Meetings. Major organizational decisions are taken by the executive committee but they need to take approval from the general members in their monthly/fortnightly meetings.

3.6. Resource mobilization and Utilization

3.6.1. Internal Resources Accumulation

All the CBOs are accumulating financial capital through savings and subscriptions of the members, however, only 14% of the EOs have started collecting savings from the members. The amount and interval of savings collected by the organizations from the members varied considerably. Following tables draw the scenario of savings collection (table 3.5) by the organizations and amount of collected savings (Table 3.6)

Table-3.5. Savings rate of the members of the organizations

Evolving Organizations (EOs)												
District	Weekly				Fortnightly				Monthly			
	Org. #	Savings rate/members (Taka)			Org. #	Savings rate/members (Taka)			Org. #	Savings rate/members (Taka)		
		Min.	Max.	Mean		Min.	Max.	Mean		Min.	Max.	Mean
Kishoregonj	1	5	5	5	1	10	10	10	6	10	20	13
Mymensingh		0	0	0	2	5	10	8	2	10	40	25
Sherpur	4	5	10	9	1	10	10	10	1	10	10	10
Rajshahi	5	2	10	6	2	5	10	8	4	10	20	15
Chapai Nawabgonj	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	10	2	10	7	6	5	10	8	13	10	40	15
Community Based Organizations (CBOs)												
Kishoregonj	1	10	10	10	1	10	10	10	13	10	50	24
Mymensingh	2	5	20	13	4	10	10	10	4	10	50	25
Sherpur	2	10	10	10	4	10	10	10	4	10	25	16
Rajshahi	4	10	10	10	0	10	10	10	11	10	50	22
Total	9	5	20	11	9	10	10	10	32	10	50	23

Table 3.6. Average savings of the organizations

District	Average savings /organization (taka)	Average savings /organization (taka)
Kishoregonj	300	16119
Mymensingh	530	36063
Sherpur	687	27337
Rajshahi	729	14239
Chapai Nawabgonj	0	
Total	574	21,788

Note: In Chpai Nawabgonj there is no CBOs.

3.6.2. Internal Resources Utilization:

The baseline study revealed that only the CBOs are disbursing loans among the members and non-members. The loans are mostly used by the members for income earning activities undertaken at household level. In some instances they are using loans for treatment and children marriage. Following table depicts the credit amounts and utilization areas of the members of the community based Organizations:

Table-3.7: Loan disbursement and accumulation of service charges

District	Credit receiver		Credit distribution		Service charge	
	Organization members	Villagers (other than the members)	Total credit distributed (taka)	Average credit distribution (taka/org.)	Total service charge (taka)	Average credit distribution (taka/org.)
Kishoregonj	21	18	39840	7968	5450	1090
Mymensingh	82	155	1030228	128779	359158	44895
Sherpur	179	143	345866	34587	293639	29364
Rajshahi	154	1	247000	30875	46285	5786
Total	436	317	1662,934	53,643	704,532	22,727

Beside the credit operations, many of the CBOs also invested in different income earning projects (commonly known as joint projects), these investment area are leasing of lands for cultivation and ponds for fish culture, setting up agricultural nurseries, road side plantation etc. Following tables gives an impression on the income of the organizations from various income earning activities

Table 3.8 : Income of the organizations from IGAs per year??

District	Gross Income/EO in Taka	Gross Income/CBO in Taka
Kishoregonj	450	15913
Mymensingh	0	15730
Sherpur	0	22878
Rajshahi	6600	2086
Chapai Nawabgonj	0	
Average	3525	15612

3.7. External Resources

3.7.1. Grants received by the organizations

CBOs have accumulated resources from various external sources. One of the sources is donation of the GOB officials and local elites. As high as 74% of the CBOs received grants. The average amount of grant received stands at TK. 5924. . . There is no record of receiving such donation by the Eos (if it is so, there is no need to have separate columns showing grants to EO in the following table) till the baseline study. Organizations also received grant from various GOB departments. Table below states the amount received by the CBOs and EOs.

