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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFS</td>
<td>Adolescent Friendly Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>Child Friendly Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>Core Humanitarian Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CiC</td>
<td>Camp-in-Charge Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAST Trust</td>
<td>Coastal Association for Social Transformation Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP</td>
<td>Cyclone Preparedness Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>Complaint Response Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>Disasters Emergency Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee (of the OECD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRM</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTWs</td>
<td>Deep Tube Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDMN</td>
<td>Forcibly Displaced Myanmar National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>Faecal Sludge Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Host Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>Hygiene Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Office of Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCG</td>
<td>Inter Sector Coordination Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRP</td>
<td>Joint Response Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAL</td>
<td>Monitoring Evaluation Accountability and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAs</td>
<td>Newly Arrivals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCE</td>
<td>No Cost Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Government Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOAB</td>
<td>NGO Affairs Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>Non-Food Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>Persons With Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM</td>
<td>Post-Distribution Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFA</td>
<td>Psychosocial First Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>Psychosocial Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCC</td>
<td>Red Cross Code of Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRRRC</td>
<td>Rohingya Refugee Return Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>Training of Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDMCs</td>
<td>Union Disaster Management Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WaSH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDMCs</td>
<td>Wards Disaster Management Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMCs</td>
<td>Water Management Committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 1: Executive Summary

See separate document.

To ease the reading, a summary in blue colour is also available at the beginning of each section of this report.

Section 2: Introduction, scope and objectives of the evaluation

Introduction and scope of the evaluation

The Disasters Emergency Committee (DEC) launched a public appeal on 4th October 2017 and Tearfund launched their own appeal alongside this. Whilst Tearfund has been working in Bangladesh since the 1970’s Tearfund did not have an existing presence in Cox’s Bazar. Tearfund therefore entered into new partnerships with local NGOs to respond to the crisis.

Tearfund partnered with the local NGO COAST Trust in September 2017 and with another local NGO, CCDB (Christian Commission for the Development of Bangladesh) in October 2017. Tearfund also supported a project run by a global partner organization, World Concern, who were working with Medair.

TF’s first project with COAST Trust began in September 2017 and provided immediate relief to the newly arrived refugees in Bangladesh, with a focus on healthcare, food and water distributions. Phase 1 of the DEC response lasted for 6 months from 4 October 2017 to 31 March 2018. COAST’s intervention focused on protection and NFIs whilst World Concern distributed shelter and hygiene kits to 3,375 households.

The scope of this evaluation is only on the Phase 2 of the DEC funded response covering the period 1 April 2018 to 30 September 2019 (18 months). This means that the evaluation should be considered as mid-term evaluation as the field work took place early February 2019 with implementation data available up to January 2019, 8 months before the end of the project.

The focus of this evaluation is on the project implemented by COAST Trust in the following sectors: NFIs, WASH, DRR, host community livelihood support, as well as continuing to strengthening the Protection work initiated in Phase 1.

Objectives of the evaluation

1. To assess the quality of emergency project delivery against the key evaluation criteria (relevance, impact, efficiency, effectiveness) considering how the response is aligning with the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS).

2. To assess the project effectiveness, including intended and unintended impact, and the level of adaptation to the changing context in the target communities.
3. To identify key good practices and lessons learnt, including how these have been used throughout the project to improve delivery and to make recommendations for future programming.

**Section 3: Methodology**

### 3.1. Approach

The evaluation team was composed of an international consultant, a national researcher and two translators.

The evaluation took a **summative** approach, reviewing and discussing how and to what extent the programme realized its expected results and outcomes.

In addition, there was also a **formative** element in that the evaluation documented some important lessons learned.

The evaluation took a constructive and **participative approach** to engaging programme staff and other key informants (including the project beneficiaries, Tearfund, COAST trust and other organisations). Discussions offered opportunities for joint reflection and lesson learning. At the beginning of the field work in Bangladesh, a briefing meeting was organised to collect invaluable learning in relation to the main evaluative questions. At the end of the field visit a debriefing meeting took place with COAST Trust and Tearfund staff in Cox’s bazar to present the preliminaries findings of the mission.

The consultant team conformed with **principles for good practices and ethical behaviour** in all aspects of the work. More particularly the evaluation paid specific attention to the BOND criteria for effective evaluations. Throughout the process, specific attention was sought between critical, independent assessment and building trust and collaboration with informants. Findings have been balanced between a presentation of strong and positive points of the programme with the areas that would need improvements.

Different data collection methodologies have been used and different types of data collected. The evaluation team utilized **mixed-methods and participatory approach** through a **four-phase activity plan categorized around planning, data collection, analysis, and report writing**.

**Findings were triangulated** through at least three complimentary and distinct data collection methods and types of data.

**The evaluation intended to be “evidence based”**. This means that through the data collection process, the evaluation team looked for facts, tangible and reliable evidences (through secondary and primary data collection and analysis) that could later on be used to inform the findings of the evaluation.

### 3.2. Tools used and deliverables

The following tools were used during the evaluation:

- Desk review of available secondary data (see annex 10.5 for the list of documents consulted)
- Key Informant Interviews through skype with Tearfund program manager in UK and face to face interviews with stakeholders in Bangladesh through a 15 days mission in country.
A total of 198 persons was met through KIIs and FGDs with project beneficiaries. (84 female and 114 male) and with Tearfund/COAST trust staff and other organisations in selected field locations.

Observations of project facilities during field visits.

The first data collection method included a desk study\(^1\) of all relevant M&E documentation, reports and studies related to the programme. The relevant documentation was read to pull out information relevant to answering each evaluation question. This data was triangulated with the data collected in the field, which allowed the team to see information gaps and adjust fieldwork efforts accordingly through the other data collection tools used during the field visit.

A field visit took place from 1\(^{st}\) to 15\(^{th}\) February 2019 in Bangladesh, more particularly in Cox’s bazar district and included refugees’ camps and host communities. In Bangladesh, the evaluation team was able to interview a whole range of different stakeholders such as Tearfund/COAST Trust staff from all project component and other organisations and beneficiaries.\(^2\)

The program for the field visit included a good sample of the variety of the activities implemented as well as reflected well the diversity of the stakeholders with whom Tearfund/COAST is working.

2 CFS (among 6 funded) and 2 AFS (among 6 in operation) were randomly selected for the field visit in the camp 1E and 1W. Similarly, children attending the CFS/AFS were randomly selected. The evaluation Team used “Non-Participant Observation methods” (observing participants without actively participating) during the site visits of the project activities.

The following deliverables were produced during this evaluation:

- Inception report\(^3\) presenting the Evaluation Questions (EQ), a proposed schedule of work for the field visit and a list of documents needed for the desk review.
- A power point presenting the preliminaries findings after the field visit
- This evaluation report that also includes a separate executive summary

### 3.3. Limitations and scope of the evaluation

The evaluation process went smoothly thanks to the rigorous cooperation and planning between the various individuals from Tearfund and COAST Trust who grandly facilitated the preparation of the study sites before and during the data collection phase.

Ahead of the field work, the evaluation team received several documents to conduct the desk review including project proposals, activities report, training curriculum and assessments tools used during the project implementation. (see annex 10.5 the list of the documents reviewed). This information was found useful and allowed us to have a first picture of the projects achievements and to get an overview of the performance of the program in relation to some of the OECD/DAC criteria as detailed later in this report. For these reasons we did not have any major limitations to conduct our work.

Only in one instance, a group of elder women invited for an FGD, left the room soon after the beginning of the discussion as some of them thought that the project would help them with donations and were not

---

\(^1\) See in annex 10.5 the bibliography used for this evaluation

\(^2\) List of persons met during the field visit is available in annex 10.4 to this report.

\(^3\) Available in a separate document.
interested to carry on the discussion. Also, one of the women requested to be brought to the hospital which was done on the spot by COAST Trust staff.

Section 4: The Rohingyas crisis

Series of violence in Rakhine State, Myanmar, began on 25 August 2017, and drove thousands of people to seek sanctuary in Cox’s Bazar, Bangladesh joining approximately 212 500 others who had fled in earlier waves of displacement- the fastest growing forced displacement crisis in the world. The speed and scale of the influx has resulted in a critical humanitarian emergency.

As of 12 December 2018, there were 907,952 Rohingyas refugees in Bangladesh mostly living in camps concentrated in two Upazilas of Cox’s Bazar District; Ukhia and Teknaf putting an immense strain on the almost half a million Bangladeshis who live there, and the District government in particular. Infrastructure, health and water services, and the environment, especially fragile forest and land resources, are now under massive pressure which also create tensions between host and refugees’ communities. The crisis has also impacted the livelihood of host communities. (see annex 10.8)

The Rohingyas now constitute at least one third of the total population. The Humanitarian Joint Response Plan (JRP) aims to meet the needs of 300,000 (54%) Bangladesh of Teknaf and Ukhia, in the seven unions with the highest proportion of Rohingya people.

The Government of Bangladesh (GOB) refers to the Rohingya that arrived since August 2017 as Forcibly Displaced Persons from Myanmar (FDMN). Bangladesh is not a party to the 1951 Convention and does not have domestic legislation, decrees or policy in place that regulate the reception and protection of persons of concern. Coordination of the overall emergency is done by the government and through the Inter Sector Coordination Group (ISCG).

FDMNs live in congested sites that are ill-equipped to handle natural hazards with alarmingly limited options for relocation or evacuation because of the lack of space. An Emergency Preparedness and Response Task Force has been established by the ISCG to coordinate preparedness and response activities ahead of both monsoon and cyclones. Access to basic services remains insufficient in the camps; The government authorities are not allowing any permanent structures to be constructed and have severely limited what shelter items can be given to refugees by NGOs. Refugees are not allowed to access local markets. Some traders come in to the camps but refugees lack resources to buy items they need as they are also forbidden to work and therefore cannot earn an income.

After days of preparations following nearly a year’s efforts, in November 2018, a Government plan to start repatriating the Rohingya people from Bangladesh to Myanmar has stalled as the refugees refused to go back to their homeland as they said that the conditions were not met in Myanmar. The UN welcomes the commitment of the government of Bangladesh to stick to the principle of voluntary, safe, and dignified returns.

