Following is a response from Senior DHS staff members, Tom Pullum and Fred Arnold:

Response to Part 1. NFHS-5 included a module of questions on domestic violence that was administered to women age 18-49 in the subsample of households selected for the state module. A similar module was also included in NFHS-4, although the NFHS-4 module was administered to women age 15-49, not 18-49. In both NFHS-4 and NFHS-5, households that were not selected for the state module skipped Section 11 on domestic violence, as well as Sections 8-10. In accordance with the World Health Organization's guidelines on the ethical collection of information on domestic violence, only one eligible woman per household was randomly selected for the module in both NFHS-4 and NFHS-5. In both NFHS-4 and NFHS-5, the domestic violence module was not administered to eligible women if privacy could not be obtained after at least three attempts during the survey.

Response to Part 2. Are you thinking of constructing district-level variables based on individual-level responses? For example, you could construct a measure of education using E=0 if a woman has no formal schooling, and E=1 if she any. (The boundary between 0 and 1 could be specified in different ways.) Then the district-level mean of E would be the proportion of women who have E=1. If you do that, you could use either d005 or v005 as the weight. For an individual-level analysis of DV variables you would definitely use d005 for a weight. However, for a contextual variable you could use v005, assuming that all women, not just those who respond to the DV module, provide the context. This is your choice--and there would be almost no difference between the two means. You would not have to calculate any new weights.