Table- 3.9. : Grants received by the CBOs

District	EO		CBO	
	Org. %	Average grant Received (taka)	Org. %	Average grant Received (taka)
Kishoregonj	0.0	0	73	4792
Mymensingh	0.0	0	80	5438
Sherpur	0.0	0	50	8420
Rajshahi	0.0	0	87	6221
Chapai Nawabgonj	4.2	1700	0	0
Total	0.5	1700	74	5924

3.7.2. Linkages with mainstream service providers

The baseline study revealed that 84% CBOs and 6% evolving organizations have established linkages with different government and non-government service providers/institutions. Among them, 30% CBOs has formal linkages with mainstream service providers like DAE, DOF, DoL, Department for Youth Development, Department for Cooperative, Department of Social Welfare etc. Following table shows their linkages with various service providers:

Table 3.10: Linkages of EO/CBOs with Service Providers

Name of Service Providers	EO		CBO	
	# of organization	%	# of organization	%
Youth department	2	1	20	40
Social Welfare department	0	0	7	14
Livestock department	2	1	22	44
Agriculture office	2	1	17	34
Fisheries department	1	.5	19	38
NGO	4	2	12	24
Research institute	2	1	5	10
Other institute	3	1.5	9	18

Table - 3.10: Services received by the EO/CBOs through establishment of linkages

Linkage Type	Services	Received by EOs		Received by CBO	
		#	%	#	%
Formal Linkages	Training	0	0	18	36
	Registration	0	0	6	12
	Vaccination	0	0	3	6
	Other service	0	0	3	6
	Total	0		30	
Informal Linkages	Training	3	1	39	78
	Agricultural input	9	4	13	26
	Registration	0	0	4	8
	Vaccination	1	0	16	32
	Loan	0	0	3	6
	Other service	3	1	6	12
	Total	16		81	

3.7.4. Accessing common natural resources

The baseline study revealed that only 8% CBOs have accessed organization established for cultivation of crops (what does it mean?). These common natural resources include government khas lands, roadside slopes, khas ponds etc. Following tables shows the distribution of organizations, who were able to access common natural resources.

Table 3.10: Access to common natural resources by organizations

District	CBO	
	# of CBOs accessed common natural resources.	%
Kishoregonj	1	7
Mymensingh	0	0
Sherpur	1	10
Rajshahi	2	13
Total	4	8

3.7.5. Establishment of Women Market Corners by the CBOs and marketing initiatives of the organizations

The CBOs are actively involved in establishment of the Women Market Corner—a small place within a village market dedicated for the women sellers. The baseline study revealed that as many as 24 markets were established by the CBOs. They also undertake collective marketing initiatives, described in details in the marketing section of this report.

3.7.6. Community work of the EO/CBOs.

The baseline study revealed that 84% CBOs and 5% evolving organizations deliver certain services to the communities. These include dispute resolution in a peaceful manner, raising awareness on preventing dowry, early marriages and polygamy, promoting girls' education, facilitating enforcement of family law, environmental protection, vaccination of livestock, sanitation, tree plantation etc.

Analysis from the sampled data reveals that 13% CBOs repaired of mud roads and installed culvert, 10% CBOS were involved in resolving social conflicts. , 2% CBOs facilitated 10% CBOs succeeded in drastically reducing early marriage, 7% CBOs conducted arsenic test and 11% CBOs helped community members by providing food, medicine etc.

Conclusion:

From the baseline survey it is evident that an overwhelming majority of the participants of the ongoing sub phase of the project is still food insecure and substantial scope exists for enhancing their farm productivity and income. FFS groups, which transformed themselves into organizations in the earlier sub phase, have grounded themselves as community-based organizations (CBOs) and are benefiting from greater access to common natural resources and mainstream extension services. However, in order to consolidate technical and social gains and further enhance and sustain their accessibility to common property natural resources and mainstream services, CBOs need facilitation. On the other hand, FFS groups that are currently undergoing transformation into community-based organizations require intensive facilitation. Scope for promoting improved marketing practices is substantial too.