---

Tearfund first project with Coast Trust began in September 2017 and provided immediate relief to the newly arrived refugees with a focus on healthcare, food and water distribution. DEC 1st phase project began in October 2017 focusing on protection, NFI and WASH.

**COAST’s Vision:** Fighting for a world of Equity and Justice where Human Rights, Democracy and Dignity are the Social Cultures.

**COAST’s Mission:** COAST organizes strategically important activities related to development, which in turn, will facilitate the sustainable and equitable improvement of life, especially of women, children and disadvantaged population of the coastal areas in Bangladesh through their increased participation in the socio-economic, cultural and civic life of the country.

**COAST Trust’s sector under DEC funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEC Implementation Period</th>
<th>DEC Phase 1: Distribution of NFI, WASH and protection</th>
<th>4 October 2017 to 31 March 2018 (6 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEC Phase 2: NFIs, WASH, DRR, host community livelihood support, protection</td>
<td>1 April 2018 to 30 September 2019 (18 months)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project has the following 5 expected outcomes

Outcome A-Improved psychosocial support for FDMN and host population.
Outcome B- Improved NFI support to FDMN and host population
Outcome C- Improved standard of WASH facilities for FDMN population
Outcome D- DRR and preparedness amongst FDMN and host population
Outcome E- Improved livelihood opportunities for host community

**Planned activities per outcomes as per the project proposal.**
A. PROTECTION
- 6 CFS and 6 AFS (FDMNs)
- 12 parents groups (FDMNs)
- 12 Child Safety Committees (FDMNS)
- Trainings for parents & committees
- Solar lights (for FDMNS & host communities)

B. SHELTER/NFI
- Distribution of charcoal/rice-husk/LPG to use as fuel for FDMNs & host communities
- NFI kits including clothing items, umbrellas, blankets for both communities (FDMNs & Host)

C. WASH (for FDMNs)
- Maintenance of tube Wells & existing latrines
- Desludging of latrines
- Hygiene promotion sessions for parents of children of CFS/AFS
- Assessment of water resources
- Contingency funds for emergency provision of safe drinking water and supplies.

D. DISASTER RISK REDUCTION-DRR (FDMNs & Host communities)
- Construction of drains
- Training of Madjiis on DRR
- Small scale mitigation works
- Garbage collection & disposal
- Planting trees
- Awareness raising on DRR

E. LIVELIHOODS (Host only)
- Training on income generation
- Provide agricultural and non-agricultural input
- Income Generating Activities (IGAS)
- Market assessment

- Monitoring of activities
- Capacity building (trainings and coaching)
- Information sharing
- Coordination
As of 10 October 2018, the population of FDMNs\textsuperscript{5} in the three main camps supported by the project was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Total Household</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp 1E</td>
<td>9158</td>
<td>39376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 1W</td>
<td>9167</td>
<td>39526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 8 E</td>
<td>7935</td>
<td>33022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 8 W</td>
<td>8074</td>
<td>33786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{5} 181010\_location\_masterlist\_anonymized\_r12sa\_public
Section 6: Key Findings

The following sections set out the key findings. Performance was assessed against the OECD-DAC criteria using the scoring system. A score of 1 indicates that there is a poor contribution to the criteria, with 4 a strong contribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low or no visible contribution to this aspect</td>
<td>Some evidence of contribution to this aspect but significant improvement required</td>
<td>Evidence of satisfactory contribution to this aspect but improvement required</td>
<td>Evidence of good contribution to this aspect with some areas for improvement and change</td>
<td>Evidence that the contribution is strong and/or exceeding that which was expected of the project/programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Scoring System

6.1. Impact

Impact is the cumulative contribution of various stakeholders and is both positive and negative changes that have been brought about directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

6.1.1. Key Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Impact of the intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF QS</td>
<td>Resilience (Environment and Disaster Risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 3</td>
<td>Communities and people affected by crisis are not negatively affected and are more prepared, resilient and less at-risk as a result of humanitarian action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 1</td>
<td>To what extend host communities and Forcibly Displaced Myanmar Nationals (FDMN) are not negatively affected and are more prepared, resilient and less at-risk as a result of humanitarian action? And Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 2</td>
<td>What have been the intended and unintended effects (social, physical, environmental, economic) of the intervention both positive and negative? And Why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To track the impact of the project, as much as possible the evaluation team looked at primary and secondary outcomes related to the project interventions. Examples are provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Primary outcomes</th>
<th>Secondary outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge, skills, assets, services, NFIs</td>
<td>Change in Behavior, Practices. Access and use of DRR, PROTECTION services, WASH facilities, income</td>
<td>Improved health, well-being, family and social relationships, feeling of safety, transformative practices (becoming change agent, empowerment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of findings:

Most Significant changes observed during the evaluation are related to the hygiene promotion sessions and psychosocial activities organized in the CFS/AFS that benefited not only children but their parents who had received awareness raising sessions during the parent meetings. Some parents reported that they also learnt new knowledge from their children attending the centers. Parents mentioned evidences of how knowledge was effectively translated into practices by their children at home in relation to hygiene practices. The impact is significant also because respondents said that before the project, they did not know any of the hygiene promotion messages they have learnt during the project. Furthermore, parents interviewed shared that they could relate the reduction of diarrhea and skin rash with the fact that they and their children had started to practice the improved behaviors.

Triangulation of information between parents and children show that children had gained more confidence to speak to elders, fight less between them, were more respectful of their friends and parents (and that their parents were also respecting them more) and had less bad dreams at nights.

Reinforcing factor of successes of the centers are that both children and their parents are benefiting from information related to health and hygiene promotion, DRR and child rights. This strategy has contributed to the positive impact of the intervention (ex: positive parenting skills taught to parents and life skills related to respect for elders taught to children have strengthened family relationship).

Similarly, the knowledge acquired during the parent’s meetings and Child Safety Committee trainings started to bear fruits. Adults interviewed reported that as members of these committees, they contributed to address child rights issues in their communities and that there were less cases of child marriage, violence against children and child labor.

Similarly, respondents shared examples of practices put in place at HHs level related to the Disaster Risk Reduction trainings sessions. Preparedness measures implemented were related to before the disaster phase and less during and after.

The distribution of LPGs to beneficiaries had important positive effects on health, well-being, family relationship but also positive unintended effects on reduction of gender-based violence (Two women shared that because they could now save time with the LPG and therefore prepare the food on time, their husband stopped physically or verbally harassing them).

Beneficiaries expressed their overall satisfaction with the quality of the NFIs (clothes and umbrella) received. Satisfaction being considered also as a proxy indicator of impact in emergency settings.

The WASH activities (desludging of latrines, provision of functioning tube wells, construction of drains and collection of waste) are definitively contributing to reduce public health risks. This is also evidenced by the fact that beneficiaries are effectively using the facilities and that they are prompt to report any latrines that need to be emptied or tube wells that need repair to the WASH agencies and COAST Trust.

It was too early to gather impact related data for the livelihood component of the intervention, as it only started recently.

WASH
The existing public health conditions in the camps are unsatisfactory due to poor sanitation facilities, poor water quality, space limitation and terrain. These conditions, combined with the increased population, have greatly increased the risk of serious public health hazards. Thanks to this project, COAST Trust has desludged 950 non-functional latrines. The activity is definitively contributing to reduce public health risks. This is also evidenced by the fact that beneficiaries are effectively using the facilities and that they are prompt to report any latrines that need to be emptied to the WASH agencies.

COAST is one of the rare organizations who started to work on waste management. COAST is currently working with 12 garbage collectors in charge of collecting the waste, cleaning the drains and the latrines built by COAST as well as the surrounding of the tube wells. Majority of the facilities mentioned previously and visited during the evaluation were in good functioning order and clean.

Children and parents interviewed during the evaluation reported a good knowledge and attitude related to the hygiene promotion sessions they attended in the CFS/AFS centers and through the parent meetings. Knowledge and practice for the children was confirmed by parents met separately. The changes in attitude and practice is significant since the refugees mentioned that they never received hygiene promotion sessions before their arrival in Bangladesh and were not aware of the contamination route and the importance of using soaps. Parents interviewed shared that they could relate the reduction of diarrhea and skin rash with the fact that they and their children had started to practice the improved behaviors.

Even though it was not a requirement from this project, COAST/Tearfund has started to collect information on the effects of the hygiene promotion awareness raising sessions. As there was no previous baseline conducted, the latest PDM survey done early 2019 could be considered as a baseline in case the project wishes to repeat the exercise in few months to measure the outcomes of the intervention. This exercise will allow to strengthen the validity of our own qualitative findings.

**PROTECTION**

**Psychosocial counsellors’ intervention**

- Over a period of 3 months, the 6 counselors conducted one on one session with 752 persons with an average of 3 visits per beneficiary. Out of the 752 assisted persons, 110 persons were referred to mental health services and or other services. The 3 counselors interviewed during the evaluation reported positive changes in emotional well-being after beneficiaries had been referred to the MSF mental health clinic.

**Child Safety committees**

The evaluation team met with 4 Child Safety committees set up by the project 7 months ago.

- The 380 members of the child safety committees have publicly stated in the past that they will advocate for the end of child marriage. This includes also 4 imams (religious leaders) who are relaying this message in their mosques during the Friday speech. Similarly, adolescents’ girls and boys have been sensitized on the risks caused by child marriage. According to our discussion with various type of respondents, the prevalence of child marriage has reduced in the camps and this project contributed to it through awareness raising and behavior change.

---

6 The added value of this intervention is that only few agencies had shown their interest for this type of work even though it is very needed and more particularly during the rainy season when the latrines fill quickly.
In its monthly activity reports, COAST reported very interesting human-interest stories to demonstrate the impact of its intervention. In one instance, one individual facilitator of Tearfund-COAST Trust’s project assisted by the Child Safety Committee, successfully prevented a case of early marriage through discussion with the parents of a girl child.

