

ANNEX

ANNEX 1: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference for Hiring Firm for Conducting Mid-term Evaluation of Support to Host Communities Affected by the Rohingya Influx Project (SHARIP)

The Terms of Reference (TOR) has been designed to conduct a mid-term evaluation of Support to Host Communities Affected by the Rohingya Influx Project (SHARIP), a sub-project under UNDP’s Strengthening Inclusive Development in CHT (SID-CHT).

This evaluation aims to measure progress made by the project so far in comparison with baseline and targets defined in the results framework as well as to assess different aspects of the project based on the OECD DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiencies, effectiveness, coherence, impact and sustainability based on the lessons learned and recommended follow-up actions.

Job	: Mid-term Evaluation of SHARIP project
Duration	: 60 days over 3 months’ period
Location	: Bandarban and Cox’s Bazar districts
Start	: 1 September 2021 (or earlier if possible)

Background and Rationale:

In 2017, over 700,000 Rohingya refugees fled into Cox’s Bazaar to escape what the UN has identified as ethnic cleansing in neighboring Myanmar. Today, nearly a million refugees live in 30-plus camps in Cox’s Bazaar’s Ukhiya and Teknaf Upazilas (sub-districts). As a result, the population in these areas tripled, exacerbated pre-existing vulnerabilities in the areas, and put an immense strain on local livelihoods, ecosystems, and basic services. Although the Government of Bangladesh (GoB) attempted to restrict the influx to the camps, recent reports highlight that many Rohingyas are believed to have left the camps and are settling in both Bandarban and Cox’s Bazar. As per UNDP studies, arable and grazing land has been re-purposed to house refugees, thousands of hectares of forest have been cut down, and water sources have been stretched and contaminated⁴. Competition for opportunities for informal work as day laborers has resulted in reduced wages, while the local market has been distorted as refugees compete with local retailers to offer lower prices⁵.

Consequently, tension and conflicts within and between host communities and Rohingya refugees are intensifying. This situation has been aggravated by the COVID 19 outbreak, which has negatively impacted the livelihoods of poor and vulnerable communities, increased social frustration due to disruptions in essential services such as education and health, and raised the possibility of a breakdown in social cohesion.

Objective: To strengthen the socio-economic conditions of the poor households of the host communities affected by the recent Rohingya influx in ten Upazilas of Bandarban and Cox’s Bazar districts.

This objective will be achieved through the following three outcomes and intervention areas:

Outcome 1: Agricultural production increased and diversified in targeted communities through:

Establishment of 1,800 Integrated Farm Management – Farmer Field Schools (IFM-FFS) (813 IFM-FFS in Cox’s Bazar and 987 IFM-FFS in Bandarban) with the participation of 54,000 poor and marginalized farmers, of which at least 50% are women.

Building the capacity of 563 Farmer Facilitators who will act as model farmers and facilitate learning in the IFM-FFS.

Facilitating group learning for IFM-FFS farmers on new farming components and improved techniques focusing on homestead production.

Enhancing access of IFM-FFS farmers to agricultural services through the engagement of Government Line Departments (DAE, DLS, DoF) and local Government Institutions as resource persons and monitors, and through training of Community Livestock Workers.

Enhancing access of IFM-FFS farmers to marketing through the establishment of 56 collection points.

Outcome 2: Agroforestry production increased sustainably through:

Developing and implementing 1,800 IFM-FFS community Agroforestry Development Plans and 54,000 individual household Agroforestry Development Plans.

Enhancing access to quality input, amongst other training nursery growers, establishing 65 community nurseries, and distributing 133,200 samplings.

Outcome 3: Social cohesion increased through:

Forming and providing support to 10 Local Volunteer Mediators Forums (LVMFs) who offer mediation services in the project areas.

Courtyard sessions for IFM-FFS farmers on leadership, conflict management, gender equality, etc.

Events raising the awareness and boosting the confidence of youths, including 1-month long martial art training, youth camps, debating competitions, etc.

Sensitizing events on social cohesion topics for the population in the project areas, including religious dialogues, street drama, and international world day celebrations.

Different types of stakeholders are engaged in the implementation of the SHARIP project, who all need to be taken into consideration when assessing the progress and results of the project:

Poor, marginalized farmers

Farmer Facilitators

Youth representatives

Local volunteer mediators

Government Line Departments (DAE, DLS, DoF)

Local government institutions (Upazila and Union Parishads)

Geographical Coverage:

The geographical coverage of the evaluation is 39 Unions in 6 Upazilas in Bandarban and Cox’s Bazar districts.

District	Upazila	Union	Union names	Farmer			
				Female	Male	Total	Female %
Bandarban	Alikadam	4	Alikadam sadar, Chaykhong, Korok pata, Noya Para	2,547	2,327	4,874	52
	Lama	8	Aziznagar, Faitong, Fashiyakhali, Gojalia, Lama Pouroshova, Lama Sadar, Rupashipara, Sarai	4,071	1,393	5,464	75
	Naikhyongchari	5	Baishari, Dochori, Gumdhum, N.Sadar, Sonaichari	3,742	1,497	5,239	71
	Grand Total	17		10,360	5,217	15,577	67%
Cox's Bazar	Ramu	11	Chakmarkul, Dakkhinmithachhari, Eidghar, Fotekharkul, Garjoniya, Jouarianala, Kacchapia, Kauwarkhop, Khuniapalong, Rajarkul, Rashidnagar	3,542	223	3,765	94
	Teknaf	6	Baharchara, Hnila, Saintmartin, Subrang, Teknaf Sadar, Whykong	3,115	540	3,655	85
	Ukhiya	5	Holdiapalong, Jaliapalong, Palongkhali, Rajapalong, Ratnapalong,	3,557	149	3,706	96
	Grand Total	22		10,214	912	11,126	92%
Total	6	39		20,574	6,129	26,703	77%

Evaluation Objectives and Scope:**Purpose:**

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to assess the process and progress of the SID-CHT project so far compared to its baseline and targets defined in the results framework. Mid-term evaluation will also evaluate and document the project activities’ relevance, efficiencies, effectiveness, impact, coherence, and sustainability to understand and undertake necessary adjustments of the project for the remaining period so that the project can achieve its planned goal and objectives as committed. The evaluation will also generate knowledge for wider use, assess the scope for scaling up the current programme, and serve as a quality assurance tool for both upward and downward accountability.

Specific Objectives:

The specific objectives of the study are:

To assess the performance of SHARIP since its commencement in 2018 to date against the outcome and outputs indicators as set out in the Results Framework;

To assess how far SHARIP has come in achieving the development engagement objective measured through the impact indicators identified in the Results Framework;

To draw the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes and effects driven by project-supported interventions;

To examine the assumptions embedded in the Theory of Change of SHARIP and assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and sustainability of the project drawn from its design and implementation;

To assess the extent to which the rights-based approach and gender-mainstreaming are applied; and

To draw lessons learned and good practices for the GoB and UNDP replication and/or up-scaling and provide forward-looking recommendations for the next programming phase.

The evaluation employs OECD evaluation criteria (Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact, Sustainability, and Coherence).

The Mid-term evaluation aims at critically reviewing and identifying what has worked well in the project, what challenges have been faced, what lessons can be learned to improve implementation for the remaining period. The evaluation will also generate knowledge for wider uses, assess the scope for scaling up the current programme, and serve as a quality assurance tool for both upward and downward accountability.

The evaluation should provide credible, useful, evidence-based information that enables timely incorporation of its findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes of UNDP and key stakeholders.

Scope of Evaluation:

This mid-term evaluation covers the project implementation of the project from July 2018 to June 2021. The mid-term project evaluation will be conducted from August 2021 to October 2021. The timing has been agreed with the project advisory board.

Utilization:

The primary audience for this evaluation is Government officials from MoCHTA, National Programme Director, Programme Coordinator, Project Manager, Technical specialist, Donors, other relevant government, civil society representatives, and development partners as well as UNDP Country Office, Resilience & Inclusive Growth (RIG) cluster, and SID-CHT project. UNDP will consider all useful findings, conclusions, and recommendations from the evaluation, prepare a systematic management response for each recommendation, and implement follow-up actions as per UNDP Evaluation Resource Center guidance/policies.

Evaluation Approach and Questions:

Evaluation Questions

As part of the evaluation, the firm needs to address evaluation questions. The following evaluation questions are key but not limited to:

Relevance

To what extent is the design of SHARIP as well as implementation approach/ methodology relevant to the current Bangladesh contexts, including both national context and local conditions of the project intervention areas?

How relevant is the project to UN/ UNDP strategies in Bangladesh (i.e. CPD, UNDAF), UNDP Strategic Plan, and SDGs?

To what extent has the project design and implementation taken cross-cutting issues into account, such as gender equality, human rights-based approach (HRBA), and Leaving no one behind (LNOB)?

To what extent has SHARIP’s Theory of Change been helpful to achieve the results? Is there any gap between the project reality and a pathway to achieve the results, hypothesis, assumptions, and risks identified when developing the Theory of Change?

Efficiency

How efficiently has the project spent available budget so far as per Prodoc and annual work plan?

Is budget allocation well considered to achieve the results to date in terms of cost efficiency?

To what extent is financial management efficient and effective?

Are the project’s institutional and implementation arrangements appropriate, effective and efficient for the successful achievement of the project’s objectives? How effectively has the project been managed?

To what extent has the M&E system supported effective project management and implementation?

Effectiveness

To what extent has the project been on track so far towards achieving its planned outcomes and outputs as per approved Results Framework? This includes critical analysis of the project’s achievements of indicators and targets.

What factors have contributed to the achievement or non-achievement of the outcomes and outputs?

To what extent are the activities of SHARIP adopting a gender responsive approach and making gender equality an integral part of the project?

What would be bottlenecks and changes if the project is not achieving the results as planned? (it should consider both external and internal factors)

Coherence

How do government policies and priorities in relation to enhancing the livelihood of small-scale farmers and development in host communities support or undermine the SHARIP project, and vice versa?

In which ways are there coherence between the SHARIP project and other UNDP interventions in the project areas?

Impact

What are the significant changes that the SHARIP project has brought in the lives of the direct beneficiaries and their communities so far? (this should include case studies)

Is there any positive/ negative change in target beneficiaries, their communities, and duty bearers as a result of the projects? How many were to benefit?

Sustainability

To what extent are individual and institutional capacities improved through SHARIP’s interventions sustainable?

What is the probability of the benefits of the interventions under SHARIP continuing in the long term?

Has the project considered necessary institutional arrangement of the government stakeholders’/partner organizations to be set up to make the project’s impact sustainable over a longer term?

Leave no one behind

To what extent have the projects’ response and recovery initiative(s) been inclusive in supporting the most vulnerable and marginalized group in the implementing area.

Lessons learned

What are the lessons that the projects have had learned so far?

What are the challenges that the projects have faced during their implementation?

What measures have already been taken to mitigate those challenges?

Way forward

Have any good practices, success stories, or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.

Based on the achievements to date, provide forward-looking programmatic recommendations.

Analysis on programme management and M&E system needs to be covered extensively by the mid-term review.

The selected consulting firm needs to collect and compile necessary recommendations from the stakeholders to be consulted on the above issues and furnish these recommendations in the mid-term evaluation report with appropriate details.

Gender and Human Rights-based Approach:

As part of the requirement, the mid-term review must include an assessment of the extent to which the design, implementation, and results of the project have incorporated gender equality perspective and a rights-based approach. The review team is requested to review *UNEG’s Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation* during the inception phase⁶.

In addition, the methodology used in the mid-term evaluation, including data collection and analysis methods, should be human rights and gender-sensitive to the greatest extent possible, with data and findings disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, etc. Detailed analysis on disaggregated data will be undertaken as part of the mid-term evaluation from which findings are consolidated to make recommendations and identify lessons learned for enhanced gender- responsive and rights-based approach of the project.

These evaluation approaches and methodology should consider different groups in SHARIP project intervention – women, youth, minorities, and vulnerable groups. Persons with disabilities (PwD) also need to be considered in the evaluation, following the new UNDP evaluation report checklist.

The evaluation covers the following questions in relation to gender equality and human rights:

Gender equality

To what extent have gender equality and women's empowerment been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project?

Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?

To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

Human rights

To what extent have poor, indigenous, and physically challenged women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

Evaluation Methodology and Approach:

Proposed Methodology

The firm will adopt qualitative methodologies, including household/institutional surveys, Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). Since quantitative data supplement qualitative data, a level of quantitative data collection is required. The bidders have been requested to elaborate on how to quantify the qualitative data in the proposal.

Survey questionnaires need to cover all indicators⁷ in the results framework detailed in Annex 1. The questionnaires should also keep at least the same level of data coverage as the baseline survey to ensure a robust comparison between baseline and mid-line data. The bidders are requested to propose strong data collection methodologies/tools and data analysis methodologies in the proposal and should be sufficiently detailed.

The firm needs to develop an evaluation matrix (template is attached in Annex 3 of this ToR) to clarify what types of data will be required to respond to which evaluation question and how those data will be collected.

The proposed sample size for both treatment and control groups is indicated in the table below. It should keep comparability with the baseline survey and include both treatment groups and control groups. The bidders are expected to select treatment groups (individual beneficiaries) based on specific criteria in the same 6 Upazila Parishads and 39 Union Parishads as baseline survey (but might be in different paras/grams). Control groups (individual beneficiaries) should derive from other paras/grams in the same 6 Upazilas and 39 UPs as treatment groups based on the criteria.

The bidders need to calculate the sample size for both treatment groups and control groups with a proper sampling method. The bidders are requested to elaborate the appropriate method and procedure (including selection criteria of control groups) in the proposal to determine the sample size and select treatment and control groups. It will be further elaborated in the inception report of the selected firm and determined in consultation with UNDP and relevant stakeholders during the inception phase.

District	Upazila	Union	Union names	Farmer				Proposed sample	
				Female	Male	Total	Female %	Treatment	Control
Bandarban	Alikadam	4	Alikadam sadar, Chaykhong, Korok pata, Noya Para	2,547	2,327	4,874	52	950-1,100	450-650
	Lama	8	Aziznagar, Faitong, Fashiyakhali, Gojalia, Lama Pouroshova, Lama Sadar, Rupashipara, Sarai	4,071	1,393	5,464	75		
	Naikhyongchari	5	Baishari, Dochori, Gumdhum, N.Sadar, Sonaichari	3,742	1,497	5,239	71		
	Grand Total	17		10,360	5,217	15,577	67%		
Cox's Bazar	Ramu	11	Chakmarkul, Dakkhinmithachhari, Eidghar, Fotekharkul, Garjoniya, Jouarianala, Kacchapia, Kauwarkhop, Khuniapalong, Rajarkul, Rashidnagar	3,542	223	3,765	94	950-1,100	450-650
	Teknaf	6	Baharchara, Hnila, Saintmartin, Subrang, Teknaf Sadar, Whykong	3,115	540	3,655	85		
	Ukhiya	5	Holdiapalong, Jaliapalong, Palongkhali, Rajapalong, Ratnapalong,	3,557	149	3,706	96		
	Grand Total	22		10,214	912	11,126	92%		
Total	6	39		20,574	6,129	26,703	77%		

All of the following data collection methods need to be covered. The firm can also add any other appropriate data collection method.

1. Household survey (if required);
2. Institutional surveys;
3. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)
4. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)
5. Case studies/ Success stories

The bidders are also requested to propose the appropriate number of FGDs and KIIs to be conducted per geographical coverage in the proposal. FGDs and KIIs also require semi-

structured questionnaires and/or checklists to make the data collection process as structured as possible.

The use of electronic-based data collection tools (i.e., web-based questionnaires/data collection apps) is highly encouraged.

The data collection process should be participatory, involving implementing partners, key stakeholders, and a broad cross-section of project staff and beneficiaries incorporating a gender equity approach.

The firm shall conduct robust analysis using statistical software. Qualitative data collected through KIIs and FGDs will also be analyzed extensively to provide a picture of the project’s results and impacts. Data and evidence will be triangulated to address evaluation questions.

The current situation of the COVID-19 crisis in the country needs to be considered when proposing data collection tools. The bidders are expected to present alternative means of data collection as viable options. Particularly, if the COVID-19 crisis continues at the time of data collection, FGDs might be difficult due to concerns about exposure to risk against social distancing. If the situation does not allow, there is an option to incorporate in-depth qualitative-based questions into the household survey questionnaires instead of conducting FGDs. The detailed methods will be decided in consultation with UNDP during the inception phase.

The selected firm is requested to identify 4 to 6 case studies (equally representing Cox’s Bazar and Bandarban) to look into qualitative changes for project beneficiaries made by the project. Details will be discussed during the inception phase and data collection phase. Case studies need to be elaborated in the evaluation report together with infographics and photos.

In the proposal, the bidders are requested to elaborate:

Overall evaluation strategies

Detailed work plan

Evaluation matrix

Sampling strategies based on the total beneficiary

Data collection methodologies & protocols

Data quality control methods

Data analysis methodologies and

Gender analysis plan

All of these aspects need to be sufficiently detailed. It will be assessed rigorously, which will heavily affect the scoring of the proposal.