Section - IV

Annexes

Annex_I

List of partner NGO's of LIFE-NOPEST Phase-II Project

SL#	Name of NGO	Contact Person	Address & Telephone no.
1	Pally Bikash Kendra (PBK)	Md. Humayun Kabir Selim Executive Director	<u>Head office :</u> 27/C, Block-E, Ground Floor, Asad Avenue, Mohammedpur, Dhaka- 1207, Phone : 9132389 Fax : 8115770 e-mail : iird@drik.bgd.toolnet.org Project Office Village :Hapania, Post : Pakundia District : Kishoregonj
2	Rural Advancement Committee (RAC) Bangladesh	Md. Ebadur Rahman Badal Executive Director	Bashantapur, Bajitpur, Kishoregonj. Phone : 09432-281 (office) 09432-232 (Residence) Mobile : 017-381071
3	People's Oriented Program Implementation (POPI)	Murshed Alam Sarker Executive Director	<u>Project address :</u> Jamalpur, Post : Kalika Prosad Bhairab, Kishoregonj <u>Head Office :</u> 9/10, Block-D, Lalmatia, Dhaka-1207 Phone : 9121049, 017-536531 017-685571 e-mail : popi@bdmail.net
4	Rural Development Sangstha (RDS)	Md. Mofazzal Hossain Executive Director	<u>Branch Office</u> Village - Fulhari, P.O.- Dhanshali Up.-Jhinaigat, Sherpur-2100 Head Office 49 Grirdanarayanpur, Sherpur Town
5	Landless, Upbringing, Social Work, Thearapeutics (LUSTER)	Laila Arzumand Banu, Director	Chalakraampur, Natore-6400 Phone :0771-2787
6	PARTNER	Md. Abdus Sobhan Meah Director	Sagarpara, Ghoramara Rajshahi-6100 Phone : 721-772398 e-mail : partner@access-bd.com
7	Association for Community Development (ACD)	Salima Sarwar Director	H-41, Sagarpara, Ghoramara Rajshahi
8	People's Organization For Sustainable Development (POSD)	A.F.M. Razib Uddin Executive Director	F-1233, Miapara, Rajshahi

Annex_II

List of Thana/Upazila under LIFE-NOPEST Phase II Project

Name of District	Name of Thana/Upazila
Mymensingh	Muktagacha Gouripur Fulbaria Nandail Trishal
Sherpur	Nokla Sribordi Jamalpur Nalitabari Sharishabari
Kishoreganj	Katiadi Hossainpur
Rajshahi	Durgapur Godagari Mohanpur
Chapai Nawabgonj	Nachole Sadar Gomastapur Shibgonj

Annex- IIIA

Participant Registration Format LIFE-NOPEST phase II project, CARE-Bangladesh

1. General Identification

Identification	Code	Name
1.1 CARE/PNGO		
1.2 Field Office		
1.3 District		
1.4 Upazila		
1.5 Union		
1.6 Village		
1.7 FT/ODMF		
1.8 Organization		

Identification No (For Office Use)			
1.9 Registration date			
1.10 Service type ^F			
1.11 Type of organization ^A			
	Male	Female	Total
1.12 Member of organization			
F -Direct=1, Partnership=2 A – Male=1, Female=2, Mixed=3			

Sl #	Participant's Name	Father/ Mother/Husband Name	Sex ^B	Relation ship with HH Head ^C	Age (Year)	Mari tal Stat u ^D	No. of family memb er	Own land (deci mal)	Food Secu rity (How mont h?)	Religio n ^E
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										

2. Basic information for organization member:

B--- Male=1, Female=2. /C--- Self=1, Spouse=2, Child=3, Parents=4, Sibling=5, Others=6

D--- Married=1, Unmarried=2, Widowed=3, Divorced=4, Seperated=5.