The following information were gathered during the FGDs with members of Child Safety Committees interviewed:

- Child labor has been reduced and safety committee members confirm that no children of the CFS/AFS are sent to work.
- Imams (members of the CSC) are giving special message during Friday prayer meeting. While explaining his role, an Imam interviewed during the evaluation said:

  “As a religious leader, people look up to me. One thing that I have understood from these training that there are many ways we can do harm to children. One of such things is early marriage. I make sure I discuss this with my congregation as I preach.”

- The early marriage is reduced. The members now know that no one should marry before 18 (as this has some health implication as well) and they are monitoring it within the community.
- They do not let children carry heavy goods from the camp.
- Main activities reported several times by the members were the action they took to refer cases to services (mainly to health and recreational centers) and to contribute to resolve domestic conflict that arise sometimes.

Case Study: There was twins who mother was extremely sickly while delivering her new baby and was carried to the government hospital. The babies stayed with their grandmother and became sick also. There was complaint registered by the neighbor. The facilitator informed the Child Protection Officer of Coast Trust who made a visit to the NGO MOWCA. She recommended the officer to take the babies to BRAC clinic. BRAC further referred it to MSF hospital who refused to take the babies as they were not with their mother. Knowing about the situation the Coast Staff again made a contact with the MOWCA Official who then took up the case and treated them in the hospital. Both the babies are doing well now.

- Key issues addressed by the Committees are child labor, child marriage, unhealthy hygiene attitudes and Disaster preparedness.

Majhis are also playing a key role in preventing early marriage. One of a great story that the study has found was a case that took place in Block 13P-D

“There was an unknown person coming to one of the resident’s place. The Majhi noticed that and asked the head of the family why the boy was coming to their house. From them the Majhi came to know that he wants to marry his daughter. Majhi asked both the girl and the boy to show their ID which has their date of birth written on them. Majhi noticed that the girl is 17. So he told both the family that the girl is yet to turn 18 and it is not good for her to get married at an early age and it would have a negative impact on her health. He managed to convince the family and the marriage was stopped.”

One positive unintended effect of the project is that the CSCs do not only work on issues faced by children but also by adults as in many cases there are no other established committee to address other social issues in the blocks. Therefore, at the end, in some instances, the Child Safety committees play the role of a broader protection committee.
Notwithstanding these key achievements, the evaluation noted that there are room for improvement for the members of the CSC to effectively reach a bigger group of people and more particularly hard to reach population such as female head of household.

CFS/AFS

Most Significant Changes perceived by the children:

- It was not easy during the interviews with the children to capture the Most Significant psychosocial changes in well-being that could be attributed to their attendance to the CFS/AFS. This can be explained by the fact that the centers have been in operation since one and half year after the influx of refugees in Bangladesh, and that many other factors have also contributed to build the resilience of the children.
- We therefore assessed mainly whether children learnt something useful, experienced changes in self-esteem, or valued the Child/Adolescent Friendly Spaces activities positively. The main changes observed and appreciated by the children were mainly related to the acquisition of new learning skills recently introduced by the project in the centers (such as basic written and spoken English, alphabet literacy and math), in addition to the recreational activities that had been organized since early 2018. Children interviewed were able to mention key messages that they had learnt during the hygiene promotion sessions organized in the centers.

One child shared that: “I have learnt how to recognize the signs of puberty and this has increased my level of self-confidence as I know now what is happening to my body.”

One boy said: “I do not have any fear or discomfort to express myself. Even if the president of the state comes to visit us, I would not hesitate to share what I have learned here.”

Another boy said: “When I attend the AFS, I forget that I can’t go back to Myanmar. The activities in the center help me to focus my attention on somethings else.”

- The evaluation noted that writing skills could be improved in some centers. Each children has a notebook which is kept in the CFS. The evaluation team found that children could pronounce the word correctly but when asked to write the words they could not do it properly. One of the reasons is that they seemed to have learned the word as an image but without being able to write it by their own if asked.
- Children also reported that thanks to their attendance to the centers they stopped being too curious in following unknown adults like it was the case when they arrived in the camps:
  “Before I come to the center, I was used to follow adults and look at some pictures in their mobile phone, now I have stopped doing that”

Most Significant Changes perceived by the parents of children attending the CFS/AFS:

- Parents interviewed were more vocal about the benefits that the centers provided to their children. They mentioned several examples where children were having bad dreams during the

---

7 It is generally known that it is very challenging to measure the impact of CFS/AFS on improved well-being of children, as it may require following-up with children sometime after the end of the project and “isolating” the impact of the Child Friendly Spaces from other possible factors unrelated to the intervention (such as other external support, natural recovery over time, etc)
night after their journey from Myanmar to Bangladesh where they had witnessed atrocities. Soon after their attendance to the centers, they could notice significant changes in the emotional well-being of their children who had found a protective environment and regained a feeling of safety and self-confidence. Thanks to the CFS/AFS activities, the children were also able to socialize with their new friends met in the centers while in the same time learnt about key hygiene, health and DRR lifesaving messages.

- Parents of children reported that everyone in the family is using soaps to clean hand before having food and after coming from the latrine. Children also reported practicing the skills they had learnt and more particularly in relation to the use of soap at critical at-risk points during the day. (ex: before eating, after going to the washroom as well as the use of sandals to go to the bathrooms...).

In two different FDGs, we heard similar testimonies where respondents said:

“One thing that I have noticed is that children are not getting sick often. Diarrhea and dysentery happened to be very common among children and also among adults. We have been told during the training that washing hands and wearing sandal reduce the risk of several disease.”

- Both parents and children reported that the relationship parents-children had also improved after the children attended the centers and the parents, the parent meetings:

Testimonies from parents:

“They are well behaved now and showing respect to the elders. They used to address everyone by ‘Tui’ (not considered as a suitable word for addressing elders) but now they use ‘Apni’ (the world represents respect). Also, they listen to us (parents) and do not fight with others. They have become cultured and tolerant.”

“We realized that raising a child is like nursing a tree. You need to provide good care, water and food to your tree if you want him to grow.” Testimony from a Madjii attending both parent meetings and Child safety Committee

Testimony from a child:

“We have learnt how to better speak with our parents and not using slang language. Thanks to this, we also noticed that they are respecting us more and do not argue with us before we go to the centers in the morning. They have softened their voices with us”

- The children did not know how to write while coming to Bangladesh, now many of them know all the letters of the alphabet and meaning of many words in English. Also, the children and the parents have had awareness on hygiene, protection and safety measures during a disaster. They also know about disaster preparedness.

One parent respondent said:

“One day I notice two children have set fire with wooden pieces to feel warm as it was cold that night. I told them not to set fire and stopped the fire using my feet. I knew from the training that in winter fire can spread all over the camp from a small incident.”

- Parents themselves mentioned that thanks to their regular attendance to the parent’s meetings they learnt many health and hygiene related messages that they did not know prior to their arrival
in Bangladesh. Part of their learnings also came from their children who had acquired new skills in the AFS/CFS as described earlier.

- A reinforcing factor of success of the centers is that both children and their parents are benefiting from information related to health and hygiene promotion, DRR and child rights. As described previously, this strategy has contributed to the positive impact of the intervention (ex: positive parenting skills taught to parents and life skills related to respect for elders taught to children have strengthened family relationship)

**NFI**

- COAST initially distributed charcoal and risk husk to the refugees but changed its strategy to increase its impact. It is known that cooking fuel and cooking stoves have a direct impact on food utilization by the Rohingyas, their nutritional status as well as on the environment. From a discussion with the FDMNs, the evaluation found many strong positive impacts related to the distribution of LPGs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Without LPGs</th>
<th>With LPGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ There has been a high level of deforestation reported by several studies since the arrival of the FDMNs who are cutting trees in the forest for their energy needs.</td>
<td>▪ The use of LPGs is contributing to slow down the deforestation of the forest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Smoke of Charcoal and risk husks are bad for health.</td>
<td>▪ LPG stoves do not smoke (better for health and less risk for children).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Children are staying outside of the shelters because of smoke and more at risk of road accident and other protection risks.</td>
<td>▪ Child comfort at home and safety (Less risks of road accident.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Children, women and girls have to collect woods and are sometimes harassed by men.</td>
<td>▪ Less risk of sexual harassments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Children collecting woods have less time to attend CFS/AFS.</td>
<td>▪ More time to attend recreational activities for children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ▪ Cooking preparation with charcoal is time consuming.  
▪ High fire risk with charcoal | ▪ Women beneficiaries using LPGs stoves reported saving 1,5 hour/day that they have used for resting, praying and taking care of children and elders.  
▪ Beneficiaries reported installing the stove on a top of mud structure and cover the nearby wall with mud for safety reason. |
| ▪ Cooking with woods make cloths dirty. As a result, people had to use more soaps and needed to buy soaps from local market. | ▪ With LPG there is less smoke, which is why, they now have soaps in stock and there is no need to buy extra soaps. |
- Less Gender Based Violence because of the use of LPG (shared by two women in two different FDGs): "My husband used to beat me every day as he was feeling impatient to wait for me to cook the food. Since I am using the LPG stove, he has not beaten me anymore as I am now cooking quickly.”

- In emergency situation, satisfaction of beneficiaries with the services provided is also considered as a proxy indicator of impact. Beneficiaries who received other NFIs items such as clothes, umbrella and charcoal reported to the evaluation team that they were generally satisfied with the products received as they arrived from Myanmar with very little personal effects. The items that were given were good in quality and could be used for a long time. Umbrella used to be very useful particularly during monsoon it helped them going to distribution point to collect relief martials.
- The Charcoal that were given would meet their need up to 20-25 days. Rest of the days they manage by borrowing from neighbors or buying it from local market.