Available Data Sources:

For the purpose of the mid-term review, the review team is expected to collect relevant information from the Project Document, Annual Work Plans, financial reports, training database, M&E plan, periodic progress reports, donor reports, policy documents, SHARIP/SID-

CHT produced IEC/BCC materials, fact sheets, case studies, meeting minutes, study reports, household database, SID-CHT baseline report and any other relevant documents.

For primary data collection, the following sources should include (but not limited to):

At the national level: National Project Director (SID-CHT), Deputy National Project Director (SID-CHT), Project staff, Donors, and other relevant government as stated in the stakeholder list in the Background section.

At the field level: Hill District Council, District and Upazila Administration including Deputy Commissioner (DC), UNO, Upazila Parishads (UZP) Representatives of Upazila Parishads and Union Parishads (UPs), local Government Line Department officials, Ward Committee Members, implementing partners, community members, and project beneficiaries.

Evaluation Ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’⁸. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees, and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected.

The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners. Signed ‘Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation of the United Nations System’ needs to be attached in the Annex of the final evaluation report. A template can be downloaded from the link below on the footnote⁹. The evaluation team may refer to UNDP’s Dispute and wrongdoing resolution process and contact details¹⁰ (Annex 3 (page 55) of Section 4: Evaluation Implementation and Use of UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2021)).

Scope of Work and Timeline:

Scope of Work:

The scope of the work for this assignment is outlined below:

Detailed methodologies note of the evaluation: The firm will develop detailed methodologies including 1) Overall evaluation strategies, 2) Detailed work plan, 3) Evaluation matrix, 4) Sampling strategies based on the total beneficiary, 5) Data collection methodologies & protocols, 6) Data quality control methods, 7) Data analysis methodologies, and 8) Gender analysis plan. Methodologies will be finalized in consultation with UNDP. The firm shall also review primary and secondary project data. Before submitting the inception report, the firm shall consult with the key persons of the project to finalize the data collection methodologies, tools, and data analysis plans.

Detailed sampling frame of evaluation:

Determination of Sample size

The firm shall propose the sample size from its total beneficiary. It should keep comparability with the baseline survey and include both treatment groups and control groups. Proposed sample size for both treatment and control groups is added in the table in ‘5.1. Proposed

Methodology’ of this ToR. A specific sample for qualitative and quantitative data collection is required to draw. The SID-CHT team will assist in drawing the whole sampling framework after hiring the firm. Details shall be confirmed and finalized in consultation with UNDP and stakeholders during the inception phase.

Household Survey

As per the requirement, the bidders need to calculate the sample size for both treatment groups and control groups with proper sampling method. The bidders are requested to elaborate the appropriate method and procedure in the proposal to select sample size. Information are available in ‘5.1. Proposed Methodology’ of this ToR.

Focus Group Discussions

The firm is also expected to conduct a sufficient number of FGDs. The bidders are requested to propose the number of FGDs to be conducted per geographical coverage in the proposal.

Development of data collection tools: The firm needs to design a set of tools to collect data from different stakeholders and households. This should include 1) HH survey questionnaires, 2) Key Informant Interview (KII) checklist/ semi-structured questionnaire, 3) Focus Group Discussion (FGD) checklist/ semi-structured questionnaire, 4) case study guideline as well as 5) survey protocols and 6) data quality assurance mechanism. Survey questionnaires should keep at least the same level of data coverage as baseline survey to ensure robust comparison between baseline data and mid-line data. Except these requirements, the firm has a freedom to propose data collection tools as appropriate for the evaluation in consultation with UNDP.

Field test of data collection tools: To avoid non-sampling error, the firm will conduct field test of data collection tools and methodologies and will adjust them based on learning/ feedback of field testing.

Field data collection: The firm will hire the required number of researchers/surveyors/data entry personnel with sufficient experiences in data collection. They will collect data from households, project participants, local governance institutions (HDCs), and any other relevant organizations with appropriate data collection methods/tools. In order to ensure the best quality data collection, experienced field coordinators and enumerators collecting the data in the field will carry out data quality control using different methods. The firm shall organize training for field coordinators and enumerators before deployment to familiarize them with data collection tools and data quality assurance mechanism.

Use of Electronic-based data collection tools (i.e. web-based questionnaires/data collection apps) is highly encouraged, in case the firm already has tablets and any other necessary equipment which can be used for this evaluation. Data collection tools will be developed both in Bangla and English.

Data Entry/Data Quality Control/Data Management: The firm will design and implement a system for data entry and data management. The firm needs to ensure the quality of data with a robust quality assurance mechanism in the whole data entry/management process.

Data Analysis: The firm will analyze and interpret data through relevant statistical software and triangulate both qualitative and quantitative data. Multivariate data analysis is encouraged to be used.

Report: The firm will provide a draft report and share its findings with UNDP and other relevant stakeholders through the presentation. The feedback received will be incorporated into the report. The final report should include programmatic recommendations on what needs to be considered for the remaining project period of SID-CHT. The reporting language is English. The evaluation report shall follow the structure outlined in Annex 3/ Evaluation Report Template and Quality Standards (Page 55-59) of Section 4/ Evaluation Implementation and Use of UNDP Evaluation Guideline. All evaluation reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO’s quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 (Page 8-12) of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines [2].¹¹

Evaluation Timeline:

Phase	Estimated # of Days	Proposed Timeline
Inception work: Review necessary documents Inception report and detailed methodologies notes, including 1) Overall evaluation strategies, 2) Detailed work plan, 3) Evaluation matrix, 4) Sampling strategies based on the total beneficiary, 5) Data collection methodologies & protocols, 6) Data quality control methods, 7) Data analysis methodologies, and 8) Gender analysis plan. Submit draft inception report to UNDP.	5 days	Within two week of signing contract
Organize an inception meeting with UNDP to finalize mid-term review framework and methodologies. Submit final inception report and obtain approval from UNDP including detailed methodologies.		
Data collection tools development: Develop data collection tools and protocols (i.e. survey questionnaires, checklist, survey protocols, data quality assurance mechanism). Presentation of data collection tools to UNDP/ SID-CHT management. Field test data collection tools. Finalize data collection tools incorporating feedback of field testing.	5 days	Within two weeks of signing contract
Field data collection/ Data management: Provide training to onboard enumerators on data collection tools and methods. Collect data from the agreed sources using agreed tools and methods. Conduct data quality assurance	30 days	Within eight weeks of signing contract

Data entry into the software Data processing Debrief key findings to the UNDP CO and the stakeholders		
Reporting: Conduct data analysis Triangulate/ analyse findings from desk review, stakeholders’ interview, and KIIs Draft evaluation report Organize a sharing meeting for UNDP and relevant stakeholders. Incorporate feedback and comments from UNDP and stakeholders. Submit final report to UNDP together with other deliverables.	20 days	Within twelve weeks of signing contract

The firm/organization will be expected to present a draft report in both written form and oral -presentation to the UNDP/SID-CHT and relevant stakeholders within one month of completion of field data collection. The UNDP/SID-CHT and relevant stakeholders will then give their written comments for incorporation in the final report after submitting the draft report. The team leader should be available to discuss findings with management before the presentation of the draft report. The final report (MS Word format) and clean data (excel/SPSS) on a flash drive should be presented within 2 weeks of getting the comments on the draft report.

ANNEX-2: Household Survey Questionnaire**Treatment Group****Strengthening Inclusive Development in Chattogram Hill Tracks,
(SID-CHT), Ministry of Chattogram Hill Tracts Affairs****And****United Nations Development Programme****Mid-Term Evaluation of Support to Host Communities Affected by the
Rohingya Influx Project (SHARIP)****Greetings! Assalamu-alaikum/Adab.**

My name is I am representing PMID, which was engaged by UNDP to carry out a Mid Term Evaluation of on-going UNDP project “Support to Host Communities Affected by the Rohingya Influx Project (SHARIP)” On behalf of PMID, I would like to take your interview with the aim to to know about the project activities, progress and how you are benefited from the project. I will ask you some questions about your present situation and to know about your attitudes towards it and as part of it, we would like to talk to you about different aspects related to the initiative for about 45/50 minutes. Your name, your answers, opinions, and information provided by you will be kept strictly confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Your name will not be cited anywhere. Your participation in this survey is fully optional. You can decide whether to answer any question or not. Still, we hope you will participate in this survey, because your response is particularly very important for this survey. With your permission we might take some pictures and record some audio from your speech for the report.

We thank you very much for your readiness to participate in the survey and assure you that information provided by you will be kept strictly confidential and used only for the study purpose. You can now ask me any question regarding this survey. May I now start asking questions?

Household Questionnaire		SL.	
a)	District:	1. Cox’s Bazar; 2. Bandarban	
b)	Upazilla:	1. Alikadam; 2. Lama; 3. Naikhyongchari; 4. Ramu; 5. Teknaf; 6. Ukhiya	
c)	Union:	Cox's Bazar: Eidghar; Fotekharkul; Kauwarkhop; Teknaf Sadar; Whykong; Holdiapalong; Rajapalong	Bandarban: Chaykhong; Gojalia; Rupashipara; Baishari; N.Sadar
d)	Village/ Para:		
e)	Type	1. Treatment Group	
f)	Category of Respondent	1. Female headed household 2. Male headed household	
g)	Name of respondent		
h)	Sex	1. Male; 2 Female;	
i)	Age:		

j)	Ethnicity	1. Chakma; 2. Marma; 3. Tripura; 4. Bawm; 5. Chak; 6. Khyang; 7. Khumi; 8. Lusai; 9. Mro; 10. Pangkhua; 11. Tanchangya; 12. Rakhaine; 13. Bengali; 14. Others (Specify)		
k)	Disability	1 Yes; 2. No		
l)	Cell phone :			
A. DEMOGRAPHIC				
1	What is your main occupation?	1. Farmer, 2. House wife, 3. Small Business, 4. GoB Service, 5. Private Service; 6. Small entrepreneur 7. Self-employed 8. Day labor, 9. Others		
2	What agricultural products do you produce?	1. Crops, 2. Vegetables, 3. Fruits; 4. Livestock; 5. Poultry; 6. Fisheries; 7. Agroforestry, 8. Nursery; 9. Beekeeping; 10. Floriculture, 11. Others		
3	What is the land size (decimal)?	1 Agricultural land: 2 Homestead Land: 3 Pond area:		
4	What is your annual household income?	BDT.....		
5	What is your highest educational attainment level?	1. No formal education; 2. Grade I - V; 3. Grade VI - X; 4. SSC; 5. HSC; 6. Graduation and above		
6	Number of Family members of HH?	1. Male:	2. Female:	3. Total:
B. Outcome-1: Agricultural production increased and diversified in targeted communities				
7	Date of joining the IFM-FFS (Month/Year)	Month Year.....		
8	Did you attend IFM-FFS sessions on integrated farming?	1. Yes 2. No		
8.1	If yes, what kind of training did you get?	1. Integrated farm management; 2. Vegetable cultivation; 3. Fruits cultivation 4. Paddy Cultivation; 5. Agroforestry 6. Poultry Farming 7. Goat rearing 8. Cow rearing 9. Pig rearing 10. Fish culture (pond and creek), 11. Honey beekeeping 12. Nutrition 13. Marketing of Agro-products 14. High-value crops (Papaya, banana, mushroom, betel leaf, malta/orange etc.) 15. Awareness on Disease and Vaccination for livestock/ Poultry; 16. Others specify.....		
9	Could you undertake additional farming components after getting training?	1. Yes; 2 No		

9.1	If yes, what additional farming components could you apply after getting training?	1. Vegetable; 2. Fruit; 3. Poultry rearing; 4. Goat rearing 5. Cow rearing 6. Pig rearing 7. Fish culture 8. Beekeeping; 9. Papaya; 10. Banana; 11 Mushrooms; 12. Betel Leafs 13. Malta/orange 14. Others Crops;		
10	Could you apply improved farming techniques/technologies that you learned from training?	1. Yes; 2 No;		
10.1	If yes, what type of improvements have you experienced after using new technologies?	1. Increased production; 2. Reduced production time; 3. Less labor; 4. Reduced cost; 5. Increased quality; 6. No improvement at all.		
10.2	If no, why couldn't you apply additional components and/ or improved farming techniques?	1. I could not understand anything in the training 2. I didn't get on-job support while trying to apply improved techniques 3. I have no means/ additional resource/ land to apply additional components/ technique 4. I didn't get any input (seed, fertilizer, insecticide or tools) support to apply additional components/ techniques 5. I have no helping hand in my family to undertake new components and/or to adopt new techniques.		
11	Mention how much did you produce before joining FFS and 2021	Item Produced in kg	Before joining FFS	2021
		Crop (Kg)		
		Vegetable (Kg)		
		Fruit (Kg)		
		Hen/duck eggs (No)		
		Chicken/ duck Meat (No)		
		Goat (No)		
		Cow (No)		
		Pig (No)		
		Milk (Liter)		
		Papaya (High value crops) (Kg)		
		Banana (kadi)		
		Mushrooms (High value crops) (kg)		
		Betel Leaf (High value crops) (....)		
		Malta/orange (kg)		
		Fish (Kg)		

		Honey (Kg)		
12	Are you in contact with farmer facilitators for any help during the last three months?	1. Yes; 2. No		
12.1	If yes, how frequently did you contact?	1. Once Per week; 2. Twice Per week; 3. Once per 15 days; 4. Once per month; 5. Others specify.....		
13	Did any Local service providers/ volunteer provide you with any support?	1. Yes 2. No		
13.1	If yes, which service provider contacted you or vice versa?	1. Community agriculture worker; 2. Community livestock worker; 3. Community poultry development worker; 4. Community aquaculture resource person; 5. Bee-keeping worker; 6. Vaccination service provider; 7. Nursery grower 8. Vermicompost producer; 9. Other Input traders		
13.2	If yes, what kind of support did you get?	1. Demonstration of improved agricultural practice 2. During cultivation/production training support for skill up-gradation; 3. vaccination support; 4. Supply of saplings 5. Information about inputs and improved practices; 6. Others		
14	Did you receive any support from GoB line agencies (DAE, DLS, DoF, DWA, LGIs) or from district council?	1. Yes, 2. No		
14.1	If yes, what kind of support did you receive from these agencies?	1. Provided training as a resource person/ facilitator in FFS; 2. Visited production activities of the farmers and provided technical guidance; 3. Gave necessary advice when contacted in person or over mobile phone; 4. Provided input support in cash/ kinds when faced with disaster or emergency situation 5. Provided vaccination support to prevent disease of livestock and poultry; 6. Provided support under safety net program (Receive cash/ kinds)		
15	Was your agricultural production disrupted by COVID 19?	1. Yes; 2. No; 3. Partially		
15.1	If yes, did you receive any agricultural input packages as a part of COVID-19 response to resume your agriculture production disrupted by COVID-19?	1. Yes 2. No		
15.2	If yes, from which organization did you receive input packages?	1. DAE; 2. DLS; 3. DOF; 4. DWA; 5. LGI; 6. ACLAB/UNDP; 7. Other NGO; 8. Union Parishad; 9. Private Companies		
15.3	If option 6 (ACLAB/ UNDP) is answered in 15.2, then what type of input packages did you receive?	1. Seeds; 2. Farming tools; 3. COVID PPEs ; 4. Cash;		

15.4	Are you satisfied with the quality of agricultural input packages?	1. Satisfactory 2. Moderate 3. Unsatisfactory		
16	Did you receive any information on the potential negative impact of COVID-19?	1. Yes 2. No		
16.1	If yes, from whom did you receive this information?	1. DAE; 2. DLS; 3. DOF; 4. DWA; 5. LGI; 6. IFM-FFS; 7.Other NGO; 8. Volunteer; 9. Radio; 10. Television; 11. Mobile SMS;		
17	Do you have access to high-quality farming inputs?	1. Yes; 2. No		
17.1	If yes, how do you get access to high quality farming inputs?	1. Have access to inputs in nearby collection points; 2. Have access to local markets for purchasing input materials from traders; 3. Have contact with small entrepreneurs providing support/ services to communities/ farming households		
18	Do you have link with buyer/traders to sell your agricultural products?	1. Yes; 2. No;		
18.1	If yes, where do you sell your agricultural products?	1. Local Markets; 2. Collection points 3. Others (.....)		
C. Outcome-2: Agroforestry production increased sustainably				
19	Areas of lands (decimal) under firewood, bamboo and vegetation?	Item	Before joining FFS	2021
		Nursery (No. of seedling)		
		Firewood (No. of trees)		
		Vegetation (decimal)		
		Bamboo bushes (No. of bush)		
		Beekeeping (No. of box)		
20	Did you have your own Agroforestry Development Plan?	1. Yes; 2. No; 3. Don't know/ Can't say		
20.1	If yes, are you implementing Agroforestry Development Plan and adopting improved agroforestry system?	1. Yes; 2. No; 3. Don't know/ Can't say		
20.2	If yes, what type of improvements have you experienced by adopting improved agroforestry system?	1. Increased production; 2. Less labor; 3. Reduced cost; 4.Increased knowledge & Skills; 5. More profitable; 6. No improvement at all.		