E--- 1=Muslim, 2=Hindu, 3=Christain, 4=Boudish, 5=Tribal

Annex_IIIB

Buddy Registration Format LIFE-NOPEST phase II project, CARE-Bangladesh

1. General Identification

Identification	Code	Name
1.1 CARE/PNGO		
1.2 Field Office		
1.3 District		
1.4 Upazila		
1.5 Union		
1.6 Village		
1.7 FT/ODMF		
1.8 Organization		

Identification No (For Office Use)			
1.9 Registration date			
1.10 Service type ^G			
1.11 Type of organization ^A			
	Male	Female	Total
1.12 Member of organization			
G -Direct=1, Partnership=2 A - Male=1, Female=2, Mixed=3			

3. Basic information for buddy:

SI #	Participant's Name	Buddy Name	Sex ^B	Relationship with HH Head ^C	Age (Year)	Marital Status ^D	No. of family member	Own land (decimal)	Food Security (How month?)	Religion ^E
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										

B--- Male=1, Female=2. / C--- Self=1, Spouse=2, Child=3, Parents=4, Sibling=5, Others=6

D--- Married=1, Unmarried=2, Widowed=3, Divorced=4, Separated=5.

E--- 1=Muslim, 2=Hindu, 3=Christain, 4=Boudish, 5=Tribal

Annex IV

BASELINE DATA COLLECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

LIFE NOPEST Phase II Project

Method: **Participants Sample Survey**

Frequency: One Time (at beginning of Cycle)

1.0 GENERAL IDENTIFICATION:

Identification	Code*	Name
1.1 CARE/PNGO		
1.2 Field office		
1.3 District		
1.4 Upazila		
1.5 Union		
1.6 Village		
1.7 FT/ODMF		
1.8 Organization		
1.9 Participant		

Form Id no. (For office use only)	
1.10 Data collection date	
1.11 Service type ^A	
1.12 Organization type ^B	
1.13 Participant type ^C	
A-- DD=1, Partnership=2; B- Male=1, Female=2, Mixed=3 C- Participant =1, Buddy=2, Control Group=3	

- See attachment-1: *general identification code*

Farm (Agricultural) Production

2.0 Rice

2.1 Yield Information

		Aus	Amon	Boro	Total
Total Land Used	Decimal				
Total Production	Total rice (kg)				
	Rice (Kg/dec)				
Market Price of the product during harvesting	Total rice				
	Tk/kg (rice)				
	Straw				

2.2. Production Cost

Item	Unit	Quantity			Total cost		
		Aus	Amon	Boro	Aus	Amon	Boro
Land preparation							
Seed/ Seedling (Own / Purchased)							
Inorganic Fertilizer	Urea	Total Kg					
		gm/dec					
	TSP	Total Kg					
		gm/dec					
	MP	Total Kg					
		gm/dec					
	Zinc	Total Kg					
		gm/dec					
	Boron	Total Kg					
		gm/dec					
	Sulfur/ Gypsum	Total Kg					
		gm/dec					
Organic Fertilizer/ Compost	Total Kg						
	Kg/dec						

Labor (Own+Hired)	Man-Days						
Pesticide ^C							
Pesticide use(frequency Cost)							
Irrigation							
Others (Please Specify)							
Total Cost							

C : Pesticide includes insecticide, fungicide, bactericide, weedicide and herbicide.