**DRR**

- The Project did not conduct a PDM survey in relation to the changes in Knowledge, Attitude and Practice related to the risk communication activities organized through the CFS/AFS (including with parents of children and members of the Child Safety Committees). Findings from our FDGs with various audiences (children and adults), show that many respondents interviewed were able to report practical messages and practices related to preparedness measures conducted at the Household level before the rainy season and cyclone period: storing dry food, preparing ready to go back, protecting important documents or tying down the roofs of the shelters. One main constraint that limit the impact of the project is that there are no strong emergency shelters available in the camps that could sustain a wind higher than 40 or 50 kms/hour (according to a previous ISCG report) while it is known that Cox’s bazar is highly exposed to strong cyclone every 3-4 years.
- The knowledge that the Majhies have gathered while attending the training on DRR was transferred to the community. A member of each family residing in the operational area were invited in a meeting organized by the Majhies and they disseminate information and knowledge they have received on DRR so that the community has a basic understanding about preparedness and Dos and Don’ts during a disaster situation.

One of the Majhis has shared an event which took place the last monsoon season when a family was saved from possible casualty. The family was living in the slope of the hill. There was heavy monsoon which had increased the risk of landslide in that particular place. Noticing the risk, the Majhi informed the Site Management Agency that the family needed to be shifted to a safer place. The family was then relocated to a safer place.

### 6.1.2. Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low or no visible contribution to this aspect</td>
<td>Some evidence of contribution to this aspect but significant improvement required</td>
<td>Evidence of satisfactory contribution to this aspect but improvement required</td>
<td>Evidence of good contribution to this aspect with some areas for improvement and change</td>
<td>Evidence that the contribution is strong and/or exceeding that which was expected of the project/programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The evaluation found many evidences of positive impact for almost all activities implemented except for the livelihood component which is at planning stage.

6.2. Relevance

Relevance: The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.

6.2.1. Key Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Adaptation to changing context and relevance of strategic targeting with large needs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF QS</td>
<td>Impartiality and Targeting, Protection and Gender, Population with specific needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 6</td>
<td>Communities and people affected by crisis receive coordinated, complementary assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 6</td>
<td>How flexible the response was taking into account the changing context? How relevant the current intervention was in terms of geographical targeting? How the project met the challenge of remaining relevant and effective with limited resources while facing a very large scale of need?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Overall, we found that the project was constantly analyzing the changing environment and was responsive to the new needs and requests from the beneficiaries. Distribution of rice husk were changed into LPGs, the number of desludging activities was increased and new learning activities were recently introduced in the AFS/CFS centers in addition to the other recreational activities. Area that need to be improved are related to the activities undertaken in the AFS activities for the adolescents. The evaluation noticed that in the activity schedule, only few of them differed between the children attending the CFS and AFS. We were expecting more life skills activities for adolescents and more learning activities for both age groups. COAST recently introduced basic English literacy skills and math but the life skills component still needs to be scaled up for adolescents.

The evaluation team found that overall the project adapted well to the changing context as highlighted with the following evidences:

- The project initially distributed rice husk as source of energy but decided to change its focus to LPG distribution after being requested by the beneficiaries to do so as there was more health and social benefits (time saving for the women). As described later in this report, Tearfund/COAST have been among the first organizations to use LPG and more particularly to disseminate its learning and best practice in this area which has been appreciated.
- Knowing that some NFIs items were being sold after distribution (ex: hygiene kits delivered by other projects), the project found that it was preferable to invest in the delivery of high-quality items such as double layer blankets or clothes to reduce the chance that the items would be sold on the market. Beneficiaries interviewed valued the distribution of clothes and umbrellas.
While many NGOs built latrines, only few were interested in desludging them. COAST volunteered to undertake this task in training a volunteer network which added value to its interventions as this was a well-regarded activity by the refugees and by other WASH stakeholders. Also, the project initially planned to construct 2 Faecal Sludge Management (FSM) sites but because of space constraint, COAST Trust converted the activity to increase the number of desludged latrines whose waste is being disposed of in existing FSM sites run by other organisations. Also, it has to be noted that unlike certain organizations, COAST remained flexible in its intervention to desludge all latrines even those they did not build them themselves.

Like the desludging of latrines, waste management is also an activity that added value to the overall humanitarian action in the camps as only few agencies were ready to embark on these types of interventions.

The project had to constantly adapt and remained flexible to a fast-changing environment particularly in the NFI sector where the decision makers (Camp In Charge), tend to favor the organisations who have already a stock of items to distribute on the spot even though they previously committed to another organization who was in its final stage of procurement. Because of this, COAST had to distribute NFIs in blocks locations not initially planned which had required them to, sometimes, reassess the area.

Having observed a drop out in attendance in the CFS/AFS and after being requested by the parents, COAST recently introduced more learning activities in the centers to remain relevant to the needs.

Areas that need to be improved are related to the activities undertaken in the AFS activities for the adolescents. The evaluation noticed that in the activity schedules, only few of the sessions differed between the children attending the CFS and AFS. We were expecting more life skills activities for adolescents and more learning activities for both age groups. COAST recently introduced basic English literacy skills and math but the life skills component still needs to be scaled up for adolescents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Relevance to needs and appropriate target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF QS</td>
<td>Impartiality and Targeting, Protection and Gender, Population with specific needs, Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 1</td>
<td>Communities and people affected by crisis receive assistance appropriate and relevant to their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 3</td>
<td>To what extent activities of Tearfund/COAST’s response are suited to the priority needs of affected communities? To what extent the most vulnerable have been targeted? If not, why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Needs assessments**

*Summary:* For the initial project design, needs were assessed using existing assessments for the FDMNs population while additional study was conducted for the host communities. The findings of the latter were used for program design and also as an advocacy tool to call for more support for the Host communities that had been somehow “forgotten” by the humanitarian stakeholders. During the project implementation, series of qualitative and quantitative assessments were effectively conducted prior to the start of all activities. Shortcomings found is that reporting skills related to qualitative research such as reporting findings from FDGs still need to be strengthened.

**Strong points:**
As to avoid duplication of efforts and frustrate the respondents with too many assessments, for the FDMNs population, the initial phase 2 DEC funded plan had been prepared using existing data from assessments gathered between December 2017 and February 2018 that had been used to inform the Joint Response Plan (JRP), a coordination and consolidation process led by the ISCG. The JRP covers the period March to December 2018 and gives a full description of the needs found within each sector.

Although overall poverty levels in Cox’s Bazar district are similar to the national average (around 18% of people living under the lower poverty line), according to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework, Cox’s Bazar district is considered one of 20 (out of 64) ‘lagging districts’ of Bangladesh (based on indicators of poverty, literacy, nutrition, risks associated with environmental degradation, etc.). According to UNICEF’s pockets of social deprivation evaluation, Ukhia and Teknaf upazilas are among the 50 most socially deprived upazilas of Bangladesh (out of 509), based on indicators of literacy, child labour, access to sanitary toilets and connection to electricity (UNICEF 2013). Lack of adequate infrastructure and poor roads contribute to poor coverage of basic services and also make access to these services difficult. Before the influx of FDMNs, the host community was therefore already vulnerable because any shock that destroys or damages their assets would make them difficult to bounce back from. As of 12 December 2018, there were 907,952 Rohingyas refugees in Bangladesh mostly living in camps concentrated in two Upazilas of Cox’s Bazar District; Ukhia and Teknaf putting an immense strain on the almost half a million Bangladeshi who live there, and the District government in particular. Infrastructure, health and water services, and the environment, especially fragile forest and land resources, are now under massive pressure which also create tensions between host and refugees’ communities. The Rohingya now constitute at least one third of the total population. The Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) aims to meet the needs of 300,000 (54%) Bangladeshis of Teknaf and Ukhia, in the seven unions with the highest proportion of Rohingya people. When the crisis started mid-2017, only few NGOs such as COAST initially responded to the needs of the “forgotten” host communities as most of the new humanitarian comers had mainly focused their attention on the FDMNs.

As a local NGO with pre-crisis established presence in the affected areas, COAST Trust strongly advocated for more support for the host communities. With input from Tearfund, COAST Trust conducted an assessment among the host community from 1-18th February 2018. The exercise led to the production of an evidence-based information report that was used later on as an advocacy tool. While other existing reports were mainly providing quantitative figures on the impact of the emergency on host communities, we found that the added value of the qualitative study conducted by COAST and CCNF is that it showed a human face of the problem in sharing several testimonies of the affected communities. Also, the study was initially commissioned by the then acting Director General of NGOAB (NGO Affairs Bureau) Mr. KM Abdus Salam which had certainly increased later on the buy in of the results by the Government.

---

9 As an INGO, Solidarites International was already working for Teknaf’s communities prior to the crisis and had continued since then.
10 Crisis within the crisis, a study on impact of Rohingya influx on the host community, NGO affairs bureau, COAST and CCNF (Cox’s Bazar CSO NGO Forum) published in July 2018.
11 As mentioned by Mr Mohammad Abul Kalam NDC (Additional Secretary) from the Refugee Relief and Repatriation Commissioner, Cox’s Bazar in its appreciation letter to the study conducted by COAST, There had been several studies done on this topic: The International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) with the Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies (BIDS), Centre for Policy Dialogue (CPD), Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) with the Bangladesh Agricultural University, Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre (ADPC) with the Dhaka University, UNDP. This evaluation also found also that ACAPs/NPM analysis Hub, had published in January 2018 a thematic report that reviewed existing pieces of information gathered by UN agencies and INGOs on the impact of the Rohingya crisis on host communities.
The evaluation team found that thanks to a good collaboration and exchange of experience and monitoring tools (use of KOBO platform for quantitative survey), the project conducted effectively series of consultation and assessments to identify the needs of beneficiaries before the beginning of each intervention. More specifically, before starting each activity, secondary data were obtained from key informants’ interviews with government leaders, Madjees, other NGOs and community leaders. This phase was followed by few FGDs with potential beneficiaries to better understand their needs (including use of social mapping) and finally, a comprehensive quantitative survey (with the use KOBO) was completed to select the final beneficiaries in using the commonly agreed ISCG vulnerability criterias.