20.3	If no, why couldn't you adopt improved agroforestry system?	1. I could not attend courtyard session on agroforestry and don't know about improved agroforestry system; 2. I didn't get support from my group or facilitator while trying to apply an improved agroforestry system; 3. I have no means/ additional resource/ land to apply improved agroforestry system; 4. I didn't get any input (seedling/sapling, fertilizer, tools) to apply an improved agroforestry system; 5. I have no helping hand in my family to undertake improved agroforestry system	
21	Do you have access to high-quality agroforestry inputs?	1. Yes; 2. No	
21.1	If yes, how do you get access to high quality agroforestry inputs?	1. Have access to local markets for purchasing input materials from traders; 2. Have contact with new agroforestry based small entrepreneurs providing support/ services to communities/ households	
22	Do you produce any high value crop ?	1. Yes 2. No	
22.1	If yes, what type of crop do you produce?	1. Papaya, 2. Betel Leaf, 3. Mushrooms 4. Beekeeping (apiculture) 5. flower 6. other.....	
D. Income from agricultural production		Before joining FFS (BDT)	2021 (BDT)
23	What is your gross agricultural income of your own (not other HH members) in the past 12 months (Sales?		
24	What is your net agricultural income of your own (not other HH members) in the past 12 months? (Sales-cost of production)		
E. Outcome 3: Social cohesion increased			
25	What do you think of the presence of Rohingyas in the area? (Multiple answer possible)	1. A burden on our community, sharing our food and wealth and doing harm to our environment; 2. We are deprived of our rights and benefits; 3. We are feeling unsecured as they may grab/ occupy our land and property; 4. Neither good nor bad, and we don't feel a threat from them; 5. It's a humanitarian problem and it is good that we can provide them with support; 6. It provides opportunities to sell our agricultural products; 7. Not applicable / we live distant places than the Rohingya people; 8. Cannot say; 9. Others, specify:	

26	In your opinion, is the relation of your community with the Rohingya community generally peaceful or marked by any dissatisfaction?	1. Very peaceful; 2. Moderately peaceful; 3. Neither peaceful nor dissatisfied; 4. Moderately dissatisfied; 5 = Very dissatisfied; 6. Not applicable / Rohingya people live far from our community; 7. Don't know/ Cannot say;
27	Compared to the situation before joining FFS, has the level of dissatisfaction between the two-community people increased, decreased or stayed the same?	1. Increased; 2. Decreased; 3. stayed the same; 4. Not applicable / Rohingya people live in distant places; 5. Don't know/ Cannot say.
27.1	If answered, then why? What are the causes of community conflict and dissatisfaction resulted from Rohingya influx?	1. Illegal occupation/ grabbing of productive lands; 2. Environmental degradation; 3. Unemployment; 4. Occupation of labor market and low wage rate, 5. Unbalanced demand and supply- price hike; 6. Easy access to weapons/ illegal arms; 7. Easy access to drugs/ narcotics, 8. No rule of law; 9. Violence due to marriage or commitment of marriage; 10. Abduction and ransom demand
28	Do you have any conflict with Rohingya present in your area?	1. Yes; 2. No;
28.1	If yes, what specific conflicts/ disputes have you experienced in last 4 years?	1. Occupied my crop lands; 2. Evicted me from my settlement; 3. Threatened my life; 4. Polluted/ damaged my environment; 5. Carry illegal arms/ drug in my premises; 6. Abducted me/ my family member and demanded ransom 7. Illegal marital relations established 8. Others.....
29	Have you got your conflicts/ disputes settled?	1. Yes; 2. Partially solved; 3. Not yet
29.1	If yes, who solved the disputes?	1. LVMFs Volunteers; 2. Union Parshad (Village Court); 3. Farmer's Facilitators; 4. I coped with the situation; 5. Others Specify...;
30	Have you heard of LVMF and their activities?	1. Yes; 2. No
30.1	If yes, did you seek assistance of any LVMF member for solving your dispute?	1. Yes; 2. No
30.2	If yes, what is your level of satisfaction to get solution of your dispute?	1. Highly satisfied; 2. moderately satisfied; 3. moderately dissatisfied; 4. Not satisfied at all.

31	Did you participate FFS courtyard session regarding social cohesion and conflict resolution?	1. Yes; 2 No
31.1	If yes, which are the sessions, you attended?	1. Conflict and Conflict management; 2. communication; 3. Leadership; 4. Covid-19 awareness; 5. Social capital
31.2	If yes, do you feel confident that you can apply knowledge and address disputes and conflicts at household and/ or community level?	1. Confident; 2. Not confident; 3. Can't say
31.3	If yes, how many conflicting cases you addressed/ mediated successfully after attending the courtyard sessions?	1. One; 2. Two; 3. Three, 4 More than three.
E. Gender Equality		
32	Did you participate in courtyard sessions on Gender awareness?	1.Yes 2. No; 3. Can't remember
33	Are you involved in disseminating your knowledge/ learnings on agriculture/agroforestry and social cohesion to other non-FFS farmers?	1. Yes; 2. No
33.1	If yes, how do you do that?	1. Visit occasionally non-FFS farmers and give them advice 2. Non-FFS farmers sometimes visit my production field to see and know about improved practices; 3. Non-FFS farmers contact over mobile phone and I gave them advice; 4. Others
34	Did you ever participate in national and international day observations particularly the international women's day?	1. Yes, 2. No; 3. Can't remember
34.1	If yes, who organized the events?	1. GoB; 2.ACLAB/UNDP; 3. Other NGO; 4. IFM-FFS 5. Private Companies
35	Do you have control over household and particularly on agricultural production related income?	1. To large extent; 2 to some extent; 3. Not at all
36	Do you have increased participation in decision making regarding production and sales in household or in farmers group?	1. To large extent; 2 to some extent; 3. Not at all

37	Do you share knowledge and practices with my husband and other family members and take decisions jointly about improved practices?	1. To large extent; 2 to some extent; 3. Not at all
38	Do you have mobility to access local input and sales market?	1. To large extent; 2 to some extent; 3. Not at all
39	Are you able to impart knowledge on improved agricultural practice/ agroforestry techniques to non-FFS farmers	1. To large extent; 2 to some extent; 3. Not at all
40	Do you hold a leadership position in a community group and can influence decision making?	1. To large extent; 2 to some extent; 3. Not at all
41	Are you living free of violence or threat of violence in your own family?	1. No Problem, living free of violence 2. Living with threats of violence in the community 3. Feeling risk of safety and security in mobility
G. Sustainability		
42	Do you think that you have enough capacity to sustain your learned improved agricultural practices for long term without any project support?	1. Yes; 2. No
42.1	If yes, what are your strengths to sustain your production activities and improved practices?.	1. I have the required knowledge and skill to continue my production activities 2 I have full access to the input market (local traders of seed, fertilizer, feeds etc.) 3. I have market linkage for selling my agricultural products 4. I have regular contact with community service providers and GoB line departments for necessary technical support. 5. I can cope with local conflicting situations, 6. I can mitigate conflicts through LVMF/ LGI and thus reduce risk of local insecurity 7. Any other
42.2	If no, what are the barriers/ challenges of sustainability?	1. Lack of skill, knowledge and confidence 2. Lack of resources, quality inputs and services 3. Unavailability of skilled service providers/ entrepreneurs 4. Lack of marketing opportunities; 5. Frequent natural disaster (storm, cyclone, flush flood, hill slide, climate change etc.) 6. Existence of violence and lack of social cohesion.

Control Group

**Strengthening Inclusive Development in Chattogram Hill Tracks,
(SID-CHT), Ministry of Chattogram Hill Tracts Affairs
And
United Nations Development Programme**

**Mid-Term Evaluation of Support to Host Communities Affected by the
Rohingya Influx Project (SHARIP)**

Greetings! Assalamu-alaikum/Adab.

Greetings! Assalamu-alaikum/Adab.

My name is I am representing PMID, which was engaged by UNDP to carry out a Mid Term Evaluation of on-going UNDP project “Support to Host Communities Affected by the Rohingya Influx Project (SHARIP)” On behalf of PMID, I would like to take your interview as potential participant of the project and ask you some questions about your present situation, know about your attitudes towards the project and talk to you about different aspects related to your initiative for about 45/50 minutes. Your name, your answers, opinions, and information provided by you will be kept strictly confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Your name will not be cited anywhere. Your participation in this survey is fully optional. You can decide whether to answer any question or not. Still, we hope you will participate in this survey, because your response is particularly very important for this survey. With your permission we might take some pictures and record some audio from your speech for the report.

We thank you very much for your readiness to participate in the survey and assure you that information provided by you will be kept secret and used only for the study purpose. You can now ask me any question regarding this survey. May I now start asking questions

Household Questionnaire		SL.
a)	District:	1. Cox's Bazar; 2. Bandarban
b)	Upazilla:	1. Alikadam; 2. Lama; 3. Naikhyongchari; 4. Ramu; 5. Teknaf; 6. Ukhiya
c)	Union:	Cox's Bazar: Eidghar; Fotekharkul; Kauwarkhop; Teknaf Sadar; Whykong; Holdiapalong; Rajapalong Bandarban: Chaykhong; Gojalia; Rupashipara; Baishari; N.Sadar
d)	Village/ Para:	
e)	Area	1. Control area
f)	Category of Respondent	1. Female headed household 2. Male headed household
g)	Name of respondent	
h)	Sex	1. Male; 2 Female;
i)	Age:	
j)	Ethnicity	1. Chakma; 2. Marma; 3. Tripura; 4. Bawm; 5. Chak; 6. Khyang; 7. Khumi; 8. Lusai; 9. Mro; 10. Pangkhua; 11. Tanchangya; 12. Rakhaine; 13. Bengali; 14. Others(Specify)

k)	Cell phone :	
l)	Disability	1. Yes; 2. No
A. DEMOGRAPHIC		
1	What is your main occupation?	1. Farmer, 2. House wife, 3. Small Business, 4. GoB Service, 5. Private Service; 6. Small entrepreneur 7. Self-employed 8. Day labor, 9. Others
2	What agricultural products do you produce?	1. Crops, 2. Vegetables, 3. Fruits; 4. Livestock; 5. Poultry; 6. Fisheries; 7. Agroforestry, 8. Nursery; 9. Beekeeping; 10. Floriculture, 11. Others
3	What is the land size (decimal)?	1 Agricultural land: 2 Homestead Land: 3 Pond area :.....
4	What is your annual household income?	BDT.....
5	What is your highest educational attainment level?	1. No formal education; 2. Grade I - V; 3. Grade VI - X; 4. SSC; 5. HSC; 6. Graduation and above
6	Number of Family members of HH?	1. Male: 2. Female: 3. Total:
B. Outcome-1: Agricultural production increased and diversified in targeted communities		
7	Are you member of any agricultural groups?	1. Yes 2. No
7.1	If yes, Date of joining?	1. Months..... 2. Years.....
8	Did you receive any field training on integrated farming?	1. Yes 2. No
8.1	If yes, from whom did you receive the training?	1. DAE, 2. DLS, 3. DoF; 4. DWA 5. NGOs; 6. Union Parishad; 7. Private Sector
8.2	If yes, what kind of training did you get?	1. Integrated farm management; 2. Vegetable cultivation; 3. Fruits cultivation 4. Paddy Cultivation; 5. Agroforestry 6. Poultry Farming 7. Goat rearing 8. Cow rearing 9. Pig rearing 10. Fish culture (pond and creek), 11. Honey beekeeping 12. Nutrition 13. Marketing of Agro-products 14. High-value crops (Papaya, banana, mushroom, betel leaf, malta/orange etc.) 15. Awareness on Disease and Vaccination for livestock/ Poultry; 16. Others specify.....
9	Could you undertake additional farming components after getting training?	1. Yes; 2 No

9.1	If yes, what additional farming components could you apply after getting training?	1. Vegetable; 2. Fruit; 3. Poultry rearing; 4. Goat rearing 5. Cow rearing 6. Pig rearing 7. Fish culture 8. Beekeeping; 9. Papaya; 10. Banana; 11 Mushrooms; 12. Betel Leafs 13. Malta/orange 14. Others Crops;		
10	Could you apply improved farming techniques/technologies that you learned from training?	1. Yes; 2 No;		
10.1	If yes, what type of improvements have you experienced after using new technologies?	1. Increased production; 2. Reduced production time; 3. Less labor; 4. Reduced cost; 5. Increased quality; 6. No improvement at all.		
11	Mention how much did you produce in 2018 and 2021	Item Produced in kg	2018	2021
		Crop (Kg)		
		Vegetable (Kg)		
		Fruit (Kg)		
		Hen/duck eggs (No)		
		Chicken/ duck Meat (No)		
		Goat (No)		
		Cow (No)		
		Pig (No)		
		Milk (Liter)		
		Papaya (High value crops) (Kg)		
		Banana (kadi)		
		Mushrooms (High value crops) (kg)		
		Betel Leaf (High value crops) (....)		
		Malta/orange (kg)		
		Fish (Kg)		
		Honey (Kg)		
12	Did you receive any support from GoB line agencies (DAE, DLS, DoF, DWA, LGIs) or from district council??	1. Yes, 2. No		

12.1	If yes, what kind of support did you receive from these agencies?	1. Provided training as a resource person/ facilitator in FFS; 2. Visited production activities of the farmers and provided a technical guideline; 3. Gave necessary advice when contacted in person or over mobile phone; 4. Provided input support in cash/ kinds when faced with disaster or emergency situation 5. Provided vaccination support to prevent disease of livestock and poultry; 6. Provided support under safety net program (Receive cash/ kinds)
13	Was your agricultural production disrupted by COVID 19?	1. Yes; 2. No; 3. Partially
13.1	If yes, did you receive any agricultural input packages as a part of COVID-19 response to resume your agricultural production disrupted by COVID-19?	1. Yes 2. No
13.2	If yes, from which organization did you receive input packages?	1. DAE; 2. DLS; 3. DOF; 4. DWA; 5. LGI 6. NGOs; 7. Union Parishad; 8. Private Companies
13.3	If yes, what type of input packages did you receive?	1. Seeds; 2. Farming tools; 3. COVID PPEs ; 4. Cash;
13.4	Are you satisfied with the quality of agricultural input packages?	1. Satisfactory 2. Moderate 3. Unsatisfactory
14	Did you receive any information on the potential negative impact of COVID-19?	1. Yes 2. No
14.1	If yes, from whom did you receive this information?	1. DAE; 2. DLS; 3. DOF; 4. DWA; 5. LGI; 6. NGOs; 7. Volunteer; 8. Radio; 9. Television; 10. Mobile SMS;
15	Do you have access to high-quality farming inputs?	1. Yes; 2. No
15.1	If yes, how do you get access to high quality farming inputs?	1. Have access to inputs in nearby collection points; 2. Have access to local markets for purchasing input materials from traders; 3. Have contact with small entrepreneurs providing support/ services to communities/ farming households
16	Do you have link with buyer/traders to sell your agricultural products?	1. Yes; 2. No;
16.1	If yes, where do you sell your agricultural products?	1. Local Markets; 2. Collection points 3. Others (.....)