2.3 Income

Item	Aus	Amon	Boro	Total
Rice				
Straw				
Total				

2.4 Net Income = (Total income - Total cost)=

2.5 Relevant Information

2.5.1

	Aus	Amon	Boro
Seed Source ^A			
Rice Variety ^B			
Transplanting system ^C			

A-- 1=own,2=Others ; B-- 1=Improved variety, 2=Local variety; C-- 1=Line, 2=Not in line

2.5.2

	Aus	Amon	Boro
Causes of pesticide used / not used			
Causes of crop damaged			

3.0 Vegetable

3.1 State the land area you used to produce vegetable (in decimal)?

3.2 Identify your vegetable growing location from the list (Put tick mark)

Homestead Crop land Dike Pond dikes Common property land Roadside slopes

3.3 Description of vegetable production

Name of vegetable	Code ³	Total production (Kg)	Total Sale (Kg)	Sale value (Tk)	Total production Value (Tk)	Total production cost (Tk)	Comments

3.4 Net income = (sum of total production value-sum of total production cost)=

3.5 Improved cultural practices and LEISA

3.5.1 description of production systems (put \sqrt mark)

Single storied cropping	<input type="checkbox"/>	Multistoried cropping	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mono cropping	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed cropping	<input type="checkbox"/>	Improved Pit	<input type="checkbox"/>	Traditional pit	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Organic fertilizer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Balanced fertilizer in all crops	<input type="checkbox"/>	Balanced fertilizer in some crops	<input type="checkbox"/>	Improved bed system & drainage	<input type="checkbox"/>	No bed and drainage system	<input type="checkbox"/>	HYV	<input type="checkbox"/>	hybrid	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local seeds	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.5.2 IPM Knowledge & practice (put \sqrt mark)

Practiced IPM	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did not practiced IPM	<input type="checkbox"/>	Used chemical pesticides	<input type="checkbox"/>	Used organic pesticides	<input type="checkbox"/>	Know major beneficial insects	<input type="checkbox"/>	Do not know beneficial insects	<input type="checkbox"/>
Harvested crops 7 or more days after pesticide application	<input type="checkbox"/>	Harvested 1-6 days after pesticide application	<input type="checkbox"/>								

4.0 Field Crop

4.1 Production cost

Name of crop	Code ^A	Place ^B	Land area in decimal	Total Production cost (Tk)	Total Production (Kg)	Total Production Value (Tk)	Total Sale (Kg)	Total Sale Value (Tk)

A:- See attachment crop code
B (Place) : 1=Homestead, 2=Field, 3=Dike, 4=Roadside , 5=Dike, 6=Pond Side.

4.2 Net income=(Total Production Value-Total Production Cost)=

4.3 Relevant information:

- Balanced fertilizer used (put √ mark)? Yes No
- Required irrigation applied (put √ mark)? Yes No

4.4 Causes of crop damaged (if damaged). (Natural calamities / Other factors)

5.0 Fish

5.1 Production related Information

	Land area in decimal/ Cage Frequency	Fish species	Total Stock	Pond prepare /Dike repair /Made cages	Total Fertilizer cost (Tk)	Lime /Salt cost	Feed Cost	Seed cost	Collection cost	Total Cost
Pond										
Rice Field										
Seed										
Cage										
Total Cost										

5.2 Fish production and utilization

Types of fish culture	Fish species	Total Production (Kg)	Total Production Value (Tk)	Sale (Kg)	Sale Value (TK)	Fish Transfer / Re Stock(Kg)
Pond						
Rice - fish culture						
Fish seed production						
Cage Aquaculture						
Total						

5.3 Net income = Sum of total production value – sum of total cost

5.4 Relevant information :

Bana compost used (put √ mark)? Yes..... / No.....

Feeding ring used (put √ mark)? Yes..... / No.....

6.0 Fruit & timber Tree Production

6.1 Seedling NURSERY

6.1.1 Total Nursery Land:----- Decimal

6.1.2 Production related information:

Species raised	Number of seedling raised	Value of seedling raised (Tk)	Item	Cost (Tk)
			Seed	
			Soil	
			Polethiline	
			Fertilizer	
			Labor	
			Fence	
			Other	
Total			Total	

6.1.3 Net income = (Total value of seedling raised- production cost)=

6.2. Tree Plantation

Species planted	Code ^c	Number of seedlings planted	Number of seedlings survived

C---Attachment Code

6.3 Fruit Tree Management

Name Of Tree	Tree Code	Type of Management (Code)	Number	Management Cost	Total Production		Sale			Total Production Value (Fruit)
					Number	Kg	Number	Kg	Taka	