Area to improve

Prior to the implementation of the various activities, series of FGDs were organized to better understand i) the needs of the beneficiaries for Tree Plantation, Fuel support, IGA support, Winter Clothes\(^{12}\) ii) desludging needs\(^{13}\) and iii) cash for work priorities\(^{14}\). The evaluation found that the initiatives to conduct small qualitative researches (through FGDs) to identify needs are indeed a useful exercise. Nevertheless, the quality of the FDGs reports were found poor in term of analysis and information provided\(^{15}\). This finding highlights the needs for more training of COAST staff in qualitative research and reporting for qualitative type of assessments.

2. Relevance to needs

Summary: The TF/COAST intervention in DRR, NFIs, WASH, host community livelihood support and protection were found very relevant to the needs of both communities (host and FDMN). More specifically, the desk review conducted during this evaluation found that the main activities implemented by the project were aligning well with needs identified by other sectorial studies. (For example: gaps in adolescent programming and learning activities in the camps, gaps for desludging activities and lighting systems). In the meantime, the desk review and our findings also show that there are still important gaps that the project could not cover for the provision of lights\(^ {16}\), fuel and learning centers for the FDMNs in all camps.

Our analysis of the children registers for the CFS/AFS intervention shows that compared to their weight in the general camp population, the CFS/AFS centers receive proportionally more girls aged 5-11 and fewer boys and girls aged 12-17. This indicates that the AFS are less popular than the CFS and that there is a need to pro-actively enroll more adolescent girls in the AFS. There is also a growing demand from parents and children to include more learning activities in the centers. Learning activities have only been introduced recently by the project and would need to be put on scale.

Child Protection:

Strong points

---

12 Area: South shilerchora village, Rajapalong Union, Date: 9th August, 2018
13 Desludging Priority, Area: Blocks in camp 1, Date: 18th November, 2018
14 FGD on cash for work organized in Palongkhali on 17th October 2018.
15 For instance, some findings from the FDG conducted in Palongkhali on 17th October 2018, were not shared in the FDG report. (example, in relation to the identification of the most vulnerable groups who should benefit from the initiative). In November 2018, 12 FGDs were organized to identify desludging needs in camp 1 but the FDG report displays only three sentences to analyse the findings of the research done.
16 The review of the DEC funded 1st phase also recommended to provide lighting in camps and lamps to HH to mitigate protection risks.

The latest UNHCR factsheet on Mental Health & Psychosocial Support from November, 2018 reported that because of their experiences in Myanmar and the current difficult living conditions in the camps, 15-20% of refugees potentially have mild or moderate mental disorders and 3-4% of refugees potentially have severe mental disorders. The 6 COAST psychosocial counsellors have therefore contributed to address important needs in the mental health sector in providing psychosocial individual counselling sessions up to June 2018 when this activity was phased out.

The CFS/AFS beneficiary list segregates well the children for boys and girls. In addition, as evidenced by the analysis of this list (as of December 2018), COAST Trust has reached an almost equal number of girls and boys through its child protection initiatives as per the table below.

Our analysis of the Children’s attendance at CFS and AFS run by COAST Trust.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N°</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS (below 10 years)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46,4%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFS (10 years and above)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48,6%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47,7%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locations:
CFS: camps 1W and 1E only
AFS: camps 8, 1W, 1E

The chart above indicates that there is a good gender equality ratio in the CFS/AFS with girls outnumbering the boys.

---

17 Based on WHO projections of mental disorders in adult populations affected by emergencies.
18 CFS & AFS Participant list. COAST December 2018
Age and sex proportional analysis of children attending CFS/AFS in comparison to general population
(UNHCR data, 31 January 2019\(^{19}\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex- Age</th>
<th>Population in all camps</th>
<th>Representativity in relation to children population</th>
<th>Number of children in CFS/AFS (^{20})</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Comparison between data from CFS/AFS and general population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys 5-11</td>
<td>102 743</td>
<td>31,8 %</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>32,91%</td>
<td>+ 1,11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys 12-17</td>
<td>61 828</td>
<td>19,1 %</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>14,66%</td>
<td>-4,24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls 5-11</td>
<td>97 288</td>
<td>30,1 %</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>39,3%</td>
<td>+ 9,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls 12-17</td>
<td>60 918</td>
<td>18,8 %</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12,63%</td>
<td>-6,27 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total children</td>
<td>322 777</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-0,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other population</td>
<td>586 458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>909 235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our analysis shows that compared to their weight in the general camp population, the CFS/AFS centers receive proportionally more girls aged 5-11 and fewer boys and girls aged 12-17. This indicates that the AFS are less popular than the CFS. This finding is strengthened by the fact that there have been many requests from the parents to provide more learning for their grownup children as well as school supplies. In addition, it is known in the camps that once girls reach the age of puberty, they are asked by their parents to stay at home.

- According to the ISCG sitrep dated on 19 Jan 2019, Child Protection partners provide support to children through the 464 child protection facilities including CFSs, Girl Friendly Spaces (GFS) and Adolescent Friendly Spaces (AFS) across the camps. The DEC funding contributes to support 2.6% of these centers with 12 CFS/AFS run by COAST Trust with this funding.

**Areas to pay attention to remain relevant.**

- The ISCG report dated on 13 December 2018 reported that the education gap for pre-primary and primary aged children in camps remains approximately 98,440 learners for the age group of 3 to 14 years. It also mentioned that inadequate services for adolescents between 15 to 24 years of age remains a major concern as only 3,756 adolescents have access to education or life skills training – out of the 117,000 in need (97% gap) in all camps.

20 End of December 2018.
The same report highlighted that for all camps, only 218,765 girls and boys out of the Joint Response Plan target of 400,000 children (45% gap) are benefiting from psychosocial activities from the current 464 CFSs in operation in all camps.

CFS have been created to provide a sense of normalcy after the crisis and as an avenue for psychosocial support (PSS). One and half year after the crisis, COAST management staff and Tearfund are aware that the objectives of their CFS/AFS structures would now need to evolve to remain relevant as there is a high demand from parents for more learning activities. For this reason, COAST started recently to incorporate few sessions on basic English literacy and numeracy.

As per the November 2018 IOM needs assessment, lack of sufficient learning materials and access to transport constrain access to education facilities in camps 1W and 1E where TF/COAST are supporting AFS interventions. Additional notebooks, pencils and school bags have also been requested by the respondents interviewed during this evaluation.
When they arrived to the camps, most of the parents were unaware of various forms of child abuse and its long-term impact on children as they grow old. Therefore, it is recommended to introduce age specific session on child and sexual abuse for the children and adolescents of the centers.

NFI

Strong points:
- As seen in the chart below, cooking fuel and light remain the top concerns of the communities in camp 1E. (Findings similar for many other camps). 85% of respondents would prefer gas as their main energy source as reported by a recent study. These needs have also been reported during the FGDs we organized. To respond to these needs, in June 2018, COAST Trust has delivered 60,000kg of Rice Husk to 1,500 families and gradually moved to the distribution of LPGs for 200 Households in camp 1E.
- The contract with a vendor will be signed in a week time to procure 70 street lights between January to June 2019 and 30 more after July 2019. Specification for the design of the lighting system will follow UNHCR standards.
- These indicate the relevance of the COAST Trust intervention but also highlights that there are still many unmet needs in the camps. For instance, a mapping of the distribution of LPG shows that even though BDRC-UNHCR reported having distributed LPG to 70HHs in camp 1E, CCDB-Tearfund to 668 HHs and COAST to 200 HHs, the remaining needs are huge since camp 1E hosts 9,200 HHs.
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21 IOM Bangladesh Needs and Population Monitoring Site Assessment Round 13 SITE PROFILES November 2018
22 IOM Bangladesh Needs and Population Monitoring Site Assessment Round 13 SITE PROFILES November 2018
23 Ground Truth Solutions’ (GTS) surveys conducted in October 2018 about most basic needs in the camps: http://groundtruthsolutions.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Bangladesh_rohingya_needsservices_122018.pdf
Areas to improve or constraints faced:

- In June 2018, the project distributed 60,000 kgs of rice Husk to 1,500 families. The initial target was for 500 families where each family was supposed to receive 120kgs of rice husk, but the Government gave instruction to only distribute 40kg per family and for 1,500 families instead of 500. Because of this external (to the project) constraint, some beneficiaries were not satisfied with the quantity received.

- In October 2018, a study from Ground trust solutions found that Forty-four percent (44%) of Rohingya surveyed reported selling the aid items they received in order to better meet their needs. Among all camps, selling aid was found to be most common in Camp 2E, Camp 1E (the two main camps covered by this project) and Camp 22 (Unchiprang), where 71%, 69% and 66% report selling aid, respectively. The majority of beneficiaries used the cash to buy food items, firewood, medicine and cooking fuel.

- The overall issue related to the interdiction to access cash could probably be better addressed through more advocacy work since the Government does not allow the FDMNs to access cash transfer initiatives who is known to be a more relevant option in this context. Consideration related to market capacity and risk of price inflation should also be considered.

**WASH**

**Strong points**

- PDMs surveys conducted by the project show that only few beneficiaries sold the items received.
- As of 16 October 2018, the WASH sector identified a gap of 638 latrines in camp 1E and 569 for camp 1W. This is confirmed also by the Reach’s camp profiles for camp 1E and 1W where TF/COAST implements a WASH project. Reach’s figures below indicate that needs are not yet covered in terms of access to sanitation facilities compared to the Sphere Standards of 20
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25 Ground Truth Solutions’ (GTS) surveys conducted in October 2018 about most basic needs in the camps: http://groundtruthsolutions.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Bangladesh_rohingya_needservices_122018.pdf
26 Camp 2E and 2W are the main camps where COAST Trust is implementing the Tearfund funded project.
27 There is some level of tolerance for Cash for work initiative.
28 The PDM survey done after the risk husk distribution reported that almost every respondent from FDMN mentioned that they are using those NFIs, but out of 50 respondents 2 of them kept the Rice husk for later use, and 1 of them sold the item as he was in a bad need of money
29 Reach has provided an overview of water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) infrastructure within Camps in Ukhia, Cox’s Bazar. Primary data for this round was collected from 17 September to 22 October 2018.
persons/latrines. This means that the TF/COAST WASH intervention is relevant and well targeted but also that more need to be done to increase the number of safe latrines in the camps.