C. Outcome-2: Agroforestry production increased sustainably

		Item	2018	2021
17	Areas of lands (decimal) under firewood, bamboo and vegetation?	Nursery (No. of seedling)		
		Firewood (No. of trees)		
		Vegetation (Decimal)		

		Bamboo bushes (No. of trees)		
		Beekeeping (No. of box)		
18	Did you have your own Agroforestry Development Plan?	1. Yes; 2. No; 3. Don't know/ Can't say		
18.1	If yes, are you implementing that Agroforestry Development Plan and adopting improved agroforestry system?	1. Yes; 2. No; 3. Don't know/ Can't say		
18.2	If yes, what type of improvements have you experienced by adopting improved agroforestry system?	1. Increased production; 2. Less labor; 3. Reduced cost; 4. Increased knowledge & Skills; 5. More profitable; 6. No improvement at all.		
19	Do you have access to high-quality agroforestry inputs?	1. Yes; 2. No		
19.1	If yes, how do you get access to high quality agroforestry inputs?	1. Have access to local markets for purchasing input materials from traders; 2. Have contact with new agroforestry based small entrepreneurs providing support/ services to communities/ households		
20	Do you produce any high value crop ?	1. Yes 2. No		
20.1	If yes, what type of crop do you produce?	1. Papaya, 2. Betel Leaf, 3. Mushrooms 4. Beekeeping (apiculture) 5. flower 6. Other.....		
D. Income from agricultural production		2018 (BDT)	2021 (BDT)	
21	What is your gross agricultural income of your own (not other HH members) in the past 12 months (Sales)?			
22	What is your net agricultural income of your own (not other HH members) in the past 12 months? (Sales-cost of production)			
E. Outcome 3: Social cohesion increased				
23.	What do you think of the presence of refugees in the area? (Multiple answer possible)	1. A burden on our community, sharing our food and wealth and doing harm to our environment; 2. We are deprived of our rights and benefits; 3. We are feeling unsecured as they may grab/ occupy our land and property; 4. Neither good nor bad, and we don't feel a threat from them; 5. It's a humanitarian problem and it is good that we can provide them with support; 6. It provides opportunities to sell our agricultural products; 7. Not applicable / we live distant places than the Rohingya people; 8. Cannot say; 9. Others, specify:		

24	In your opinion, is the relation of your community with the Rohingya community generally peaceful or marked by dissatisfaction?	1. Very peaceful; 2. Moderately peaceful; 3. Neither peaceful nor dissatisfied; 4. Moderately dissatisfied; 5 = Very dissatisfied; 6. Not applicable / Rohingya people live far from our community; 7. Don't know/ Cannot say;
25	Compared to last three years, has the level of dissatisfaction between the two-community people increased, decreased or stayed the same?	1. Increased; 4. Decreased; 5. Stayed the same; 6. Not applicable / Rohingya people live in distant places; 7. Don't know/ Cannot say.
25.1	If answered, then why? What are the causes of community conflict and violence resulted from Rohingya influx?	1. Illegal occupation/ grabbing of productive lands; 2. Environmental degradation; 3. Unemployment; 4. Occupation of labor market and low wage rate, 5. Unbalanced demand and supply- price hike; 6. Easy access to weapons/ illegal arms; 7. Easy access to drugs/ narcotics, 8. No rule of law; 9. Violence due to marriage or commitment of marriage; 10. Abduction and ransom demand
26	Do you have any conflict with Rohingya present in your place?	2. Yes; 2. No;
26.1	If yes, what specific conflicts/ disputes have you experienced in last 4 years?	1. Occupied my crop lands; 2. Evicted me from my settlement; 3. Threatened my life; 4. Polluted/ damaged my environment; 5. Carry illegal arms/ drug in my premises; 6. Abducted me/ my family member and demanded ransom 7. Illegal marital relations established 8. Others.....
27	Have you got your conflicts/ disputes settled?	1. Yes; 2. Partially solved; 3. Not yet
27.1	If yes, who solved the disputes?	1. Union Parshad (Village Court); 2. Farmers Facilitators; 3. I coped with the situation; 4. Others Specify...;
28	Have you heard of LVMF or any mediator groups/forums?	1. Yes; 2. No
28.1	If yes, did you seek assistance of any mediator group for solving your dispute?	1. Yes; 2. No
28.2	If yes, what is your level of satisfaction to get solution of your dispute?	1. Highly satisfied; 2. moderately satisfied; 3. moderately dissatisfied; 4. Not satisfied at all.
29	Did you participate any training or courtyard session regarding social cohesion and conflict resolution?	1. Yes; 2 No

29.1	If yes, which are the sessions, you attended?	1. Conflict and Conflict management; 2. Communication; 3. Leadership; 4. Covid-19 awareness; 5. Social capital; 7. Others.....
29.2	If yes, do you feel confident that you can apply knowledge and address disputes and conflicts at household and/ or community level?	1. Confident; 2. Not confident; 3. Can't say
29.3	If yes, how many conflicting cases you addressed/ mediated successfully after getting training or participating in any mediator group/forum?	1. One; 2. Two; 3. Three, 4 More than three.
E. Gender Equality		
30	Did you participate in any kind of activities/ courtyard sessions particularly on Gender awareness and women empowerment?	1. Yes 2. No; 3. Can't remember
31	Did you ever participate in national and international day observations particularly the international women's day?	1. Yes, 2. No; 3. Can't remember
31.1	If yes, who organized the events?	1. GoB; 2. NGOs; 3. Private Companies
32	Do you have control over household and particularly on agricultural production related income?	1. To large extent; 2 to some extent; 3. Not at all
33	Do you have increased participation in decision making regarding production and sales in household or in farmers group?	1. To large extent; 2 to some extent; 3. Not at all
34	Do you share knowledge and practices with my husband and other family members and take decisions jointly about improved practices?	1. To large extent; 2 to some extent; 3. Not at all
35	Do you have mobility to access local input and sales market?	1. To large extent; 2 to some extent; 3. Not at all
36	Are you able to impart knowledge on improved agricultural practice/ agroforestry techniques?	1. To large extent; 2 to some extent; 3. Not at all

37	Do you hold a leadership position in a community group and can influence decision making?	1. To large extent; 2 to some extent; 3. Not at all
38	Are you living free of violence or threat of violence in your family?	1. No Problem, living free of violence 2. Living with threats of violence in the community 3. Feeling risk of safety and security in mobility

ANNEX-3: List of Personnel for IDI and KII at Central and Field Level

Sl. No.	Name	Designation	Organization
Information, feedback and guidance provided by the following key persons of the project:			
1.	Ms. Christina Nilsson	Specialist, Women & Youth Resilience	SID-CHT, UNDP
2.	Mr. Shareful Hassan	Team Leader	PMR SID-CHT Office
List of IDI/KII Personnel at Bandarban and Cox Bazar			
Bandarban District			
3.	Khushi Ray Tripura	District manager	SID-CHT, UNDP
4.	Sk Md Nazim Uddin	District Farmers Field School Officer	SID-CHT, UNDP
5.	Md. Tarique Akbar	District Livelihoods & Community Mobilizer	SID-CHT, UNDP
6.	Abul Kalam Azad	Project Coordinator	SHARIP, BHDC
7.	Doly Chowdhury	Senior Master Trainer	SHARIP, BHDC
8.	Ashraful Azim	M&E Officer	SHARIP, BHDC
9.	Lal Pekkin	Project Coordinator	GRAUS, SHARIP
10.	Pakha War Bann	M&E Officer	GRAUS, SHARIP
11.	Raton Chandra Bormon	Upazila Agriculture Expert Officer,	Agriculture Extension, Lama
12.	Shapon Kumar Das	Input seller	Locknath Krishi vander, Lama
13.	Mohammad Ismail Hossen	Sub-Assistant Livestock's Officer	Upazila Livestock Lama, CHT
14.	Saddam Hossain	UFFSC	Lama , SHARIP, BHDC
15.	Ukhaingmay marma	UFFSC	Alikadam , SHARIP, BHDC
Cox Bazar District			
16.	Mehadi Hassan	District Farmers Field School Officer	Cox's Bazar, UNDP
17.	Bikram Kishore Khisna	Upazila facilitator	SHARIP , Cox's Bazar,
18.	Nirmal Chandra Bepary	Senior Master Trainer	PAB , Cox Bazar , SHARIP
19.	Manjur Ahmed	Technical Officer	PAB, Cox Bazar , SHARIP
20.	Md. Mostaufred Ali Khan	M&E Officer	PAB, Cox Bazar , SHARIP
21.	Md. Kafayet Ullah	Project Coordinator	ACLB, SHARIP, Cox's Bazar ,
22.	Mohammed Ali	Sr. Master Trainer	PAB, Teknaf
23.	Noor mohammed	Chairman , LVMP Member	Whykong Union
24.	Harunar Rashid Shikder	General secretary , LVMP	Whykong , Teknaf
25.	Bhabashandu Roy	Upazila Agriculture Officer	Teknaf

ANNEX-4: Document Reviewed

1. IFM-FFS Manual of SHARIP
2. Strengthening Inclusive Development in Chittagong Hill Tracts (SID-CHT)-A Project of the Ministry of CHT Affairs (MoCHTA) and UNDP Guideline for Selection of Villages for IFM-FFS and Beneficiaries in Cox’s Bazar
3. Farmer Facilitator (FF) Selection Process under Support to Host Communities Affected by Rohingya Influx Project (SHCARIP) in Cox’s Bazar
4. Project Completion Report of Support to Host Communities Affected by Rohingya Influx with Strengthening Social Cohesion in Cox's Bazar District-SHARIP-1st phase
5. Extension of the support to the host communities affected by Rohingya influx project (SHARIP) July 2021- December 2022
6. Progress Report (SHARIP) July 2018 to February 2019
7. Progress Report (SHARIP) January to December 2019
8. Progress Report (SHARIP) January to June 2021
9. Annual Report 2020 - SHARIP – FINAL
10. SHARIP Contribution to Women Empowerment
11. Baseline study of Strengthening Inclusive Development in Chittagong Hill Tracts (SID-CHT) Project
12. Curricula of IFM-FFS and guideline of courtyard session
13. Women and Decision-Making in Agriculture-Assessment of the contribution of the Support to Host Communities Affected by the Rohingya Influx Project (SHARIP) to women empowerment in Cox’s Bazar, Bangladesh. (November, 2021)
14. 8th Five Year Plan (JULY 2020-JUNE 2025)-Promoting Prosperity and Fostering Inclusiveness
15. Making Vision 2041 a Reality-PERSPECTIVE PLAN OF BANGLADESH 2021-2041
16. UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FRAMEWORK GUIDANCE

ANNEX 5: Tables of Household Questionnaire (Treatment and Control)

Table f) Category of Respondent				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Female headed household	18.2	15.5	23.7	26.4
2. Male headed household	81.8	84.5	76.3	73.6
Grand Total	100	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table h) Sex				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Male	7.2	9.3	29.8	33.2
2 Female	92.8	90.7	70.2	66.8
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table i) Age				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
16-25	12.0	27.3	9.7	16.7
26-35	43.8	36.3	35.6	28.4
36-45	27.8	21.4	29.0	25.7
46-55	12.6	11.9	15.3	18.0
56-65	3.2	1.8	7.3	7.7
66-75	0.6	1.0	2.3	2.5
76-85	0.0	0.3	0.7	0.7
86-95	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table j) Ethnicity				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
01. Chakma	3.6	0.3	0.0	0.2
02. Marma	0.0	0.0	21.9	34.7
03. Tripura	0.0	0.0	3.9	7.2
05. Chak	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.2
09. Mro	0.0	0.0	11.3	1.0
11. Tanchangya	0.0		2.6	
12. Rakhaine	2.0	0.8	0.1	0.2
13. Bengali	94.4	99.0	59.0	56.4
14. Others (Specify)	0.0		0.1	
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401
Table k) Disability				
Responses	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	0.4	2.1	0.7	1.0
2. No	99.6	97.9	99.3	99.0
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401
Table 1. What is your main occupation?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Farmer	23.6	12.4	73.8	70.1
2. House wife	74.0	83.0	22.0	21.7
3. Small Business	1.2	0.5	0.6	2.0
4. GoB Service	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.2
5. Private Service	0.0	0.3	0.6	1.0
6. Small entrepreneur		0.0		0.2
7. Self-employed		0.0		0.5
8. Day labor	1.0	3.9	2.4	4.0
9. Others specify	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.2
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 2. What agricultural products do you produce? (Multiple Responses)				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
01. Crops	65.6	42.8	85.5	87.0
02. Vegetables	96.6	77.3	93.7	91.3
03. Fruits	36.6	22.7	68.7	65.3
04. Livestock	70.8	51.8	79.7	78.8
05. Poultry	35.8	32.7	52.0	43.6
06. Fisheries	1.6	1.0	9.7	11.5
07. Agroforestry	18.2	12.6	53.2	46.6
08. Nursery	8.6	1.8	1.8	1.7
09. Beekeeping	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
10. Floriculture	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2
11. Others (Specify)	2.8	0.8	1.4	6.7
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401
Table 3.1 Agricultural land (decimal)				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
<1 or (blank)	3.6	18.0	4.0	4.2
1-100	89.2	78.9	66.2	63.1
101-200	6.8	3.1	21.4	19.5
201-300	0.0	0.0	3.6	4.7
301-400	0.2	0.0	2.4	4.2
401-500	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.5
501-600	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.5
601-700		0.0		0.2
701-800	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.5
801-900	0.0		0.1	
901-1000	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.2
1101-1200	0.0		0.1	
1401-1500	0.0		0.1	
2401-2500		0		0.00
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 3.1 Agricultural land (decimal)				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Average of Agricultural land (decimal)	43	23	102	118
Max of Agricultural land (decimal)	960	200	1500	2460
Min of Agricultural land (decimal)	0	0	0	0
Sum of Agricultural land (decimal)	21420	9084	144090	47131
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401
Table 3.2 Homestead Land (decimal)				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1-5	20.0	12.1	19.6	2.2
6-10	37.2	35.6	36.1	29.7
11-15	11.4	24.5	4.6	40.6
16-20	17.8	7.0	24.5	3.0
21-25	2.0	14.2	0.3	14.0
26-30	6.6	0.3	3.7	0.2
31-35	0.8	3.6	0.1	3.0
36-40	1.4	0.3	7.6	0.0
46-50	0.0	1.5	0.6	5.0
>51	2.8	1.0	2.9	2.2
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 3.2 Homestead Land (decimal)				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Average of Homestead Land (decimal)	17	14	17	14
Max of Homestead Land (decimal)	480	800	180	220
Min of Homestead Land (decimal)	2	0	1	2
Sum of Homestead Land (decimal)	8264	5625	24186	5698
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401
Table 3. 3 Pond area (decimal)				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
<1 or (blank)	95.2	92.8	89.3	86.0
1-5	2.6	6.2	1.8	3.5
6-10	1.6	0.5	3.1	4.5
11-15	0.6	0.3	0.8	0.2
16-20	0.0	0.0	2.9	3.2
21-25	0.0		0.1	
26-30	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.5
		0.3		0
36-40	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.2
76-80	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.5
96-100	0.0		0.1	
116-120	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 3. 3 Pond area (decimal)				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Average of Pond area (decimal)	0	0	2	3
Max of Pond area (decimal)	15	35	120	120
Min of Pond area (decimal)	0	0	0	0
Sum of Pond area (decimal)	159	135	2883	1056
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 4. What is your annual household income?				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1-50000	3.2	9.5	12.2	11.7
50001-100000	32.8	42.3	38.5	33.9
100001-150000	54.4	37.6	24.8	29.7
150001-200000	6.8	8.8	12.1	11.7
200001-250000	0.6	0.8	5.4	4.5
250001-300000	1.4	0.5	3.5	4.0
300001-350000	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.7
350001-400000	0.6	0.0	1.2	1.2
400001-450000	0.0		0.1	
450001-500000	0.2	0.0	1.1	1.0
>500001	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.5
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 4. What is your annual household income?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Average of 4. What is your annual household income (BDT)?	120,198	113,154	131,168	145,343
Max of 4. What is your annual household income (BDT)?	500,000	1,800,000	600,000	2,000,000
Min of 4. What is your annual household income (BDT)?	7,200	10,800	6,000	4,500
Sum of 4. What is your annual household income (BDT)?	60,099,200	43,903,800	184,422,000	58,282,500
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401
Table 5. What is your highest educational attainment level?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. No formal education	62.2	59.3	49.0	45.6
2. Grade I - V	30.2	27.1	37.2	32.7
3. Grade VI - X	6.0	9.3	9.8	14.2
4. SSC	1.4	3.4	2.9	4.7
5. HSC	0.2	0.8	0.8	1.7
6. Graduation and above	0.0	0.3	0.3	1.0
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 6. Number of Family members of HH?				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Average of 1. Male	2.8	2.3	2.5	2.5
Average of 2. Female	2.8	2.5	2.6	2.5
Average of HH Member	5.6	4.8	5.1	5.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 8.2 If yes, what kind of training did you get?				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Integrated farm management	75.4	61.9	85.1	69.6
2. Vegetable cultivation	97.6	100.0	97.0	84.8
3. Fruits cultivation	19.1	42.9	55.7	71.7
4. Paddy Cultivation	16.6	38.1	59.7	73.9
5. Agroforestry	12.6	14.3	47.5	54.3
6. Poultry Farming	22.1	47.6	66.1	82.6
7. Goat rearing	19.3	28.6	47.9	63.0
8. Cow rearing	16.6	33.3	53.5	67.4
9. Pig rearing	0.6	0.0	18.2	6.5
10. Fish culture (pond and creek)	4.5	19.0	9.9	8.7
11. Honey beekeeping	0.9	0.0	0.2	0.0
12. Nutrition	11.3	33.3	34.6	30.4
13. Marketing of Agro-products	1.1	9.5	13.7	10.9
14. High-value crops (Papaya, banana, mu	13.6	0.0	29.6	19.6
15. Awareness on Disease and Vaccination	9.1	4.8	42.7	43.5
16. Others specify	0.0	0.0	0.1	2.2
Total HHs (Number)	499	21	1401	46

Table 9. Could you undertake additional farming components after getting training?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	97.4	6.4	92.4	13.5
2 No	2.6	93.6	7.6	86.5
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 9.1 If yes, what additional farming components could you apply after getting training?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
01. Earthworm fertilizer	31.8		13.9	
02. Organic fertilizer	53.4		46.0	
03. Vegetable	92.2	100.0	90.5	90.7
04. Fruit	29.0	16.0	59.8	77.8
05. Poultry rearing	77.8	68.0	78.1	87.0
06. Goat rearing	29.4	32.0	39.3	57.4
07. Cow rearing	30.0	28.0	54.1	72.2
08. Pig rearing	3.1	0.0	21.2	11.1
09. Fish culture	0.4	16.0	6.9	13.0
10. Beekeeping	0.6	0.0	0.2	0.0
11. Papaya	17.0	12.0	21.3	18.5
12. Banana	18.3	8.0	44.3	40.7
13. Mushrooms	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0
14. Betel Leafs	6.0	4.0	3.8	5.6
15. Malta/orange	1.8	0.0	2.5	0.0
16. Others Crops	1.2	0.0	0.6	1.9
Total HHs (Number)	487	25	1299	54

Table 10. Could you apply improved farming techniques/technologies that you learned from training?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	97	6.96	93	15.71
2. No	3	93.04	7	84.29
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 10. Could you apply improved farming techniques/technologies that you learned from training?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	484	27	1304	63
2. No	16	361	102	338
Grand Total	500	388	1406	401
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 10.1 If yes, what type of improvements have you experienced after using new technologies?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Increased production	73.6	85.2	98.2	98.4
2. Reduced production time	47.3	29.6	89.3	93.7
3. Less labor	69.6	74.1	80.6	85.7
4. Reduced cost	67.1	66.7	70.6	57.1
5. Increased quality	37.0	33.3	41.3	46.0
6. No improvement at all.	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0
Total HHs (Number)	484	27	1304	63

