No Lean Season

DRAFT Preliminary Monitoring Results: Household Targeting

Household targeting is one of the first activities implemented during each program year. This activity involved completing a complete census of selected villages (i.e. the Household Targeting Survey), and identifying eligible households based on data collected through the survey.

Our team focused on two aspects when monitoring the survey: (1) ensuring all households in each village were visited during the survey, and (2) verifying data collected during the household survey, and that was used to select eligible households, was accurate and of good quality. For the former we relied on administrative data collected by Migration Organizers (MOs), and for the latter we used verification data collected by independent enumerators.[1] Below we review the key pieces of results from these monitoring activities.

Monitoring implementation of the survey

At the beginning of the program year, we selected 575 villages in 52 branches to be included in No Lean Season 2017. We monitored this target by cross-checking incoming household data with the list of pre-selected villages. This allowed us to track villages that had and had not been visited by MOs. By the end of July, 61 out of the 575 villages had not been surveyed, representing 11% of selected villages. After catching the issue, we were able to extend the targeting period and deploy Migration Organizers to survey the remaining 61 villages and complete all villages.

This is a concrete example of how mobile data collection and careful monitoring of incoming data allows us to engage in real-time monitoring, implement course correction where needed, and provide meaningful feedback to the field team that improves quality and efficiency of the program.

Monitoring completeness of survey

The Household Targeting Survey is meant to be a complete census of each village selected. Therefore, it is important that we monitor the implementation of the survey to ensure we have comprehensive coverage. Below are two methods we employed this year to capture the completeness of the survey.

Monitoring 'missed' households

MOs are instructed to visit households in a sequential order for the household survey. In other words, MOs should move from one household to the neighboring household until they have visited each household in the village. If no one is home or there is no adult member of the household available when the MO visits, the MO will record the household as not available (i.e. 'missed') and move onto the next household. The data our team receives on missed households is then sent daily to RDRS Monitoring staff to inform them of households which require follow-up, ultimately prompting or reminding MOs to revisit these missing households. Following this process, we were able to complete the survey in 99.7% of all households visited.

Verifying all households have been surveyed

We used data from the verification surveys to measure whether our census comprehensively captured all households in a village. Results of our verification surveys show that 99% of all households were covered in the randomly selected villages. It may be the case that particularly 'hard to reach' households or sets of households would be similarly skipped by both the original survey and the verification survey. In the future we

may use GPS data and satellite imagery to identify missing clusters of households and small villages. But overall, the results of this verification survey give us a relatively high level of confidence that the Household Targeting Survey successfully achieved extremely high coverage of households within participating villages.

	Number	%
Total number of HH visited by verification enumerators	748	100%
Households captured by Household Targeting Survey	747	99.9%
Household not captured by Household Targeting Survey	1	0.1%

Accuracy of Household identification

We track households throughout the program based on their household ID, a unique identifying number assigned by the program during the Household Targeting Survey. It is critical, therefore, that we have confidence that a particular household ID refers to the actual household we think it does -- this is important for ensuring the integrity of the execution of the successive steps of the program, from eligibility through to offer, loan application, disbursement, and repayment.

Our main measure of accuracy of this dimension of the program is verifying whether we are able to visit the same household more than once based on their household ID number. By comparing data collected by MOs and data collected by independent enumerators, we can identify cases where household names diverge between visits. The results from this year show that 94% of the household data from the administrative dataset matched with verification data when looking at either the name of the head of household; name of the father of the head of household; or the household phone number. This measure reveals high fidelity between household ID assignment and the digital record of that household.

	Number	%
Households captured by Household Targeting Survey	747	100%
Households where verification data matched administrative data by households' member names	704	94.2%
Households where verification did not match administrative data by households' member names	43	5.8%

Validating self-reported data

Collecting reliable eligibility criteria, in particular the amount of cultivable land owned, is critical to the program's integrity and impact. We verified the administrative data collected on this criteria using verification data. Results from the analysis of this cross-check show that 64% of the randomly selected households reported exact or near-exact data[2] on cultivable land owned to the independent enumerators.

	Number	%
Exact or near-exact data reported	480	64%
Inconsistent data	267	36%
Total Households reporting cultivable land data	747	

Of the 480 observations that were exact or near-exact, 421 were exact matches. For the 36% of households (267 households) with differences, we analyzed whether the discrepancies led to any changes in eligibility between surveys. In this analysis, 24% (63 households) of households' eligibility status would have changed -- 41 households 'false negatives' and 22 were 'false positives'. In total, false positives and false negatives account for 8% of the total sample (63 out of 747 households). In the context of the program goals,

'false negatives' are more of a concern than 'false positives'. This is because providing access to a travel subsidy for a non-eligible household may be slightly inefficient, but it is not reducing the potential impact of the program. On the other hand, *not* serving a household that should have been eligible is a greater concern. The verification survey shows that this is an issue that we will need to monitor over time, but that the incidence of false negatives is quite low -- only 41 out of 747 cases, or 5%.

	Eligible in HH Verification Survey	Ineligible in HH Verification Survey	Total
Eligible in HH Targeting Survey	96 (36%)	22 (8%)	118
Ineligible in HH Targeting Survey	41 (15%)	108 (40%)	149
Total	137	130	267

The inconsistencies that emerged from the data may be a result of varying interpretations of cultivable land 'owned on paper', as some rented land can be recorded 'on paper'. Although there were relatively few households that changed eligibility due to the inconsistencies, we hope to further refine how we collect data for this eligibility criteria in the future.

---

[1] Verification data was collected in a random subset of villages (n = 123) and a random subset of households within these villages (n = 748). In each of the villages selected for verification activities, we would wait until the household targeting activity was complete to randomly select one household as starting point for the verification survey. The enumerator then used the left hand rule to interview two additional households skipping 4 households from the one interviewed. After conducting interviews in three households in the same area of the village, the enumerators then moved to the nearest para (i.e. Bangladesh administrative unit within villages) and randomly selected one households to be his starting point. For villages that did not have Paras, the enumerators walked for about 500 meters and then selected a starting household at random. In total, 748 households were visited during the households survey verification exercise.

[2] Near-exact means less than a 8 decimal difference in reporting. The 8 decimal cutoff was established after considering the distribution of differences between what was reported during the admin data collection and verification data. All cases where the difference was above 8 decimal was categorized as major outlier meaning it differed significantly with the rest data. More details of how the outlier were determined can be found [here](#).