**Status of Sphere Standards indicator in term of access to latrines for Camp 1E and Camp 1W**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key sectoral standards</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Current Round</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of people per functional (non-full) and safe latrine</td>
<td>max. 20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of people per functional (non-full) latrine</td>
<td>max. 20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of people per safe latrine</td>
<td>max. 20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of shelters with at least one functional and safe latrine block within 50m</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feecal Sludge Management sites are rare in the camps where COAST is operating as evidenced by the ISCG map below. To ensure that the sludge collected can effectively carry up to the sites located at more than 100 meters radius from the latrines, COAST has used intermediaries mobile pumping system (trucks) that allow to bridge this gap. Sludge is disposed of in FSM sites operated by other agencies. The WASH Focal agency for camp 1E and 1W have praised the involvement of COAST in the desludging sector as there is a big gap in this area.

**Faecal Sludge Management map.**

FSM sites are enough but far from the latrines. Trucks are needed but expensive (Here limited access in camp 1E)

**DRR**

- The entire region, which used to be a forest area has been heavily affected by deforestation which has had a deep environmental impact. A large number of trees are required to regain the lost status of the place and also to make an ecological balance. Therefore, the project plan to plant 7500 trees is very relevant. Also, the project has used indigenous trees species that are present in the forest, following requirement from the forest department. As described in this report, survival rate of tree after plantation was poor and next plantation should be undertaken during the adequate seasonal period for planting trees.
- Following the WASH internal Tearfund Mission, already constructed drains are planned to be covered in areas where the slope is steep to avoid accidents with children.
- The ISCG report dated mid-august 2018 reported that there have been 12 fires in all the camps that involved 80 affected people. COAST is planning to purchase 50 fire extinguishers, one for each

---

30 Safe refers to fully covered latrines (i.e. a latrine with four walls, a roof and a lockable door).
10 HHs. Refill will be organized once a year by COAST Trust. This is an interesting activity as not many NGOs are involved in fire prevention. ISCG sitrep in Jan 2019 indicates that following a two-week mission of three fire experts delegated from the European Union, a fire safety strategy is being developed in coordination with all relevant organisations from the Government of Bangladesh (GoB) and the humanitarian community.

3. **Targeting and dedicated support to the most vulnerable groups.**

**Summary:** We found evidences that the project purposely intended to identify and support most vulnerable groups such as orphan, people with disabilities and female head of households. Specific vulnerability criteria were used during the assessment phases. CFS/AFS centers welcomes children with disabilities who feel well accepted by the facilitator and their friends according to parents and children themselves interviewed. Effort was made to include an assistive device in the latrines (handle in some of the doors) at the intention of elders and people with disabilities. Shortcoming is that CFS/AFS and other staff have not yet been trained on inclusive education.

As seen previously, the CFS/AFS beneficiary list segregates well the children for boys and girls. COAST Trust has reached an almost equal number of girls and boys through its child protection initiatives. COAST ensured a good gender balance of its protection team composed of men and women facilitators. Nevertheless, more need to be done to enroll more women in the management team of both organizations (Tearfund and COAST Trust). Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM) in Emergencies has partly been introduced in the WASH response of the project through the sensitzation of women groups on the importance to dry clothes used during the menstruation period. The 12 latrines constructed by the phase I of the DEC funding are gender segregated. The reach of Awareness raising activities can be improved for female head of households who have little access to information. AFS facilities have different shifts for adolescents’ boys and girls. Distribution sites for NFIs have distinct queues for men and women. NFI items such as clothes are gender sensitive.

- **Support to Most vulnerable groups:**
  - As highlighted previously, to inform the project design and implementation of activities, the project organized one FDG in South Shilerchora village, Rajapalong Union in August 2018 to identify needs related to the tree plantation activity and the delivery of NFIs (Fuel, IGAs and winter clothes). In addition, 2 gender segregated FGDs were conducted in Palongkhali in October 2018 in relation to the preferred Cash For Work activities. Another series of 12 FGDs was undertaken in Camp 1 in November to identify the number of toilets to be desludged and the issues faced with the sanitation facilities. These FGDs are also used to better understand local vulnerabilities and identify the typology of the most vulnerable groups.
  - Interestingly, vulnerability criteria were chosen by the communities themselves for the distribution of the clothes for the host communities in Rajapalong and Palongkhali union of Ukhiya. The self-selected criteria were 1) Day laborer, 2) Beggar 3) Woman headed of HHs, 4) Orphan, 5) Elderly people and 6) People with income of less than 6000-7000 takas.
  - At the start of the protection activities, Children participants for the CFS/AFS interventions were selected purposely among families considered as vulnerable (ex: children of female head of households, orphans’ children, children with disabilities...).
  - ISCG vulnerability criteria described in the Joint Response Plan have been used as a reference tool to prioritize the interventions on the most vulnerable groups. For instance, the HHs who benefited from the distribution of clothes and umbrella were selected based on vulnerability criteria such as: woman headed HH, Child laborer, families with
unaccompanied children, HHs with a person with disability, with an older person at risk with or without children, single male parents with infants.

- Learning from the findings of its PDM surveys, COAST Trust enrolled some volunteers to assist vulnerable groups to carry the goods to their houses with the limitation that in some cases the beneficiaries had still to pay for the service of three wheelers as they were living too far from the distribution points.

**Inclusion of disability**

- 2 Persons with disabilities were purposely selected among the group of 12 community garbage collectors hired for the project.
- CFS/AFS centers have been purposely enrolling children with disabilities but the staff has not yet been trained on disability inclusive services. Tailored activities have been organized for the children: Two children with disability interviewed separately during this evaluation reported being well accepted in the AFS 9 and CFS 8 visited. COAST had previously invited one child with disability to share his Burmese language skills with his peers to empower him in front of other children. Other children seemed very protective of their differently able friend and the staff has shown compassion and affection for this child during our visit in the center.
- Persons with disabilities and elders interviewed reported that they were given priority during the distribution of the NFI items and that they did not have to wait.
- For each 5 blocks latrines, one or two toilets have been equipped with a handle inside the door as a useful aid for people with disabilities and elders. In addition, all latrines visited had displayed visibility logos and the date of the last desludging intervention. Latrines were gender segregated and for some of them the roof of the facilities was made with transparent plastic sheet to ensure that there is enough light. Visited latrines were found clean and not far from a water point.
- One shortcoming found is that project beneficiary tracking sheets are “disability blind”\(^\text{31}\) as there is no provision to register specifically people with disability in the table. Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund (ASB) and Centre for Disability in Development (CDD) at the end of 2017, recommended that: “Advocacy and capacity building activities on the collection of Gender, Age and Disability Disaggregated Data (GADDD) and use of the Washington Group Short Set of Questions on Disability be undertaken for humanitarian actors to encourage greater use of them in data collection and support uptake of GADDD”.

\(^{31}\) Tearfund indicated that they mainly record information in the BTT which are required by Donor reporting templates.
Gender:
- In the camps, women and girls experience social restrictions significantly more than men and boys: social and cultural norms dictate traditional gender roles, where women and girls, especially adolescents, are generally restricted to their homes, and are often not able to realize their rights; They are also underrepresented in decision making.
- Child safety Committee membership include uneven participation of women. There are still room for improvement in term of participation and number of members. We found that some CSC have 45% of female participants while some of them have only few women.
- As seen previously, the CFS/AFS beneficiary list segregates well the children for boys and girls. COAST Trust has reached an almost equal number of girls and boys through its child protection initiatives.
- COAST ensured a good gender balance of its protection team composed of men and women facilitators. Nevertheless, more need to be done to enroll more women in the management team of both organizations (Tearfund and COAST Trust).
- Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM) in Emergencies has partly been introduced in the WASH response of the project through the sensitization of women groups on the importance to dry clothes used during the menstruation period.
- The 12 latrines constructed by the phase I of the DEC funding are gender segregated.
- The reach of Awareness raising activities can be improved for female head of households who have little access to information.
- AFS facilities have different shifts for adolescents’ boys and girls.
- Distribution sites for NFIs have distinct queues for men and women.
- NFI items such as clothes are gender sensitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Values and strengthening of existing capacities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF QS</td>
<td>Impartiality and Targeting, Protection and Gender, Population with specific needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 1</td>
<td>Communities and people affected by crisis receive assistance appropriate and relevant to their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 4</td>
<td>To what extent the project has used and enhanced existing skills, knowledge and coping strategies of the target group?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Self-reliance is difficult to build in the context of the Rohingyas crisis as the government of Bangladesh does not allow the FDMNs to work in the camps as daily worker. The project contributed to build the skills, knowledge and coping strategies of the target group in the areas of health, hygiene, child protection and DRR which are good first steps to build self-reliance. In addition, some adults benefited from short term jobs from the vendors contracted by the project to desludge the latrines and construct the drains. COAST Trust is also hiring directly 12 volunteers from the FDMNs. Parents meetings and Child Safety Committees are also good avenues that could be further used to empower further the FDMNs and increase the ownership of the project activities on the long run.

Due to being displaced from their homes and unable to earn an income (as this is not allowed by the government of Bangladesh), the FDMNs are very reliant upon humanitarian partners.
Male adults interviewed: “Before in Myanmar, we had developed knowledge and skills in the farming and fishing sectors. All our knowledge is now useless as we have no lands to cultivate and no access to fishing boats”

In addition, beneficiaries reported having gained many new knowledge and skills in the areas of health, hygiene and DRR which is a good first step to increase self-reliance.

“We have been trained on how to prepare for disasters so we know what to do and where to go if we need to evacuate”

Activities like distributions and the provision of services provide some but limited opportunities to build local capacities and improve self-resilience in communities. The project provided the following casual labor opportunities for the FDMNs that they can use their skills as daily labor:
- Construction of drains (through the vendors assigned for this work)
- Desludging of latrines organized through the vendors contracted from host communities
- 12 Garbage collectors were recruited from the FDMNs to cleans the drains, the tube wells, the latrines and collect the waste.