Table 10.2 If no, why couldn't you apply additional components and/ or improved farming techniques?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. I could not understand anything in th	0.0		4.9	
2. I didn't get on-job support while try	12.5		18.6	
3. I have no means/ additional resource/	81.3		92.2	
4. I didn't get any input (seed, fertili	12.5		12.7	
5. I have no helping hand in my family t	0.0		11.8	
Total HHs (Number)	16		102	
Table Q11 Mention how much did you produce before joining FFS / 2018 and 2021				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
Sum of Crop (Kg)_ Before joining FFS / 2018	98077	71915	651407	241120
Sum of Crop (Kg)_ 2021	142804	83093	828187	302666
Sum of Vegetable (Kg)_ Before joining FFS / 2018	56145	61316	124165	25796
Sum of Vegetable (Kg)_ 2021	105151	74537	196274	40000
Sum of Fruit (Kg)_ Before joining FFS / 2018	15604	11163	269074	78191
Sum of Fruit (Kg)_ 2021	24350	13949	372297	109567
Sum of Hen/duck eggs (No)_ Before joining FFS / 2018	14831	16565	28205	9396
Sum of Hen/duck eggs (No)_ 2021	20740	21087	46779	11832
Sum of Chicken/ duck Meat (No)_ Before joining FFS / 2018	4918	37574	13775	4289
Sum of Chicken/ duck Meat (No)_ 2021	8379	45610	22971	5422

Sum of Goat (No)_Before joining FFS / 2018	269	112	1915	699
Sum of Goat (No)_ 2021	407	203	2135	574
Sum of Cow (No)_Before joining FFS / 2018	299	143	2212	696
Sum of Cow (No)_ 2021	436	230	2623	718
Sum of Pig (No)_Before joining FFS / 2018	5	0	871	113
Sum of Pig (No)_ 2021	24	0	1334	102
Sum of Milk (Liter)_Before joining FFS / 2018	2694	440	8625	4363
Sum of Milk (Liter)_ 2021	3405	250	13680	4310
Sum of Papaya (High value crops) (Kg)_Before joining FFS / 2018	1153	200	225719	15162
Sum of Papaya (High value crops) (Kg)_ 2021	1809	295	274308	17987
Sum of Banana (kadi)_Before joining FFS / 2018	4527	1659	81463	27893
Sum of Banana (kadi)_ 2021	6840	2136	139687	31488
Sum of Mushrooms (High value crops) (kg)_Before joining FFS / 2018	0	0	16	16
Sum of Mushrooms (High value crops) (kg)_ 2021	0	17	0	24
Sum of Betel Leaf (High value crops) (....)_Before joining FFS / 2018	24443	1236	213234	1301
Sum of Betel Leaf (High value crops) (....)_ 2021	40547	1493	54705	26833
Sum of Malta/orange (kg)_Before joining FFS / 2018	5	8	2698	6450

Sum of Malta/orange (kg)_2021	10	508	4443	2490
Sum of Fish (Kg)_Before joining FFS / 2018	162	717	22565	6356
Sum of Fish (Kg)_2021	365	1790	37550	9988
Sum of Honey (Kg)_Before joining FFS / 2018	11	0	14	0
Sum of Honey (Kg)_2021	16	8	24	0

Average of Crop (Kg)_Before joining FFS / 2018	196.2	185.3	463.3	601.3
Average of Crop (Kg)_2021	285.6	214.2	589.0	754.8
Average of Vegetable (Kg)_Before joining FFS / 2018	112.3	158.0	88.3	64.3
Average of Vegetable (Kg)_2021	210.3	192.1	139.6	99.8
Average of Fruit (Kg)_Before joining FFS / 2018	31.2	28.8	191.4	195.0
Average of Fruit (Kg)_2021	48.7	36.0	264.8	273.2
Average of Hen/duck eggs (No)_Before joining FFS / 2018	29.7	42.7	20.1	23.4
Average of Hen/duck eggs (No)_2021	41.5	54.3	33.3	29.5
Average of Chicken/duck Meat (No)_Before joining FFS / 2018	9.8	96.8	9.8	10.7
Average of Chicken/duck Meat (No)_2021	16.8	117.6	16.3	13.5
Average of Goat (No)_Before joining FFS / 2018	0.5	0.3	1.4	1.7
Average of Goat (No)_2021	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.4

Average of Cow (No)_ Before joining FFS / 2018	0.6	0.4	1.6	1.7
Average of Cow (No)_ 2021	0.9	0.6	1.9	1.8
Average of Pig (No)_ Before joining FFS / 2018	0.0	-	0.6	0.3
Average of Pig (No)_ 2021	0.0	-	0.9	0.3
Average of Milk (Liter)_ Before joining FFS / 2018	5.4	1.1	6.1	10.9
Average of Milk (Liter)_ 2021	6.8	0.6	9.7	10.7
Average of Papaya (High value crops) (Kg)_ Before joining FFS / 2018	2.3	0.5	160.5	37.8
Average of Papaya (High value crops) (Kg)_ 2021	3.6	0.8	195.1	44.9
Average of Banana (kadi)_ Before joining FFS / 2018	9.1	4.3	57.9	69.6
Average of Banana (kadi)_ 2021	13.7	5.5	99.4	78.5
Average of Mushrooms (High value crops) (kg)_ Before joining FFS / 2018	-	-	0.0	0.0
Average of Mushrooms (High value crops) (kg)_ 2021	-	0.0	-	0.1
Average of Betel Leaf (High value crops) (....)_ Before joining FFS / 2018	48.9	3.2	151.7	3.2
Average of Betel Leaf (High value crops) (....)_ 2021	81.1	3.8	38.9	66.9
Average of Malta/orange (kg)_ Before joining FFS / 2018	0.0	0.0	1.9	16.1
Average of Malta/orange (kg)_ 2021	0.0	1.3	3.2	6.2

Average of Fish (Kg)_Before joining FFS / 2018	0.3	1.8	16.0	15.9
Average of Fish (Kg)_ 2021	0.7	4.6	26.7	24.9
Average of Honey (Kg)_Before joining FFS / 2018	0.0	-	0.0	-
Average of Honey (Kg)_ 2021	0.0	0.0	0.0	-
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table Crop (Kg)_Status				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Increased	61.4	3.1	72.2	11.2
Decreased	0.4	27.6	3.2	64.6
New	3.8	4.1	1.2	1.2
Not Cultivated	32.8	57.2	12.9	11.7
Stoped	0.6	1.8	1.9	2.7
Unchanged	1.0	6.2	8.5	8.5
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table Vegetable (Kg)_Status				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Decreased	0.4	6.2	2.5	7.2
Increased	89.8	49.5	83.4	72.8
New	5.0	4.9	2.1	1.5
Not Cultivated	4.0	28.4	4.9	8.7
Stoped	0.2	1.3	1.0	2.0
Unchanged	0.6	9.8	6.1	7.7
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table Fruit (Kg)_Status				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Decreased	0.4	1.0	2.3	10.7
Increased	41.4	24.7	61.2	48.4
New	1.4	1.8	2.8	3.7
Not Cultivated	56.2	68.0	25.8	31.2
Stopped	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.0
Unchanged	0.2	3.9	7.7	6.0
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table Hen/duck eggs (No)_Status				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Decreased	4.6	5.4	8.0	12.5
Increased	73.4	47.4	61.6	43.9
New	7.2	5.2	11.9	15.7
Not Cultivated	11.4	30.7	14.2	21.2
Stopped	3.0	4.6	1.3	3.7
Unchanged	0.4	6.7	3.0	3.0
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401
Table Chicken/ duck Meat (No)_Status				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Decreased	5.2	7.5	11.7	19.0
Increased	77.8	48.7	64.3	46.1
New	7.0	14.2	8.4	16.0
Not Cultivated	7.6	20.1	7.3	11.0
Stopped	1.8	4.6	0.8	2.5
Unchanged	0.6	4.9	7.6	5.5
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401
Table Goat (No)_Status				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Decreased	1.8	1.5	5.6	10.2
Increased	10.2	4.9	19.3	14.0
New	10.4	9.5	11.0	11.5
Not Cultivated	67.8	79.6	51.7	49.6
Stopped	2.8	0.8	5.3	10.0
Unchanged	7.0	3.6	7.0	4.7
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table Cow (No)_Status				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Decreased	2.8	1.3	8.1	13.5
Increased	10.8	4.4	25.0	19.0
New	10.6	15.5	13.4	15.5
Not Cultivated	61.6	68.8	32.1	35.9
Stopped	1.6	3.1	5.3	5.5
Unchanged	12.6	7.0	16.2	10.7
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table Pig (No)_Status				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Decreased	0.0	0.0	1.4	2.7
Increased	0.0	0.0	11.6	1.2
New	2.6	0.0	4.8	5.7
Not Cultivated	97.0	100.0	74.6	81.3
Stopped	0.0	0.0	0.7	2.0
Unchanged	0.4	0.0	6.8	7.0
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table Milk (Liter)_Status				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Decreased	0.0	0.0	1.1	3.5
Increased	2.8	0.3	13.2	8.5
New	0.6	0.3	3.8	4.7
Not Cultivated	95.6	99.0	77.3	77.1
Stopped	0.4	0.5	3.7	5.0
Unchanged	0.6	0.0	0.9	1.2
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table Papaya (High value crops) (Kg)_Status				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Decreased	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.0
Increased	12.4	2.8	17.4	8.7
New	4.4	1.0	3.6	4.7
Not Cultivated	82.2	95.4	72.5	79.6
Stopped	0.8	0.3	1.4	4.0
Unchanged	0.2	0.5	2.1	1.0
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401
Table Banana (kadi)_Status				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Decreased	0.8	0.8	7.7	14.5
Increased	27.8	11.9	47.8	33.7
New	4.4	2.3	5.2	5.5
Not Cultivated	64.0	83.5	36.0	43.4
Stopped	1.4	0.8	0.5	1.0
Unchanged	1.6	0.8	2.8	2.0
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401
Table Mushrooms (High value crops) (kg)_Status				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
New		0.5		0.5
Not Cultivated	100.0	99.5	99.9	99.0
Stopped	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2
Unchanged		0.0		0.2
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table Betel Leaf (High value crops) (....)_Status				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Decreased	0.2	0.0	0.9	2.7
Increased	4.8	1.3	1.7	1.7
New	2.4	1.8	0.9	2.0
Not Cultivated	91.4	94.8	93.8	86.5
Stopped	0.4	0.5	1.4	3.7
Unchanged	0.8	1.5	1.4	3.2
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401
Table Malta/orange (kg)_Status				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Decreased	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.5
Increased	0.2	0.0	1.3	0.7
New	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.2
Not Cultivated	99.8	99.2	96.8	97.3
Stopped	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.0
Unchanged	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.2
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401
Table Fish (Kg)_Status				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Decreased	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.7
Increased	1.0	4.4	6.9	8.0
New	0.4	0.3	1.6	1.2
Not Cultivated	98.6	95.1	90.4	87.8
Stopped	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.5
Unchanged	0.0	0.3	0.6	1.7
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table Honey (Kg)_Status				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
New	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.0
Not Cultivated	99.4	99.7	99.6	100.0
Stopped	0.2		0.2	
Unchanged	0.2		0.0	
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 12. Are you in contact with farmer facilitators for any help during the last three months?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	19.0		48.1	
2. No	81.0		51.9	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 12.1 If yes, how frequently did you contact?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Once Per week	28.4		14.8	
2. Twice Per week	14.7		10.5	
3. Once per 15 days	27.4		8.9	
4. Once per month	29.5		65.7	
5. Others specify	0.0		0.1	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	95		676	

Table 12. Did you receive any support from GoB line agencies (DAE, DLS, DoF, DWA, LGIs) or from district council?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes		24		106
2. No		364		295
Total HHs (Number)		388		401
Table 12.1 If yes, what kind of support did you receive from these agencies?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Provided training as a resource perso		4.2		33.0
2. Visited production activities of the		16.7		40.6
3. Gave necessary advice when contacted		12.5		12.3
4. Provided input support in cash/ kinds		45.8		50.9
5. Provided vaccination support to preve		12.5		41.5
6. Provided support under safety net pro		25.0		46.2
Total HHs (Number)		24		106
Table 13. Did any Local service providers/ volunteer provide you with any support?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	8.2		33.4	
2. No	91.8		66.6	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 13. Did any Local service providers/ volunteer provide you with any support?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	41		470	
2. No	459		936	
Grand Total	500		1406	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	
Table 13.1 If yes, which service provider contacted you or vice versa?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Community agriculture worker	58.5		66.2	
2. Community livestock worker (CLW)	48.8		60.9	
3. Community aquaculture resource person	0.0		17.4	
5. Vaccination service provider	39.0		58.7	
6. Nursery grower	0.0		1.7	
7. Vermicompost producer	2.4		23.0	
8. Other Input traders	0.0		0.2	
Total HHs (Number)	41		470	

Table 13.2 If yes, what kind of support did you get? /1. Demonstration of improved agricultural practice				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Demonstration of improved agricultura	63.4		63.8	
2. During cultivation/productio n training	73.2		70.6	
3. Vaccination support	39.0		65.5	
4. Supply of saplings	29.3		9.4	
5. Information about inputs and improved	39.0		38.3	
6. Others specify	2.4		0.0	
Total HHs (Number)	41		470	
Table 13. Was your agricultural production disrupted by COVID 19?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	154	51	433	176
2. No	341	294	926	209
3. Partially	5	43	47	16
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401
Table 13.1 If yes, did you receive any agricultural input packages as a part of COVID-19 response to resume your agriculture production disrupted by COVID-19?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	4.5	2.0	48.3	21.6
2. No	95.5	98.0	51.7	78.4
Grand Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total HHs (Number)	154	51	433	176

Table 13.1 If yes, did you receive any agricultural input packages as a part of COVID-19 response to resume your agriculture production disrupted by COVID-19?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	7	1	209	38
2. No	147	50	224	138
Total HHs (Number)	154	51	433	176

Table 13.2 If yes, from which organization did you receive input packages?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. DAE	0.0	0.0	8.1	28.9
2. DLS	14.3	0.0	6.2	5.3
3. DOF	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0
4. DWA	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0
5. UP	28.6	0.0	52.6	97.4
06. Hill District Council	0.0		85.6	
07. CST	14.3		1.9	
08. GRAUS	0.0		45.9	
09. PAB	0.0		2.4	
10. ACLAB	0.0		3.8	
6. Other NGO	71.4	100.0	9.1	7.9
8. Private Companies	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0
Total HHs (Number)		1		38

Table 13.3 If yes, what type of input packages did you receive?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Seeds	71.4	100.0	95.1	10.5
2. Farming tools	42.9	100.0	74.8	2.6
3. COVID PPEs	28.6	0.0	26.8	18.4
4. Cash	14.3	100.0	94.3	36.8
5. Food		0.0		84.2
Total HHs (Number)	7	1	123	38

Table 13.4 Are you satisfied with the quality of agricultural input packages?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Satisfactory		23.2%		11.7%
2. Moderate		57.5%		64.6%
3. Unsatisfactory		19.3%		23.7%
Grand Total		100.0%		100.0%
Total HHs (Number)		388		401
Table 13.4 Are you satisfied with the quality of agricultural input packages?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Satisfactory		90		47
2. Moderate		223		259
3. Unsatisfactory		75		95
Total HHs (Number)		388		401
Table 14. Did you receive any support from GoB line agencies (DAE, DLS, DoF, DWA, UP) or from district council?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	20.8		37.8	
2. No	79.2		62.2	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	
Table 14. Did you receive any support from GoB line agencies (DAE, DLS, DoF, DWA, UP) or from district council?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	104		532	
2. No	396		874	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 14.1 If yes, what kind of support did you receive from these agencies?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Provided training as a resource perso	62.5		58.1	
2. Visited production activities of the	5.8		52.4	
2. Visited production activities of the	5.8		52.4	
3. Gave necessary advice when contacted	29.8		17.9	
4. Provided input support in cash/ kinds	26.9		47.0	
5. Provided vaccination support to preve	16.3		31.6	
6. Provided support under safety net pro	2.9		32.7	
Total HHs (Number)	104		532	
Table 14. Did you receive any information on the potential negative impact of COVID-19?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes		79.6		99.0
2. No		20.4		1.0
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401
Table 14. Did you receive any information on the potential negative impact of COVID-19?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes		309		397
2. No		79		4
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 14.1 If yes, from whom did you receive this information?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
01. DAE		2.9		5.0
02. DLS		23.9		0.5
03. DOF		0.6		0.0
04. DWA		0.3		0.3
05. UP		47.6		46.3
06. Other NGO		6.5		1.0
07. Volunteer		37.9		44.8
08. Radio		33.3		33.5
09. Television		55.7		51.6
10. Mobile SMS		55.7		88.4
Total HHs (Number)		309		397