6.4 Net income = (Total Management cost – Total production value)=

10.0 Livestock

7.1 Income Livestock

Livestock Information			Income from animal Husbandry(Sale /Eat/Distribution)			
Animal	Quantity	Total Price	Animal	Quantity	Price	Income from Egg /Milk/ Hal/ Cowdung

7.2 Livestock Disbursement

Item	Cost (Taka)
Food	
Take care /Treatment	
Sale	
Total	

7.3 Net Income = (Income from livestock- Total cost)=

7.4 Have any of your animal/bird of your household died during last year? (put \checkmark mark)

Yes No

If yes, state number

Cattle Goat Poultry Pigeon

7.5 state reasons of death of your birds/animals

7.6 Have you any shared animal or bird?

Yes No

If yes, mention the number

Cattle Goat Poultry Pigeon

8.0 Do you have any shared/ leased land (put \checkmark mark)? Yes...../No.....

If yes, then

Event	Land (decimal)	Crop Name and land used (decimal)
Shared		
Leased		

Marketing information collection Format

9.0 Marketing Activities

a) Which improved marketing strategy you use for production, please mention the name of the activities?

b) Please write the marketing activities crop wise and put mark in the activity column and write the amount in kg in the column of sale place.

Crop name	Total production (kg)	Marketing activities (<input type="checkbox"/>)					Place of selling (kg)				Amount of produces for marketing (kg)	Normal Unit price (Tk /kg)	Received value (Tk/kg)	Remarks
		Grading	Cleaning	Packaging	Early cultivation	Late cultivation	Collective sale	House	Local market	Thana market				

10.0 Collective initiative for marketing:

Are you involved in any collective Initiatives (put mark)? Yes...../ No.....

If Yes, Please fill up the following table by your own part only.

Name of Initiatives	Crop /Input	Total amount		Normal market price		Actual price (Taka)		Involvement number		Remarks
		kg	Number	kg	Number	kg	Number	Male	Female	
Agri-input purchase										
Reduce transportation cost										
Storage										
Labor Sharing										
Fish sale										
Nursery										
Seed Production										

Vegetable cultivation										
Early / Late Cultivation										
Jointly Sale										

11.0 Have any initiative taken / cooperation by the organization to face the distress sale (put mark)?

Yes...../ No.....

If Yes, what initiative / strategies are taken please mention bellow:

- a)
- b)
- c)

13.0 Have you received any information about market price? (put mark)? Yes...../ No.....

If yes, How it come?

- a)
- b)
- c)

14.0 Have any special initiative for marketing in your locality (put mark)? Yes...../ No.....

a) If yes, please write the name of initiatives – (Women Market Corner)

b) Which produces/ commodities sale;

- i)
- ii)
- iii)

15.0 Off-farm Activity

Sl. #	Name of activity	Investment	Income	Profit	Remarks
-------	------------------	------------	--------	--------	---------

01	Handicrafts <input type="checkbox"/> Katha sewing <input type="checkbox"/> Fan making <input type="checkbox"/> Mat making <input type="checkbox"/> Duli making <input type="checkbox"/> Designing on cloth <input type="checkbox"/>				
02	Food processing <input type="checkbox"/> Fried rice ball <input type="checkbox"/> Flat fried rice <input type="checkbox"/> Cake <input type="checkbox"/> Papor (Chips) <input type="checkbox"/> Pickle <input type="checkbox"/>				
03	Labor sale <input type="checkbox"/> Other farm house <input type="checkbox"/> Van <input type="checkbox"/> Rickshaw <input type="checkbox"/> Mike				
04	Small trading <input type="checkbox"/> Grocery shop <input type="checkbox"/> Tea stall <input type="checkbox"/>				