The project currently offers limited opportunities for social cohesion, sustainability and ownership of the services provided
- As it is difficult to find qualified and educated personnel in the camps, all facilitators of the CFS/AFS centers are from the host communities which does not promote full ownership of the centers by the refugees themselves.
- COAST support the organization of parent’s meetings twice a month and the participants to these meetings have shared that they had learnt many new skills during these gatherings. Nevertheless, parents’ meetings are not used yet as avenue to discuss the affairs of the centers and cannot be considered yet as a “parent teacher associations (PTAs)”
- Members of the child Safety committees need to be further empowered to be able to develop by themselves structured awareness raising activities to tackle the root causes of protection issues in the camps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Coherence with TF’s values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF QS</td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 1</td>
<td>Communities and people affected by crisis receive assistance appropriate and relevant to their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 5</td>
<td>To what extent the COAST project is consistent with the vision, values, strategy and resources of Tearfund?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Both organisations have many similarities in term of vision and values. The support provided is not only aligned with the objectives of both organizations but the partnership is also contributing to the localization agenda of the humanitarian aid in Bangladesh. Trainings through workshop settings and coaching were the two main effective avenues used for capacity building. Contributing factors of success are also related to the efficient management style and expertise of both organizations where polyvalence of tasks between staff is valued which also contributes to a culture of peer learning.
In a context of emergency such as the Rohingyas crisis, one of the main global stated outcomes of Tearfund is “to ensure that communities affected by disasters receive lifesaving assistance, recover quickly and are better equipped to face and respond to future hazards.” Similarly, two of the six stated objectives of COAST Trust are related to disaster risk reduction and crisis management: “To undertake disaster preparedness and post-disaster rehabilitation programs in the coastal areas” and to “to undertake humanitarian welfare services specially for women and children of disadvantaged and poor families.”

Whenever possible, Tearfund’s operational strategy is generally to deliver its support through partners who have the potential “to transform the lives of millions living in poverty.”

In Cox’s bazar, community based organisations have organized themselves into the CSO-NGO forum. Supported by COAST Trust, in a published policy brief, they have advocated for more inclusion into the Inter Sector Coordination Group as well as a larger operational role, with decision-making power rather than implementing power only. During 2013-2016, the World Humanitarian Summit emphasized on the importance of localization and accountability of the humanitarian aid. Through its support to a local NGO such as COAST trust, TF is also directly contributing to making this localization goal a reality.

Joint partnership and capacity building activities are being regularly conducted to ensure the quality of the intervention.

As stated in its annual report 2017/2018, capacity building is an important aspect of TF’s intervention globally: “We care passionately about building the capacity of our local partners so they can take a lead in and shape any humanitarian response, especially in small- to medium scale disasters.”

This approach is aligned with the Core Humanitarian Standard 3 that aims to ensure that humanitarian response strengthens local capacities and avoids negative effects.

Trained staff are an important component of any humanitarian projects to ensure that communities and people affected by crisis will benefit from a qualitative service. Below is a list of trainings organized by Tearfund and other organizations that benefited to several COAST Trust staff during the time of this project. COAST management staff were very satisfied with the support provided by Tearfund to attend these events and to the technical follow up and coaching provided along the project.

**Trainings organised by Tearfund:**

- A one-day orientation workshop was organized by TEARFUND before the Post Distribution Monitoring surveys to train the facilitators and M&E staff on Mobile Data Collection and Kobo platform.
- COAST M&E Officer attended a Training on Cash Transfer program organized by Tearfund.
- In addition, TF facilitated contingency, procurement and WASH trainings for COAST Trust.

**Testimony from one COAST staff:** ‘KOBO has a massive impact on managing different aspect of program management. It makes our work easier.’

**Training conducted by other organizations and benefiting the project:**

- COAST M&E staff and a supervisor participated in a workshop on tree plantation organized jointly by UNHCR and IOM.
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• COAST Trust’s Program manager and Monitoring Officer followed a training on CCP organized by Red Cross, BBC Radio
• COAST Trust’s monitoring Officer attended a training on Multi-sectoral Emergency Program organized by IOM
• Supervisors from COAST Trust were trained on WASH quality standard in emergencies by IOM staff.

Other trainings were conducted for COAST Trust and Tearfund staff on safeguarding, Child protection, management of CFS/AFS, psychosocial counselling, Quality Standards and programming approach, Post Monitoring Distribution, PARCEL (procurement related), Core Humanitarian Standard and The Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief.

Project management
During the data collection phase and discussion with several project staff, the evaluation team felt that:
• The relationship between Tearfund and COAST Trust was good and recognized by both partners.
• Tearfund staff was visiting very regularly the project sites several times a week.
• Beside the organization of workshop type of training as described above, Tearfund provides ongoing coaching support to ensure the quality insurance of the project through regular monitoring and technical support (for assessments and for monitoring related activities and also to ensure finance/donor compliances).
• Both organisations have qualified staff with high level of commitment and good senior level managers.
• Working atmosphere in both workplaces are friendly and conducive for a good work performance.
• Strengths and previous technical background of staff from both organisations were valued and polyvalence of tasks was common. Staff in charge of the implementation of different project components were helping each other in case of increase workload. This attitude contributes to peers learning and strengthen the overall institutional knowledge of the overall organization.
• Project team on the ground are respecting a good gender balance (CFS/AFS facilitators), nevertheless more need to be done to enroll more women at the more senior level positions in both organizations including at the level of project officer and manager.

6.2.2. Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low or no visible contribution to this aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some evidence of contribution to this aspect but significant improvement required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Evidence of satisfactory contribution to this aspect but improvement required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evidence of good contribution to this aspect with some areas for improvement and change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Evidence that the contribution is strong and/or exceeding that which was expected of the project/programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RELEVANCE: 3**

The evaluation found strong evidences of relevant activities being implemented. The various components also add value to the overall emergency response and contribute to bridge gaps without overlapping with the work of other humanitarian agencies. The relevance of the AFS intervention would need to be strengthened through a stronger focus on like skills and increased participatory approaches for adolescents.
6.3. Effectiveness

Effectiveness: A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.

6.3.1. Key findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Status of project implementation and contributing factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF QS</td>
<td>Resilience (Tearfund QS on Environment and Disaster Risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 3</td>
<td>Communities and people affected by crisis are not negatively affected and are more prepared, resilient and less at-risk as a result of humanitarian action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 11</td>
<td>For each project component, to what extent the project achieved its intended project outputs and project purpose? What have been the major internal and external factors that have influenced the achievement / non-achievement of the project objectives and outputs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome A - Improved psychosocial support for FDMN and host population.
Outcome B - Improved NFI support to FDMN and host population
Outcome C - Improved standard of WASH facilities for FDMN population
Outcome D - DRR and preparedness amongst FDMN and host population
Outcome E - Improved livelihood opportunities for host community

PROTECTION

Overall view of the achievements of the protection component
CFS/AFS intervention

Summary Outcome A - Improved psychosocial support for FDMN and host population.
The evaluation found that all the visited CFS/AFS were performing well according to the commonly agreed standards from the ISCG protection working group. The facilities had effectively developed several tools such as service maps, register for daily attendance of the children, activity schedule and access to functioning and well-maintained nearby WASH facilities for the children including availability of soaps (in the centers). The facilitators were trained on how to run the centers, on child development and child rights, on DRR and hygiene promotion and on how and where to refer protection cases to other services. The visited centers were well maintained, had a First Aid box and the children staff ratio was 30 for two facilitators/shift (against a standard of 25). All staff interviewed reported having signed the Code of Conduct and could mention key elements/messages referred in the documents.

Realizing that there was a growing demand for more educational type of activities, COAST introduced recently basic literacy, math and English lessons in addition to the recreational activities appreciated by the children. This move is also contributing to retain the children in the centers.

Shortcomings found are: dropout rates are not yet systematically tracked and analyzed by the project staff, more child centered and participatory activities are needed and more particularly for the adolescents, staff are not yet tracking the attendance of their children to other learning centers and some of the training curriculums used, would need to be contextualized to the camp situation. Also, the evaluation team felt that there was not a systematic process put in place by the project to use the members of the Child Safety Committees as agents of change to organize structured awareness raising activities. Sensitizations took place more on an unformal basis and there was no indicator in the project to track the effectiveness and number of awareness raising sessions organized by the committees.

Strong points

- To assess the quality of the CFS/AFS intervention, the evaluation team developed a questionnaire that used qualitative indicators developed by the Child Protection sector. (see in annex 10.9). It was found that all the visited CFS/AFS were performing well according to these standards. The facilities had effectively developed several tools such as service maps, register for daily attendance of the children, activity schedule and access to functioning and well-maintained nearby WASH facilities for the children including availability of soaps (in the centers). The facilitators were trained on how to run the centers, on child development and child rights, on DRR and hygiene promotion and on how and where to refer protection cases to other services. The visited centers were well maintained, had a First Aid box and the children staff ratio was 30 for two facilitators/shift (against a standard of 25). All staff interviewed reported having signed the Code of Conduct and could mention key elements/messages referred in the documents.

- COAST organizes many recreational activities in the CFS involving games and drawing such as carom, spinning rope, building blocks, magic slate, puzzle box, football etc. The staff also included local games. In addition, Children also received lessons on personal hygiene, health education, Disaster Risk Reduction and adolescence care (for the AFS).

- Realizing that there was a growing demand for more educational type of activities, COAST introduced recently basic literacy, math and English lessons who have contributed to retain the children in the centers.

- Overall the parents and children met during the evaluation expressed their strong appreciation of the centers, felt satisfied with the behavior of the facilitators and of the relevance and cultural appropriateness of the games and activities taught in the centers. One game (the Ludo) was
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promptly removed in some centers as it was considered as a game that could have encouraged gambling behavior (according to the Rohingyas cultural belief). Many children interviewed shared that they attended the centers since it started. The attendance registers show that among those attending regularly the activities, only few had missed classes showing their satisfaction with the activities of the centers.