Table 14.1.6 NGOs Name				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
BRAC		3.1		0.0
Caritas SAPLING		0.0		0.2
DSK		0.3		0.0
Ifm		0.0		0.2
Ifm-ffs		0.0		0.2
Name Bolte pari na		0.3		0.0
Name jane na		0.3		0.0
Susilon		0.3		0.0
(blank)		94.8		99.0
World vision		1.0		0.0
কারিতাস		0.0		0.2
Grand Total		100.0		100.0

Table 15. Was your agricultural production disrupted by COVID 19?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	30.8		30.8	
2. No	68.2		65.9	
3. Partially	1.0		3.3	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 15. Was your agricultural production disrupted by COVID 19?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	154		433	
2. No	341		926	
3. Partially	5		47	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	
Table 15.1 If yes, did you receive any agricultural input packages as a part of COVID-19 response to resume your agriculture production disrupted by COVID-19?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	4.5		48.3	
2. No	95.5		51.7	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	154		433	
Table 15.1 If yes, did you receive any agricultural input packages as a part of COVID-19 response to resume your agriculture production disrupted by COVID-19?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	7		209	
2. No	147		224	
Total HHs (Number)	154		433	

Table 15.2 If yes, from which organization did you receive input packages?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
01. DAE	0.0		8.1	
02. DLS	14.3		6.2	
03. DOF	0.0		1.4	
04. DWA	0.0		3.8	
05. UP	28.6		52.6	
06. Hill District Council	0.0		85.6	
07. CST	14.3		1.9	
08. GRAUS	0.0		45.9	
09. PAB	0.0		2.4	
10. ACLAB	0.0		3.8	
11. Other NGO	71.4		9.1	
12. Private Companies	0.0		0.5	
Total HHs (Number)	7		209	
Table 15.2.7 NGOs Name				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
BRAC	60.0		0.0	
DSK	40.0		0.0	
কারিতাস	0.0		100.0	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Table 15.2.9 Private Companies Name				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
(blank)	100.0		99.9	
কারিতাস	0.0		0.1	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	

Table 15.3. If option (PAB/GRAUS/ACLAB/UNDP) is answered in 15.2, then what type of input packages did you receive?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Seeds	71.4		95.1	
2. Farming tools	42.9		74.8	
3. COVID PPEs	28.6		26.8	
4. Cash	14.3		94.3	
Total HHs (Number)	7		123	
15.4 Are you satisfied with the quality of agricultural input packages?				
Response		Grand Total		
1. Satisfactory		69.2%		
2. Moderate		30.8%		
Grand Total		100.0%		
Total HHs		13		
Table 15. Do you have access to high-quality farming inputs?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes		31.4%		59.4%
2. No		68.6%		40.6%
Grand Total		100.0%		100.0%
Total HHs (Number)		388		401
Table 15. Do you have access to high-quality farming inputs?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes		122		238
2. No		266		163
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 15.1 If yes, how do you get access to high quality farming inputs? /1. Have access to inputs in nearby collection points				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Have access to inputs in nearby colle		90.2		55.9
2. Have access to local markets for purc		41.8		91.2
3. Have contact with small entrepreneurs		9.0		13.4
Total HHs (Number)		122		238
Table 16. Did you receive any information on the potential negative impact of COVID-19?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	474		1384	
2. No	26		22	
Grand Total	500		1406	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	
Table 16. Did you receive any information on the potential negative impact of COVID-19?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	94.8		98.4	
2. No	5.2		1.6	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 16.1 If yes, from whom did you receive this information? /01. DAE				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
01. DAE	3.6		2.3	
02. DLS	7.2		1.0	
03. DOF	0.0		0.2	
04. DWA	0.0		0.7	
05. UP	40.3		40.7	
06. IFM-FFS	77.2		81.2	
07. Other NGO	3.8		5.1	
08. Volunteer	47.0		42.3	
09. Radio	18.6		23.3	
10. Television	27.6		55.3	
11. Mobile SMS	41.6		81.4	
Total HHs (Number)	474		1384	
Table 16.1.7 NGOs Name				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
BRAC	33.3		1.4	
Caritad sapling project	0.0		1.4	
Caritas SAPLING	0.0		18.3	
Caritas Sapling project	0.0		35.2	
DSK	5.6		0.0	
GRAUS	0.0		4.2	
Grause	0.0		1.4	
GUK	16.7		0.0	
SAPLING	0.0		9.9	
SAPLING Caritas	0.0		1.4	
Susilon	16.7		0.0	
Tangetar	0.0		2.8	
World vision	27.8		0.0	
কারিতাস	0.0		1.4	
কারিতাস	0.0		22.5	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	

Table 16.1.7 NGOs Name				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
BRAC	6		1	
Caritad sapling project			1	
Caritas SAPLING			13	
Caritas Sapling project			25	
DSK	1			
GRAUS			3	
Grause			1	
GUK	3			
SAPLING			7	
SAPLING Caritas			1	
Susilon	3			
Tangetar			2	
World vision	5			
কারিতাস			1	
কারিতাস			16	
Grand Total	18		71	
Table 16. Do you have link with buyer/traders to sell your agricultural products?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes		37.1		73.3
2. No		62.9		26.7
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401
Table 16. Do you have link with buyer/traders to sell your agricultural products?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes		144		294
2. No		244		107
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 16.1 If yes, where do you sell your agricultural products?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Local Markets		100.0		100.0
2. Collection points		9.7		32.7
3. Others specify		0.7		0.0
Total HHs (Number)		144		294
Table 17. Do you have access to high-quality farming inputs?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	68.8		56.7	
2. No	31.2		43.3	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	
Table				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	344		797	
2. No	156		609	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	
Table 17.1 If yes, how do you get access to high quality farming inputs?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Have access to inputs in nearby colle	89.2		70.8	
2. Have access to local markets for purc	55.2		94.0	
3. Have contact with small entrepreneurs	4.1		16.3	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 17. Areas of lands (decimal) under firewood, bamboo and vegetation?vegetation?				
Distribution:	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
Sum of Nursery (No. of seedling)_2018		21692		10001547
Sum of Nursery (No. of seedling)_2021		32801		5008896
Sum of Vegetation (No)_2018		6980		5209425
Sum of Vegetation (No)_2021		8172		2263105
Sum of Bamboo bushes (No. of bush)_2018		338		3402
Sum of Bamboo bushes (No. of bush)_2021		272		4925
Sum of Beekeeping (No. of box)_2018		13		4
Sum of Beekeeping (No. of box)_2021		8		1
Total HHs (Number)		388		401
Table 17. Areas of lands (decimal) under firewood, bamboo and vegetation?vegetation?				
Distribution:	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
Average of Nursery (No. of seedling)_2018		55.9		24941.5
Average of Nursery (No. of seedling)_2021		84.5		12491.0
Average of Vegetation (No)_2018		18.0		12991.1
Average of Vegetation (No)_2021		21.1		5643.7
Average of Bamboo bushes (No. of bush)_2018		0.9		8.5
Average of Bamboo bushes (No. of bush)_2021		0.8		12.3
Average of Beekeeping (No. of box)_2018		0.0		0.0
Average of Beekeeping (No. of box)_2021		0.0		0.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 17. Areas of lands (decimal) under firewood, bamboo and vegetation?vegetation?				
Nursery (No. of seedling)_Status	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Both None		94.6		96.8
Decreased		0.3		0.5
Increased		3.1		0.7
New		1.3		1.7
Stoped		0.5		0.0
Unchanged		0.3		0.2
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401
Table 17. Areas of lands (decimal) under firewood, bamboo and vegetation?vegetation?				
Vegetation (No)_Status	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Both None		11.3		27.4
Decreased		11.1		18.2
Increased		48.5		41.4
New		3.4		1.7
Stoped		1.5		0.2
Unchanged		24.2		11.0
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401
Table 17. Areas of lands (decimal) under firewood, bamboo and vegetation?vegetation?				
Bamboo bushes (No. of bush)_Status	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Both None		74.2		59.6
Decreased		1.0		6.0
Increased		7.2		17.2
New		2.1		4.2
Stoped		2.6		1.7
Unchanged		12.9		11.2
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 17. Areas of lands (decimal) under firewood, bamboo and vegetation?vegetation?				
Beekeeping (No. of box)_Status	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Both None		99.5		99.5
New		0.0		0.2
Stopped		0.3		0.2
Unchanged		0.3		0.0
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 18. Do you have link with buyer/traders to sell your agricultural products?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	77.4		80.2	
2. No	22.6		19.8	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 18. Do you have link with buyer/traders to sell your agricultural products?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	387		1128	
2. No	113		278	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 18.1 If yes, where do you sell your agricultural products?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Local Markets	97.4		99.4	
2. Collection points	16.3		53.9	
3. Others specify	0.8		0.0	
Total HHs (Number)	387		1128	

Table 18. Did you have your own Agroforestry Development Plan?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes		49.7		83.8
2. No		48.7		16.2
3. Don't know/ Can't say		1.5		0.0
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 18. Did you have your own Agroforestry Development Plan?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes		193		336
2. No		189		65
3. Don't know/ Can't say		6		
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 18.1 If yes, are you implementing Agroforestry Development Plan and adopting improved agroforestry system?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes		15.0		44.6
2. No		85.0		55.1
3. Don't know/ Can't say		0.0		0.3
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		193		336

Table 18.1 If yes, are you implementing Agroforestry Development Plan and adopting improved agroforestry system?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes		29		150
2. No		164		185
3. Don't know/ Can't say				1
Total HHs (Number)		193		336

Table 18.2 If yes, what type of improvements have you experienced by adopting improved agroforestry system?

Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Increased production		89.7		96.7
2. Less labor		10.3		89.3
3. Reduced cost		31.0		64.0
4. Increased knowledge & Skills		62.1		80.0
5. More profitable		37.9		47.3
6. No improvement at all		0.0		0.0
Total HHs (Number)		29		150

Table Q19 Areas of lands (decimal) under firewood, bamboo and vegetation?

Sum of Nursery (No. of seedling)	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
Sum of Nursery (No. of seedling)_Before joining FFS	5,409		85,417	
Sum of Nursery (No. of seedling)_2021	10,874		149,847	
Sum of Vegetation (No. of Vegetation)_Before joining FFS	8,664		618,325	
Sum of Vegetation (No. of Vegetation)_2021	10,659		915,617	
Sum of Bamboo bushes (No. of bush)_Before joining FFS	937		12,174	
Sum of Bamboo bushes (No. of bush)_2021	1,447		19,999	
Sum of Beekeeping (No. of box)_Before joining FFS	35		58	
Sum of Beekeeping (No. of box)_2021	-		8	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1,406	

Table Q19 Areas of lands (decimal) under firewood, bamboo and vegetation?				
Average	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
Average of Nursery (No. of seedling)_Before joining FFS	10.8		60.8	
Average of Nursery (No. of seedling)_2021	21.7		106.6	
Average of Vegetation (No. of Vegetation)_Before joining FFS	17.3		439.8	
Average of Vegetation (No. of Vegetation)_2021	21.3		651.2	
Average of Bamboo bushes (No. of bush)_Before joining FFS	1.9		8.7	
Average of Bamboo bushes (No. of bush)_2021	2.9		14.2	
Average of Beekeeping (No. of box)_Before joining FFS	0.1		0.0	
Average of Beekeeping (No. of box)_2021	0.0		0.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1,406	
Table Q19 Areas of lands (decimal) under firewood, bamboo and vegetation?				
Nursery (No. of seedling)_Status	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Both None	86.2		95.7	
Decreased	0.2		0.2	
Increased	10.2		3.0	
New	3.2		0.4	
Stoped	0.2		0.6	
Unchanged	0.0		0.2	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1,406	

Table Q19 Areas of lands (decimal) under firewood, bamboo and vegetation?				
Vegetation (No. of Vegetation)_Status	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Both None	8.6		23.2	
Decreased	14.6		7.5	
Increased	56.4		53.8	
New	2.8		2.8	
Stoped	0.8		0.2	
Unchanged	16.8		12.5	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1,406	
Table Q19 Areas of lands (decimal) under firewood, bamboo and vegetation?				
Bamboo bushes (No. of bush)_Status	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Both None	69.0		49.4	
Decreased	0.2		3.2	
Increased	19.4		28.6	
New	3.8		3.6	
Stoped	0.4		0.8	
Unchanged	7.2		14.4	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1,406	
Table Q19 Areas of lands (decimal) under firewood, bamboo and vegetation?				
Beekeeping (No. of box)_Status	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
Both None	99.6%		99.8%	
New	0.0%		0.1%	
Stopped	0.4%		0.1%	
Grand Total	100.0%		100.0%	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1,406	

Table 19. Do you have access to high-quality agroforestry inputs?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes		31.4		59.6
2. No		68.6		40.4
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 19. Do you have access to high-quality agroforestry inputs?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes		122		239
2. No		266		162
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 19.1 If yes, how do you get access to high quality agroforestry inputs?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Have access to local markets for purchasing input materials from traders		91.0		75.7
1. Have access to local markets for purchasing input materials from traders 2. Have contact with new agroforestry based small entrepreneurs providing support/ services to communities/ households		6.6		22.2
2. Have contact with new agroforestry based small entrepreneurs providing support/ services to communities/ households		2.5		1.7
2. Have contact with new agroforestry based small entrepreneurs providing support/ services to communities/ households 1. Have access to local markets for purchasing input materials from traders		0.0		0.4
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		122		239

Table 19.1 If yes, how do you get access to high quality agroforestry inputs? /1. Have access to local markets for purchasing input materials from traders				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Have access to local markets for purc		97.5%		98.3%
2. Have contact with new agroforestry ba		9.0%		24.3%
Total HHs (Number)		122		239
Table 20. Did you have your own Agroforestry Development Plan?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	84.6		92.3	
2. No	13.6		7.3	
3. Don't know/ Can't say	1.8		0.4	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1,406	
Table 20. Did you have your own Agroforestry Development Plan?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	423		1298	
2. No	68		102	
3. Don't know/ Can't say	9		6	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1,406	
Table 20.1 If yes, are you implementing Agroforestry Development Plan and adopting improved agroforestry system?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	60.3%		62.8%	
2. No	39.2%		37.1%	
3. Don't know/ Can't say	0.5%		0.2%	
Grand Total	100.0%		100.0%	
Total HHs (Number)	423		1298	

Table 20.1 If yes, are you implementing Agroforestry Development Plan and adopting improved agroforestry system?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	255		815	
2. No	166		481	
3. Don't know/ Can't say	2		2	
Total HHs (Number)	423		1298	
Table 20.2 If yes, what type of improvements have you experienced by adopting improved agroforestry system? /1. Increased production				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Increased production	64.7		95.3	
2. Less labor	34.9		76.8	
3. Reduced cost	45.9		68.5	
4. Increased knowledge & Skills	77.3		83.8	
5. More profitable	36.1		43.2	
6. No improvement at all	0.0		0.1	
Total HHs (Number)	255		815	
Table 20.3 If no, why couldn't you adopt improved agroforestry system?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. I could not attend courtyard session	10.8		1.9	
2. I didn't get support from my group or	4.2		4.4	
3. I have no means/ additional resource/	86.7		82.7	
4. I didn't get any input (seedling/sapl	12.7		48.9	
5. I have no helping hand in my family t	4.8		33.5	
Total HHs (Number)	166		481	

Table 20. Do you produce any high value crop ?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes		6.2		24.9
2. No		93.8		75.1
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 20. Do you produce any high value crop ?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes		24		100
2. No		364		301
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 20.1 If yes, what type of crop do you produce?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Papaya		79.2		42.0
2. Betel Leaf		25.0		32.0
3. Mushrooms		0.0		0.0
4. Beekeeping (apiculture)		0.0		0.0
5. flower		0.0		1.0
6. Others (Specify)		4.2		42.0
Total HHs (Number)		24		100

Table 20.1.6 Specify				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
কলা		0.0		2.4
Banana		0.0		11.9
Nursery		100.0		0.0
কলা		0.0		40.5
কলা, আম		0.0		2.4
কলা, আম		0.0		19.0
কলা, মরিচ		0.0		2.4
কলা, লিচু, আম, মরিচ		0.0		2.4
Lemon		0.0		4.8
Banana, Mango		0.0		2.4
Mango, Lemon		0.0		2.4
Lemon, Banana		0.0		2.4
Orange, banana		0.0		2.4
Orange		0.0		4.8
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Table Gross agricultural income of your own in the past 12 months (Sales)? : 2018 (BDT)				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
<1 or (blank)		31.2		0.5
1-10000		25.0		19.2
10001-20000		18.3		10.5
20001-30000		7.0		10.2
30001-40000		6.7		7.5
40001-50000		2.8		14.5
50001-60000		1.5		6.5
60001-70000		0.0		4.5
70001-80000		1.5		8.2
80001-90000		1.0		3.7
90001-100000		1.0		6.0
100001-110000		0.3		0.0
110001-120000		0.5		0.5
>120001		3.1		8.2
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 21. Do you have access to high-quality agroforestry inputs?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	68.8		53.7	
2. No	31.2		46.3	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 21. Do you have access to high-quality agroforestry inputs?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	344		755	
2. No	156		651	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 21.1 If yes, how do you get access to high quality agroforestry inputs?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Have access to local markets for purchasing input materials from traders	95.6%		67.3%	
1. Have access to local markets for purchasing input materials from traders 2. Have contact with new agroforestry based small entrepreneurs providing support/ services to communities/ households	3.2%		31.8%	
2. Have contact with new agroforestry based small entrepreneurs providing support/ services to communities/ households	0.9%		0.4%	
2. Have contact with new agroforestry based small entrepreneurs providing support/ services to communities/ households 1. Have access to local markets for purchasing input materials from traders	0.3%		0.5%	
Grand Total	100.0%		100.0%	
Total HHs	344		755	
Total HHs (Number)	344		755	