16.0 Net profit (Taka) = (Total income – Total expenditure)=

17.0 Are you involved in collective off-farm activity (put mark)? Yes..... / No.....

If yes, please fill up the following table-

Sl. #	Name of off-farm activity	Involvement number		Remarks
		Male	Female	

Baseline Data Collection Format
Organizational Development LIFE-NOPEST Phase II Project
CARE-Bangladesh

General information

Organization name:

Field Office :

Data collector name:

Data

collection date:

A.General Information

1. Name of the Organization :

2. Address - Village:

Union:

Upazilla:

District:

3. Member of the organization. Total Female Male

4. Is the organization registered (put √ mark)? Yes No

5. If yes, name the registration-giving institute name & Registration date.....

B.Governance

1. Does the organization has written constitution (put √ mark)? Yes No

2. Are the executive committee member elected (put √ mark)?

Bhalot Other Not elected

3. Member of the executive committee. Total Female Male

4.a How often the general members & executive committee meet?

General member	Executive member

4.b How many meeting held of general member and executive member last one year & also write the attendance rate of those two member groups.

General member		Executive member	
No of meeting	Attendance rate (%)	No of meeting	Attendance rate (%)

5. Does the organization hold annual general meeting (put No mark)? Yes

6. Does the organization maintain the following records (Regular / Irregular) put mark?

Records	Regular	Irregular
Regulation register		
Savings register		
Income & Expenditure register		
Ledger		
Personal pass book(savings)		
Personal pass book(credit)		
Credit register		
Physical assets register		
Others		

7a. Has the organization bank account (put mark)? Yes No

7b. If yes, describe and comment on the financial operation of bank account?

C.Savings & credit

1. Savings draw rate of per member in taka.

2. Frequency of savings draw (put mark). Weekly Fortnightly Monthly

3. Total savings of the organization in taka.

4. Total taka using for credit operation.

5.Total income from credit operation as a service charge.

6. How many people received credit? Member Villagers

7. In which sector organization given credit?

8. Describe the project, which are operated by the organization?

Name of the Project	Project type ^A	Expenditure	Income	Net profit	Remarks

A—1=Agriculture, 2= Non agriculture

9. Does the organization taking agricultural initiatives for increased the production?

Name of the Initiative	Involved person	
	Members	Villagers

10. Does the organization received grant money (put √ mark)? Yes No

If yes, write the total amount and source of money.

Amount	Source

11. Does the organization has any others source of income (put √ mark)? Yes No

If yes, write the total amount and source of income

Amount	Source

12. Does the organization expense any money then please mention the item and amount?

Item	Amount

D. Network & Linkage

1. Is there any formal /Informal engagement with any other institution-private or public of this organization (put √ mark)? Yes No

If yes, please describe the involvement and benefits:

Name of Institutions	Name of services	Type of service ^A	Involvement		Comments
			Male	Female	

A:- 1=Formal, 2=Informal

E. Rights & Social work

1. Is the organization engaged in leasing of roadside slops/ khas land/ water bodies etc (put ✓ mark)?

Yes No

If yes, please describe the followings:

Name of work	Result	Comments

2. Is the organization engaged in different social work like prevent early marriage/ arsenic test/ mediation/ roads repairing/ children education etc (put ✓ mark)?

Yes No

If yes, please describe the followings:

Name of work	Result	Comments

3. Is the organization observed any national or international day (put ✓ mark)?

Yes No

If yes, then mention the name of the day

F. Marketing

1. Is the organization involved with marketing activities (put ✓ mark)?

Yes No

If yes, describe the followings:

Name of activities	Involvement	
	Male	Female

2. What types of initiatives taken by organization for facing distress period?

If yes, describe the followings:

Name of the Initiative	Involvement	
	Male	Female

3. How many members involved in off-farm activity?

Name of activity	Involvement	
	Male	Female

4. Is the organization involved to establish women market corner (put \surd mark)? Yes No

If yes, describe initiatives of the organization.

5. How many women are involved in the marketing corner?

Organization member/ family member	Community member