Table 21.1 If yes, how do you get access to high quality agroforestry inputs?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Have access to local markets for purchase	99.1%		99.6%	
2. Have contact with new agroforestry business	4.4%		32.7%	
Total HHs (Number)	344		755	

Table 22. Do you produce any high value crop ?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	23.0		32.6	
2. No	77.0		67.4	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 22. Do you produce any high value crop ?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	115		458	
2. No	385		948	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 22.1 If yes, what type of crop do you produce?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Papaya	82.6		69.0	
2. Betel Leaf	25.2		7.9	
3. Mushrooms	0.9		0.0	
4. Beekeeping (apiculture)	0.0		0.2	
5. flower	0.0		0.2	
6. Others (Specify)	5.2		30.1	
Total HHs (Number)	115		458	

Table 22.1.6 Specify				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
কলা	0.0		0.7	
কলা	0.0		0.7	
Banana	0.0		23.9	
Lemon	0.0		0.7	
Malta	100.0		0.0	
Mango	0.0		3.6	
Mango, banana, malta	0.0		0.7	
Mango,lemon	0.0		0.7	
Orange	0.0		0.7	
কলা	0.0		44.9	
কলা	0.0		2.9	
কলা, আম	0.0		11.6	
কলা, মরিচ	0.0		0.7	
কলা, মরিচ	0.0		0.7	
Lemon,mango	0.0		0.7	
Banna	0.0		1.4	
কলা, আম,মরিচ	0.0		0.7	
কলা,আম	0.0		0.7	
Mango, Banana	0.0		0.7	
Banana	0.0		2.2	
Banana, lemon, mango	0.0		0.7	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Table Average Gross agricultural income status				
Average Gross agricultural income status	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
Average of 23. What is your gross agricultural income in the past 12 months (Sales)? : Before joining FFS (BDT)	52,003		72,220	
Average of 24. What is your net agricultural income in the past 12 months (Sales)? : 2021 (BDT)	28,317		35,178	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 23. What is your gross agricultural income in the past 12 months (Sales)? : Before joining FFS (BDT)				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
<1 or (blank)	2.6		0.5	
1-25000	45.8		25.8	
25001-50000	29.8		26.9	
50001-75000	8.0		15.4	
75001-100000	7.0		16.4	
100001-125000	1.4		3.0	
125001-150000	2.0		4.8	
150001-175000	0.0		0.6	
175001-200000	1.4		2.8	
>200001	2.0		3.8	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 23. What do you think of the presence of refugees in the area? (Multiple answer possible)				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. A burden on our community, sharing our food and wealth and doing harm to our environment		0.5		0.0
1. A burden on our community, sharing our food and wealth and doing harm to our environment 2. We are deprived of our rights and benefits		5.2		0.0
2. We are deprived of our rights and benefits		15.7		0.0
2. We are deprived of our rights and benefits 1. A burden on our community, sharing our food and wealth and doing harm to our environment		3.6		0.0
3. We are feeling unsecured as they may grab/ occupy our land and property		2.6		0.0
3. We are feeling unsecured as they may grab/ occupy our land and property 7. Not applicable / we live distant places than the Rohingya people		0.3		0.0
7. Not applicable / we live distant places than the Rohingya people		71.6		99.3
7. Not applicable / we live distant places than the Rohingya people 6. It provides opportunities to sell our agricultural products		0.3		0.0
7. Not applicable / we live distant places than the Rohingya people 2. We are deprived of our rights and benefits		0.3		0.0
7. Not applicable / we live distant places than the Rohingya people 4. Neither good nor bad, and we don’t feel a threat from them		0.0		0.2
6. It provides opportunities to sell our agricultural products 7. Not applicable / we live distant places than the Rohingya people		0.0		0.2
1. A burden on our community, sharing our food and wealth and doing harm to our environment 7. Not applicable / we live distant places than the Rohingya people		0.0		0.2
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 23. What do you think of the presence of refugees in the area? (Multiple answer possible)/1. A burden on our community, sharing our food and wealth and doing harm to our environment				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. A burden on our community, sharing ou		9.3		0.2
2. We are deprived of our rights and ben		24.7		0.0
3. We are feeling unsecured as they may		2.8		0.0
4. Neither good nor bad, and we don’t fe		0.0		0.2
5. It’s a humanitarian problem and it is good that we can provide them with support		0.0		0.0
6. It provides opportunities to sell our		0.3		0.2
7. Not applicable / we live distant plac		72.4		100.0
8. Cannot say		0.0		0.0
9. Others specify		0.0		0.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 24. What is your net agricultural income in the past 12 months (Sales)? : 2021 (BDT)				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
<1 or (blank)	1.0		0.4	
1-25000	65.8		54.3	
25001-50000	24.2		28.8	
50001-75000	4.2		8.5	
75001-100000	2.6		4.1	
100001-125000	0.2		0.8	
125001-150000	0.8		1.1	
150001-175000	0.2		0.1	
175001-200000	0.4		1.1	
>200001	0.6		0.8	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 24. In your opinion, is the relation of your community with the Rohingya community generally peaceful or marked by any dissatisfaction?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Very peaceful		1.9		
2. Moderately peaceful		22.4		
4. Moderately dissatisfied		6.5		
5. Very dissatisfied		60.7		
6. Not applicable / Rohingya people live far from our community		1.9		
7. Don't know/ Cannot say;		6.5		
Grand Total		100.0		
Total HHs (Number)		107		

Table 25. What do you think of the presence of Rohingyas in the area? (Multiple answer possible)to our environment				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. A burden on our community, sharing our food and wealth an	24.4		0.1	
2. We are deprived of our rights and benefits	51.0		0.1	
3. We are feeling unsecured as they may grab/ occupy our lan	0.4		0.3	
4. Neither good nor bad, and we don't feel a threat from the	0.0		0.1	
5. It's a humanitarian problem and it is good that we can pr	0.4		0.0	
6. It provides opportunities to sell our agricultural produc	1.4		0.2	
7. Not applicable / we live distant places than the Rohingya	47.0		99.9	
8. Cannot say	0.2		0.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 25. Compared to last three years, has the level of dissatisfaction between the two-community people increased, decreased or stayed the same?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Increased		36.4		
2. Decreased		20.6		
3. stayed the same		36.4		
5. Don't know/ Cannot say.		6.5		
Grand Total		100.0		
Total HHs (Number)		107		
Table 25.1 If answered, then why? What are the causes of community conflict and violence resulted from Rohingya influx?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
01. Illegal occupation/ grabbing of prod		0.0		
2. Environmental degradation		2.6		
3. Unemployment		30.8		
4. Occupation of labor market and low wa		92.3		
5. Unbalanced demand and supply- price h		2.6		
06. Easy access to weapons/ illegal arms		0.0		
07. Easy access to drugs/ narcotics		0.0		
08. No rule of law		0.0		
09. Violence due to marriage or commitment of		0.0		
10. Abduction and ransom demand		0.0		
Total HHs (Number)		39		

Table 26. In your opinion, is the relation of your community with the Rohingya community generally peaceful or marked by any dissatisfaction?				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Very peaceful	2.3		0.0	
2. Moderately peaceful	44.2		0.0	
3. Neither peaceful nor dissatisfied	1.5		0.0	
4. Moderately dissatisfied	10.2		0.0	
5. Very dissatisfied	40.4		0.0	
6. Not applicable / Rohingya people live far from our community	0.0		100.0	
7. Don’t know/ Cannot say;	1.5		0.0	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	265		2	

Table 26. Do you have any conflict with Rohingya present in your area?				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes		0.5		0.0
2. No		99.5		100.0
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 26. Do you have any conflict with Rohingya present in your area?				
	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes		2		
2. No		386		401
Grand Total		388		401
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 27. Compared to the situation before joining FFS, has the level of dissatisfaction between the two-community people increased, decreased or stayed the same?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Increased	14			
2. Decreased	120			
3. stayed the same	112			
4. Not applicable / Rohingya people live in distant places	2		2	
5. Don't know/ Cannot say.	17			
Total HHs (Number)	265		2	

Table 27. Compared to the situation before joining FFS, has the level of dissatisfaction between the two-community people increased, decreased or stayed the same?				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Increased	5.3		0.0	
2. Decreased	45.3		0.0	
3. stayed the same	42.3		0.0	
4. Not applicable / Rohingya people live in distant places	0.8		100.0	
5. Don't know/ Cannot say.	6.4		0.0	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	265		2	

27.1 If answered, then why? What are the causes of community conflict and dissatisfaction resulted from Rohingya influx?	Grand Total
01. Illegal occupation/ grabbing of productive lands	0.0%
02. Environmental degradation	7.1%
03. Unemployment	64.3%
04. Occupation of labor market and low wage rate	92.9%
05. Unbalanced demand and supply- price	0.0%
06. Easy access to weapons/ illegal arms	0.0%
07. Easy access to drugs/ narcotics	14.3%
08. No rule of law	0.0%
09. Violence due to marriage or commitment	0.0%
10. Abduction and ransom demand	0.0%
Total HHs	14

Table 28. Do you have any conflict with Rohingya or your Neighbor present in your area?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	0.6		0.1	
2. No	99.4		99.9	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	
Table 28. Do you have any conflict with Rohingya or your Neighbor present in your area?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	3		2	
2. No	497		1404	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	
Table 28.1 If yes, what specific conflicts/ disputes have you experienced in last 4 years?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Occupied my crop lands	33.3		50.0	
2. Evicted me from my settlement	33.3		50.0	
3. Threatened my life	0.0		100.0	
4. Polluted/ damaged my environment	33.3		50.0	
Total HHs (Number)	3		2	
Table 28. Have you heard of LVMF or any mediator groups/forums?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes		28.8%		22.2%
2. No		71.2%		77.8%
Grand Total		100.0%		100.0%
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 28. Have you heard of LVMF or any mediator groups/forums?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes		111		89
2. No		275		312
Total HHs (Number)		388		401
Table 28.1 If yes, did you seek assistance of any mediator group for solving your dispute?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes		26.1		78.7
2. No		73.9		21.3
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		111		89
Table 28.1 If yes, did you seek assistance of any mediator group for solving your dispute?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes		29		70
2. No		82		19
Total HHs (Number)		111		89
Table 28.2 If yes, what is your level of satisfaction to get solution of your dispute?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Highly satisfied		41.4		21.4
2. moderately satisfied		51.7		74.3
3. moderately dissatisfied		6.9		2.9
4. Not satisfied at all.		0.0		1.4
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		29		70

Table 28.2 If yes, what is your level of satisfaction to get solution of your dispute?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Highly satisfied		12		15
2. moderately satisfied		15		52
3. moderately dissatisfied		2		2
4. Not satisfied at all.				1
Total HHs (Number)		29		70
Table 29. Have you got your conflicts/ disputes settled?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
2. Partially solved	0.0		50.0	
3. Not yet	100.0		50.0	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	3		2	
Table 29. Did you participate any training or courtyard session regarding social cohesion and conflict resolution?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes		6.4		21.4
2. No		93.6		78.6
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		388		401
Table 29. Did you participate any training or courtyard session regarding social cohesion and conflict resolution?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes		25		86
2. No		363		315
Total HHs (Number)		388		401

Table 29.1 If yes, which are the sessions, you attended?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Conflict and Conflict management		92.0		74.4
2. Communication		48.0		37.2
3. Leadership		4.0		24.4
4. Covid-19 awareness		16.0		55.8
5. Social capital		44.0		23.3
6. Others specify		0.0		0.0
Total HHs (Number)		25		86
Table 29.2 If yes, do you feel confident that you can apply knowledge and address disputes and conflicts at household and/ or community level?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Confident		100.0		69.8
3. Can’t say		0.0		4.7
2. Not confident		0.0		25.6
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		25		86
Table 29.3 If yes, how many conflicting cases you addressed/ mediated successfully after getting training or participating in any mediator group/forum?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. One		8.0		31.4
2. Two		12.0		22.1
3. Three		24.0		7.0
4 More than three.		56.0		39.5
Grand Total		100.0		100.0
Total HHs (Number)		25		86

Table 30. Have you heard of LVMF and their activities?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	72.0		29.9	
2. No	28.0		70.1	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 30. Have you heard of LVMF and their activities?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	360		421	
2. No	140		985	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 30.1 If yes, did you seek assistance of any LVMF member for solving your dispute?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	37.8		63.9	
2. No	62.2		36.1	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	360		421	

Table 31. Did you participate FFS courtyard session regarding social cohesion and conflict resolution?				
Response	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	36.2		44.6	
2. No	63.8		55.4	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 31. Did you participate FFS courtyard session regarding social cohesion and conflict resolution?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
1. Yes	181		627	
2. No	319		779	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	

Table 31.1 If yes, which are the sessions, you attended?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Conflict and Conflict management	75.7		79.1	
2. Communication	71.8		70.3	
3. Leadership	26.5		65.4	
4. Covid-19 awareness	51.4		83.1	
5. Social capital	33.7		41.1	
Total HHs	181		627	
Total HHs (Number)	181		627	

Table 31.2 If yes, do you feel confident that you can apply knowledge and address disputes and conflicts at household and/ or community level?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. Confident	96.7		63.5	
2. Not confident	3.3		25.2	
3. Can’t say	0.0		11.3	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	181		627	

Table 31.3 If yes, how many conflicting cases you addressed/ mediated successfully after attending the courtyard sessions?				
Response	1. Cox’s Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment (%)	Control (%)	Treatment (%)	Control (%)
1. One	21.0		42.7	
2. Two	23.8		18.0	
3. Three	34.3		7.0	
4 More than three.	21.0		32.2	
Grand Total	100.0		100.0	
Total HHs (Number)	181		627	

Table 32. FFS beneficiaries participate in courtyard sessions on Gender awareness				
Responses	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment- FFS (%)	Control (%)	Treatment- FFS(%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	22.4	3.4	68.9	39.4
2. No	76.8	96.1	30.5	59.9
3. Can’t remember	0.8	0.5	0.6	0.7
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHS (Number)	500	388	1406	401
Table 33. Beneficiaries were involved in disseminating knowledge/ learnings on agriculture/agroforestry and social cohesion to other non-FFS farmers				
Responses	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment -FFS (%)		Treatment- FFS(%)	
1. Yes	88.4		83.4	
2. No	11.6		16.6	
Grand Total	100		100	
Total HHs (Number)	500		1406	
Table 33.1 If yes, how do you do that? (Multiple Responses)				
	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment- FFS (%)		Treatment- FFS(%)	
1. Visit occasionally non-FFS farmers and give them advice	84.8		99.1	
2. non-FFS farmers sometimes visit my production field to see and know about improved practices	44.6		62.4	
3. Non-FFS farmers contact over mobile phone and I gave them advice	33.3		36.3	
4. Others specify	0.0		0.1	
Total HHs (Number)	442		1172	

Table 34. participation in national and international day observations

Responses	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment- FFS (%)	Control (%)	Treatment- FFS (%)	Control (%)
1. Yes	1.6	2.1	13.4	9.2
2. No	97.8	97.9	85.8	90.0
3. Can't remember	0.6	0.0	0.8	0.7
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

34.1 events organized By

	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment- FFS (%)	Control (%)	Treatment- FFS(%)	Control (%)
1. GoB	62.5	100	27.5	100
2. IFM-FFS	62.5	0.0	79.9	0.0
3. Other NGO	50.0	0.0	2.1	0.0
4. Private Companies	0.0	12.5	4.2	0.0
Total HHs (Number)	8	8	189	37

34.1.3 Other NGO Name

	1. Cox's Bazar	2. Bandarban
	Treatment- FFS (%)	Treatment- FFS(%)
BRAC	100	25.0
Unicef SSS group	0.0	25.0
Caritas	0.0	50.0
Grand Total	100	100

Table 35. control over household and on agricultural production related income

Responses	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment- FFS (%)	Control (%)	Treatment- FFS(%)	Control (%)
1. To large extent	55.6	39.9	41.1	39.4
2. To some extent	42.8	50.8	58.3	59.4
3. Not at all	1.6	9.3	0.6	1.2
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 36. Female household increased participation in decision making process				
Responses	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment- FFS (%)	Control (%)	Treatment- FFS(%)	Control (%)
1. To large extent	58.2	45.6	39.9	36.9
2. To some extent	39.6	44.1	58.2	61.6
3. Not at all	2.2	10.3	1.9	1.5
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 37. Female household members share knowledge and practices with others				
Responses	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment- FFS (%)	Control (%)	Treatment- FFS(%)	Control (%)
1. To large extent	83.6	69.6	61.9	63.8
2. To some extent	15.4	27.1	37.3	35.2
3. Not at all	1.0	3.4	0.7	1.0
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs (Number)	500	388	1406	401

Table 38. Female household have mobility to access local input and sales market				
Responses	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment- FFS (%)	Control (%)	Treatment- FFS(%)	Control (%)
1. To large extent	49.0	34.0	30.2	26.9
2. To some extent	33.0	24.7	56.6	63.8
3. Not at all	18.0	41.2	13.2	9.2
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs	500	388	1406	401

Table 39. Impart knowledge on improved agricultural practice/ agroforestry techniques to non-FFS farmers

Responses	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment-FFS (%)	Control (%)	Treatment-FFS(%)	Control (%)
1. To large extent	47.6	31.2	30.7	22.2
2. To some extent	35.0	36.1	65.4	73.1
3. Not at all	17.4	32.7	3.9	4.7
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs	500	388	1406	401

Table 40. leadership position in a community group

Responses	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment-FFS (%)	Control (%)	Treatment- FFS(%)	Control (%)
1. To large extent	54.8	46.9	24.5	25.9
2. To some extent	18.0	18.6	65.4	68.3
3. Not at all	27.2	34.5	10.1	5.7
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs	500	388	1406	401

Table 41. Female household living free of violence or threat of violence in your own family

Responses	1. Cox's Bazar		2. Bandarban	
	Treatment-FFS (%)	Control (%)	Treatment- FFS(%)	Control (%)
1. No Problem, living free of violence	94.8	88.7	88.9	93.5
2. Living with threats of violence in the community	2.2	11.1	10.6	6.5
3. Feeling risk of safety and security in mobility	3.0	0.3	0.5	0.0
Grand Total	100	100	100	100
Total HHs	500	388	1406	401

ANNEX 6: Relevance of the SHARIP Project

Introduction

Relevance of the objectives of a project with national and international priorities is critical for its survival and sustenance. The SHARIP project aims to increase the capacity of the host population of Cox’s Bazar and Bandarban of Chattogram Hill Tracts (SID-CHT), Ministry of Chattogram Hill Tracts Affairs through the establishment of sustainable Cohesion between Rohingya refugees and host population by creating more livelihoods opportunities and peace. More specifically, the project aimed to explore the innovative alternatives for workforce mobilization through IFM-FFS and their effective utilization of training outcomes through collaboration and capacity enhancement of the host communities of Cox’s Bazar and Bandarban. The current chapter examines how relevant the objectives of the SHARIP project with national and international priorities.

Relevance with National Priorities

Priorities of the Government of Bangladesh (GOB) are reflected in various national documents, including i) Vision 2021; ii) Perspective Plan (2010-21); and iii) the 7th & 8th Five Year Plans, Vision 2021, “Bangladesh Vision 2021”, announced in December 2008, aspires to adopt the forward-looking plan for transforming Bangladesh into a knowledge-based and technology-driven middle-income country by 2021. The vision includes eight inter-linked goals and 85 activities and standards for achieving the goals. Three of the eight goals of Vision 2021 have relevance to the objectives of the SHARIP project. Table 2.1 shows the relevance.

Table 1: Relevance of the SHARIP Project with Vision 2021

National Priority Document	Goals/Priorities having relevance with SHARIP	Relevant SHARIP outcome
Vision 2021	Goal: To become a poverty-free middle-income country	One of the outcomes of the SHARIP is increased Agricultural production and diversified in targeted communities. This project creates plenty of opportunities for host communities to work and increasing social cohesion through the establishment of different peace-making groups, thus contributing towards a poverty-free middle-income country.
	Goal: To develop a skilled and creative human resource	The project aims to develop the capacity of vulnerable people of Bandarban and Cox’s Bazar, especially women, to guide the development process through the capacity development of target beneficiaries with the inclusion of women empowerment.
	Goal: To become a globally integrated regional economic and commercial hub	The project aims to promote new knowledge and resource partnerships under the canopy of CHT host population/communities and Cohesion of Rohingya refugees.

Perspective Plan (2010-41)

Perspective Plan of Bangladesh 2021-2041 is a genuine articulation of the government to transform the country from a lower middle-income country to Upper Middle-Income Country by 2031 and a high-income country by 2041 under the World Bank Classification. We have to keep in mind that this is a vision document and an outline of a perspective plan– if anyone looks for a detail strategy about something, this might not fill his/her expectation because it only provides guidelines and strategic directions that to be elaborated in associated four five year plans. Based on this vision document, four consecutive five-year plans will be formulated, where detailed strategies and action programmes will be available. This document is instrumental because it covers two important transitions for Bangladesh- one is graduation from LDC status, expected to happen in 2024 if the country meets the criteria again in the second triennial review by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) in 2021 and the second is the implementation of SDGs by 2030 and 8 FYP (2021-26). The SHARIP Project objectives have relevance to two development priorities of the Perspective Plan. They are:

Table 2: Relevance of the SHARIP Project with Perspective Plan (2010- 2041)

National Priority Document	Goals/Priorities having relevance with prospective plan	Relevant SHARIP Objectives
Perspective Plan (2010-41)	Ensuring High growth, job creation, and reduction of poverty and inequality are the final outcomes that are built on foundations of sustained macroeconomic stability	The goal of the project is to contribute to the achievement of inclusive economic growth, which is one of the 4 pillars of the UNDAF Action Plan through its different initiatives.
	Agriculture, though declining in relative size, will remain a pivotal sector for food security and nutrition balance, and inter-sectoral policies have to be directed towards gaining a highly productive modern agriculture that is diversified and also climate-resilient over the long term.	SHARIP aims to promote knowledge-based decision-making process and develop knowledge partnerships. It also provides knowledge services through capacity building initiatives.

8th Five Year Plan (2021-26)

The core theme of the National 8th Five Year Plan is “Accelerating Growth, Empowering Citizens”. The utmost attention has been given to job creation in the economy, accelerating GDP growth to 8 percent and ensuring equitable income distribution to reduce extreme poverty to around 8.9% and empower the citizen. The Plan will also pursue a strategy for capital formation by mobilizing higher domestic and foreign investment to achieve 8% annual average growth rates. The development approach underlying the Plan is consistent with the SHARIP project objective of mobilizing resources to facilitate the acceleration of economic growth. The plan will be implemented by mobilizing private investment, with a focus on PPP initiative and FDI attracting for CHT areas where public investment will create the investment climate for a favorable pro-business growth.

Table 2.: Relevance of SHARIP project with the 8th Five Year Plan

National Priorities	Goals/Priorities having relevance with SHARIP	SHARIP Objectives Relevant to the 8th Five Year Plan
8 th Five Year Plan (2021-26)	Goal 1: Income and Poverty -Attaining average real GDP growth rate of 7.4% per year of the Plan period -Reduction of extreme poverty by about 4.0 percentage points	With a view to increase household income and reduce overall poverty of the country, SHARIP project aims to contribute to the process of poverty reduction, growth and sustainable development and strengthen the socio-economic conditions of the poor households of the host communities affected by the Rohingya influx.
	Strategies for Sectoral Development (General Public Service) Improving the capacity of public administration will be one of the important areas of intervention to improve overall development performance.	Core objective of the project was to develop the capacity of CHT Ministry to manage and guide the development process, but while in operation, it extended its capacity-building initiative to other ministries in order to bridge the knowledge gap between the CHT Ministry and other ministries of government and also to have a broader impact of the capacity building initiative across government.

Thus, the above Tables (1.- 2) demonstrate that the objectives of the SHARIP Project have relevance to the national priorities of the Government of Bangladesh. In some cases, such relevance is direct, while in other cases, it is a little indirect, meaning the issues are not explicitly pronounced as the Project objectives as they are in the national documents, but the Project activities are ultimately geared towards achieving them.

Consistence with the International Priorities

The SHARIP Project objectives were consistent with the international priorities, including the SDG Goals and UNDP priorities

Relevance with SDG Goals

During the Post MDG period, the World has set its development agenda called the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which are now being considered the international priorities for all countries across the Globe. The SDGs contain 17 goals to transform the World. One of the key focuses of the SHARIP Project is to generate able population resources for SDG implementation. The Project objectives have relevance to several goals and targets of SDG. Table 4 shows this relevance in detail.

Table 4: Relevance of SHARIP project with the SDGs.

International Priorities	Goals/Targets having relevance with SHARIP	Relevant objectives of SHARIP
SDG Goal/Target	Goal 1: End poverty in all forms everywhere	The objective of the SHARIP Project is to strengthen the socio-economic conditions of the poor households of the host communities affected by the Rohingya influx and specifically to support livelihood improvement of marginal farmers through income generation from increased agricultural production and agro forestry, new high-value crops, value addition and improved market linkages.
	Indicator 17.6.1: Number of science and /or technology cooperation agreements and programs between countries, by type of cooperation	The Project aimed to establish various cooperation between the countries under the canopy of UNDP and CHT Ministry

Relevance with UNDP Priorities

UNDP priorities are demonstrated in the Country Programme Document (CPD) 2017-2020, UNDAF and Strategic Plan. The ProDoc mentions that the project directly contributes to the achievement of Bangladesh UNDAF outcomes. Some specific targeted outputs of other documents have also been found to be relevant to the SHARIP Project objectives. Table 2.5 provides the details.

Table.5: Relevance of the SHARIP Project with the UNDP Priorities

UNDP Policy Documents	Outputs/Outcome having relevance with SHARIP	Relevant objectives of SHARIP
Country Programme Document (CPD) Outcome/Output	Outcome 2: Develop and implement improved social policies and programs that focus on good governance, reduction of structural inequalities and advancement of vulnerable individuals and groups.	The SHARIP aimed to develop livelihoods opportunities in IFM and agroforestry and strategic peaceful cohesion/ collaboration with the host community/ civil society in order to utilize their expertise as inputs for effective peacemaking in Rohingya influx areas of Bangladesh
UNDAF Output	Outcome 1.1: Government institutions at the national and sub-national levels can more effectively carry out their mandates, including the delivery of public services. Output1.1.4: The civil service has greater institutional capacity and better business process	The project aimed to contribute to this outcome through undertaking initiatives for capacity building of government officials as a cross-cutting issue of the project.
Strategic Plan Outcome/Output	Outcome 7: Development debates and actions at all levels prioritize poverty, inequality and exclusion, consistent with our engagement principles	The SHARIP Project emerged to contribute to the reduction of poverty and inclusive economic growth through livelihood support to the marginal farmers affected by Rohingya influx.

ANNEX 7: District wise output progress

Activities	Cox's Bazar			Bandarban		
	Target (June 2021)	Achievement (June, 2021)	% Achieved (June, 2021)	Target (June 2021)	Achievement (June, 2021)	% Achieved (June, 2021)
1. Number of total IFM-FFS groups	372	372	100%	540	540	100%
2. Number of functional IFM-FFS groups	372	372	100%	540	540	100%
3. Number of members enrolled in functional IFM-FFS groups	11160	11160	100%	16,200	15,577	96.15%
4. Number of female members enrolled in functional IFM-FFS groups	5580	10221	183.17%	6480	10,360	159.88%
5. Number of Master Trainers developed and running Training of Farmer Facilitators	10	10	100%	8	9	112.5%
6. Number of female Master Trainers developed and running Training of Farmer Facilitators	3	0	0%	2	2	100%
7. Number of Farmer Facilitators developed and conducting IFM-FFS sessions	147	147	100%	120	120	100%
8. Number of female Farmer Facilitators developed and conducting IFM-FFS sessions	59	106	179.66%	48	56	116.67%
9. Number of farmers who have completed the IFM-FFS and/or agroforestry sessions	11160	11132	99.75%	16,200	15,577	96.15%
10. Number of female farmers	5580	10195	182.71%	8,100	10,360	127.90%

Activities	Cox's Bazar			Bandarban		
	Target (June 2021)	Achievement (June, 2021)	% Achieved (June, 2021)	Target (June 2021)	Achievement (June, 2021)	% Achieved (June, 2021)
who have completed the IFM-FFS and/or agroforestry sessions						
11. Number of local service providers (LSP), i.e. Community Livestock Workers (CLW) and Community Aquaculture Resource Persons, providing support to communities	30 (CLW)	29	96.67%	30	30 CLWs	100%
12. Number of female local service providers (LSP), i.e. Community Livestock Workers and Community Aquaculture Resource Persons, providing support to communities		(2 (CLW))			3 CLWs	
13. Number of monitoring visits by Government line agencies (DAE, DLS, DoF) and follow up support made to IFM-FFS communities	744	897	120.56%	1,080	507	46.94%
14. Number of monitoring visits organized to support IFM-FFS communities by local Government Institutions (Union Parishad, Upazila Parishad)	30	30	100%		145	

Activities	Cox's Bazar			Bandarban		
	Target (June 2021)	Achievement (June, 2021)	% Achieved (June, 2021)	Target (June 2021)	Achievement (June, 2021)	% Achieved (June, 2021)
15. Number of agroforestry development plans developed	372 (Community ADP) 11160 (Individual ADP)	372 (Community ADP) 11124 (Individual ADP) Male: 902 Female: 10126	100% (Community ADP) 99.67% (Individual ADP)	540 (Community ADP) 16200 (Individual ADP) 6480 (Individual ADP)	487 (Community ADP) 13980 (Individual ADP) 8985 Female	90.18% (Community ADP) 86.30% (individual ADP)
16. Number of participating farmers who has access of high-quality farming inputs (including agroforestry)	0	0	N/A	0		N/A
17. Number of participating female farmers who has access of high-quality farming inputs (including agroforestry)	0	0	N/A	0		N/A
18. Number of new collection points operating (bulking and trading) on an average twice in a week	11	11 (8 fully functional)	100%	17	17	100%
19. Number of households who have received farming input packages as part of SHARIP's COVID-19 response report to have resumed their agricultural production disrupted by COVID-19	Total target: 80% of households who have received farming input packages			Total target: 80% of households who have received farming input packages		
20. Number of IFM-FFS participating households apply additional farming component and improved farming techniques	Total target: 75% of IFM-FFS participating households			Total target: 75% of IFM-FFS participating households		

Activities	Cox's Bazar			Bandarban		
	Target (June 2021)	Achievement (June, 2021)	% Achieved (June, 2021)	Target (June 2021)	Achievement (June, 2021)	% Achieved (June, 2021)
21. Number of new agroforestry-based small enterprises (i.e. nursery grower's / women entrepreneurs doing value addition at local level/high value crop producers / beekeepers / vermicompost producers)	25 (nursery growers)	25 nursery growers	100%	25	25 nursery growers	100%
22. Number of new agroforestry-based small female enterprises (i.e. nursery grower's / women entrepreneurs doing value addition at local level/high value crop producers / beekeepers / vermicompost producers)		3 female nursery growers			3 female nursery growers	
23. Number of Local Volunteer Mediators Forum (LVMF) operational at Upazila and Union level, with a particular focus on domestic violence	3	3	100%	3	3	100%
24. Number of women in the LVMF executive committees	30%	19%		30%	25 (28%)	28%
25. Number of courtyard sessions organized for IFM-FFS members to enhance their knowledge on leadership, conflict	732	742	101.36%		716	

Activities	Cox's Bazar			Bandarban		
	Target (June 2021)	Achievement (June, 2021)	% Achieved (June, 2021)	Target (June 2021)	Achievement (June, 2021)	% Achieved (June, 2021)
management and gender equality						
26. Number of events specifically targeting youth and their engagement in promotion of social cohesion, tolerance and conflict prevention	36	33	91.67%	76	54	71.05%
27. Number of initiatives taken by the community groups/ forums at Upazila level observed with engagement of all relevant stakeholders	122	137	112.30%	166	115	69.27%
28. Number of IFM-FFS modules printed	12	12	100%	12	12	100%

ANNEX 8: Fund received and expenditure statement

**Project Name: Support to Host Community People affected by
Rohingya Influx**

Major outputs	Actual Expenditure Report (July'18 - January'22)	
	DKK	USD
Output 1.1 Enhanced knowledge and skills of communities, farmers, farmer facilitators, local service providers, and monitors on improved agriculture practices	7,697,755	1,192,566
Output 1.2: Market linkage and access to quality farming (including agroforestry) inputs enhanced	559,193	86,632
Output 2.1 Improved knowledge and skills of Community People on agroforestry systems	552,471	85,591
Output 3.1: Improved community skills in conflict resolution, gender and youth engagement contributing to limiting negative effects of influx	2,339,541	362,451
Covid-19_ Expenditure as of 31 Dec'2020	6,616,219	1,025,010
Subtotal outputs	17,765,180	2,752,249
Implementation:	-	-
NGOs	10,137,080	1,570,475
Communication, planning, M&E	124,819	19,337
Technical Advisory	307,493	47,638
SID-CHT operations and management (UNDP)	13,048,912	2,021,587
Subtotal of implementation	23,618,304	3,659,037
GMS	3,344,057	518,074
Total expenditure as of 22 August 2021	44,727,541	6,929,361
Funding details		
	DKK	USD
Total Fund received as of 31 January 2022	47,800,000	7,405,357
Less Actual Exp. as of 31 January 2022	(44,727,541)	(6,929,361)
Less Committed Expenditure as advance to Hill District Councils as of 31 January 2022	(1,024,000)	(158,642)
Less Committed Expenditure as advance to NGOs as of 22 August 2021	(638,753)	(98,958)
Less Committed expenditure as of 31 January 2022	(245,353)	(38,011)
Current funding balance as of 31 January 2022	1,164,347	180,385

Note: Using the average rate is 1 USD. = 6.454786 DKK (D K K 47,800,000.00/USD.74,05,357.36)