- In the last few years, parents of children attending the CFS reported that their children did not attend any school or have not attended any sessions where they could learn education. (even though their children attended several centers such as Madrasat and other newly set up learning centers). Very few had taken private lessons from teachers in Myanmar. Since they have arrived in Bangladesh, their children started to get education from the CFS/AFS centers. Most of the members in the community are sending their children to the CFS/AFS in the blocks where COAST Trust is operating.

- There is no pressure from any side on the parents to send their children to CFS/AFS. They send them voluntarily and children are happy to attend as evidenced by the attendance sheets and by the testimonies shared by the children to the evaluation team.

- The timing of the CFS is, for most of the time, not contrasting to any existing activities for example religious school, prayer time, etc.

Area to strengthen

- Dropout rates are not yet systematically tracked and analyzed by the project staff. Our estimates vary from 5 to 33% depending on the centers visited (In the AFS 9 visited, the dropout rate was 33% in average for the last 12 months, while it was only 5% in AFS 7 for one year and 20% for the last three months for CFS 6). We found many reasons to explain the drop out cases i) other learning centers were attracting more children because they were provided bags and note books. ii) parents of children also wished that their children acquire learning skills in the religious schools/madrassas (since then COAST introduced more non-formal education sessions as described previously), ii children and their families relocated to other blocks in the camps, iv) COAST had to stop the distribution of snacks early January 2019 as it waits for the approval of the FD6 to resume the distribution v) children fell sick.

- The study found that it is necessary to keep including new things in the program. Few participatory and child centered activities that Coast Trust can introduce are- Reading room, drawing club, debate club, etc. There is a need to introduce more life skill development for adolescents. The project could for example organize demonstration exercise (drill) while offering DRR sessions for children and parents.

- COAST’s CFS/AFS centers could potentially receive 3 to 5 additional children per center. (not more as the space is limited) Unfortunately, it seems that the reason why this is not done is related to the limited budget allocated by the project for the provision of snacks and other learning materials to the children. This is an issue that could be resolved with a budget reallocation that could also contribute to reduce the dropout rate.

- COAST just recently put in place a register to track the cases refer by the child Safety Committees to other services. It will be interesting to regularly consolidate these figures in all the CFS/AFS as this can provide useful indication of the activities conducted by the members of the Committees and be used also as an indicator of the main protection issues faced in the project area.

- Facilitators of the CFS/AFS did not receive yet a training on Psychosocial First Aid even though they are regularly in contact with children who have experienced important traumas in a recent past.

- Beside the existing collaboration and coordination with the koranic schools, it was not clear during this evaluation if the staff of the CFS/AFS keeps track of the attendance of the CFS/AFS children to
other newly set up and nearby learning centers. This is an important indicator to track as it provides useful information for the centers to verify that their activities remain relevant to needs.

- Field level collaboration between nearby CFS and learning centers run by other NGOs could be strengthened in relation to sharing of best practices and exchange of information. In one center (AFS 7), we surveyed the attendance of 30 children boys and found that 50% of them were attending every day 3 different centers (The koranic school, the learning center and the AFS), 20% attend 2 centers (the Koranic school and the AFS) and 20% only the AFS.
- A review of the curriculums used to train the facilitators reveals that many of them are not contextualized to the emergency situation. Also, the curriculums use many concepts that would need to be unpacked with practical examples of a real situation.

Child safety Committee (CSC)

**Strong points**

- CSCs are operating from the beginning of the development of the CFS/AFS centers.
- There are 15 members in each CSC. Majhi, Imam, religious Leaders, influential people in the communities are the main members of the committees. The number of women varies from one committee to the other. There was no female member in one committee and 7 out of 15 in one other AFS center 7.
- There are two meetings of CSC held each month where all the members participate.
- The topic that they discuss include- early child marriage, child labor, Complain for referral, disaster preparedness and hygiene promotion and positive parenting skills.
- Some of the child protection issues that are facing in the camp include- children being unattended by their parents (parents are busy doing other works and young children are playing outside unattended), uncovered drain, garbage dumbed everywhere (spreading germs), child marriage, child labor and violence against children.
- Child safety committees have received training on personal hygiene, disaster preparedness, Child rights and child protection and started to change their behavior but have not been used yet at their full potential as explained thereafter.
- Member have very limited knowledge about child and sexual abuse and requires training on the matter so that they can share it with the community members.
- Members told that there is no cases of child labor and early marriage as they strongly advocate against these issues.

**Area to improve**

- Members of the CSC are relaying to some extend the information they got from their protection trainings to the communities. The evaluation met a group of women head of households who were not aware of the activities of the CSC. Women head of household are lacking access to information in the camps as most of the information is generally provided to women through their husband.
- Also, the evaluation team felt that there was not a systematic process put in place by the project to use the members of the CSC as agents of change and to organize more structured awareness activities. Sensitizations took place more on an unformal basis and there was no indicator in the project to track the effectiveness and number of awareness raising sessions organized by the committees.
Psychosocial counsellors’ intervention

- The project recruited 6 psychosocial counselors in Feb 2018. They received a first 2 days training in Feb 2018 on mental health support, followed by another training of 3 days in March 2018 conducted by WHO. They effectively worked from April to June 2018 before the intervention was stopped as other NGOs such as Save the Children was better positioned to continue the activity in the same locations.

- Lessons learnt from this first intervention: The project did not put in place a system to psychologically debrief the counselors. Data about beneficiaries were not recorded in a database but on hard copy files. Confidentiality of the data was ensured but the project could have benefited from a systematized process to computerize the beneficiary files while in the same time preserving the confidentiality of information. Also, there was no system in place to monitor the level satisfaction of the intervention by the clients who were supported.

NFI

Overall view of the achievements of the NFI component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output #</th>
<th>Planned output</th>
<th>No. of beneficiaries</th>
<th>Unit of measurement</th>
<th>Admin level</th>
<th>Total beneficiaries</th>
<th>Comments as of 4 February 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1.1.1</td>
<td>650 households in FDMN, populations receiving charcoal/biomass/biofuel was 1,000</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Po-kaing</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>In June 2018, the project distributed 60,000 kg of charcoal to 1,000 families. 200 kg of firewood per household was distributed to each family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1.2.1</td>
<td>420 households host community, houses to be used as shelter</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Po-kaing</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>In April 2018, COAST arranged 4 community meetings regarding NFI distribution. Distribution only took place within the new FDI agreement starting after April 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1.2.2</td>
<td>420 households host community, houses to be used as shelter</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Po-kaing</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>In April 2018, COAST arranged 4 community meetings regarding NFI distribution. Distribution only took place within the new FDI agreement starting after April 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1.3.1</td>
<td>600 households in FDMN, populations received NFIs including clothing items, umbrellas, blankets,</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Po-kaing</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Compressed Rice, Long Umbrellas, and 500 Families in June 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1.4.1</td>
<td>420 households in host community, received NFIs including clothing items, umbrellas, blankets</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Po-kaing</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>447 NFI received rice, clothes in Feb 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1.4.2</td>
<td>420 households in host community, received NFIs including clothing items, umbrellas, blankets,</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Po-kaing</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>395 instead of 421 NFI received rice, clothes in Feb 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Outcome B- Improved NFI support to FDMN and host population

Charcoal and LPGs were distributed for all FDMNs in the locations assigned to COAST. Umbrella and clothes were only provided to vulnerable population such as people with disabilities, elders and women head of households. Beneficiaries categorized as more vulnerable who were interviewed during the PDM survey and during this evaluation found that the quality of the NFIs received was good and that the waiting time at distribution site was reasonable. Special queues were organized for vulnerable groups who also reported being well respected and supported. The project conducted several Post Distribution Monitoring surveys and has tried to implement the learnings that came from the findings of these surveys.

Shortcomings are related to the weight of some NFIs package, the provision of sufficient lead time before the distribution and the lack of information for complaint in the NFI package. (even though a help desk was set up at distribution points).
Strong points

- Charcoal and LPGs were distributed for all FDMNs in the location assigned to COAST. Umbrella and clothes were only provided to vulnerable population such as people with disabilities, elders and women head of households.
- Beneficiaries categorized as more vulnerable who were interviewed during the PDM survey found that the quality of the NFIs received was good and that the waiting time at distribution site was reasonable and under 1 hour. This time was even reduced further for Most vulnerable groups who benefited from a special queue line and assistance from porters when needed.
- Elders, women and people with disabilities interviewed were thankful of the aid received and found that the project staff was respectful of their needs.

Area to improve

- Main findings of the PDM surveys are related to the weight of the NFI package delivered and the lack of initial provision from the project to help the beneficiaries carrying the goods received to their house.\(^{35}\) COAST has now organized a system of porters for the most vulnerable groups.
- Many FDMNS interviewed reported that they had to pay between 10 to 20 takas to hire three wheelers to help them carry their items to their houses as even the porters could not do the job for them because of the long distance between distribution points and their houses. It is useful here to note that Government allocated specified location for any item distribution which are not often close to the refugee’s houses.
- Beside the Madjis, FDMNS interviewed during the evaluation did not know where to launch a complaint as they were not shared contact information of COAST during distribution time.
- Other recurrent issues found in the PDMs surveys are related to the lack of sufficient lead time before the distribution days.
- 56% of the respondents who had received rice husks in June 2018, shared that the quantity was not sufficient for their household. The reason is that the project distributed 60,000kg Rice Husk to 1,500 families. In the FD7 the target was for 500 families only where each family was supposed to receive 120kg Rice husk, but government gave instruction to only distribute 40kg per family but for 1,500 families instead of 500. Ultimately it is expected that these beneficiaries will receive LPGs support that is currently rolling out for all HHs in the camps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Monitoring tools used</th>
<th>Main learnings from the monitoring activities of the NFI component. (Source: PDMs surveys)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NFI distribution (rice husks and blankets)</td>
<td>Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey (April 2018) FDMN and 9 host communities ‘s villages</td>
<td>96% of the respondents were satisfied with the quality of the rice and blankets received. Nevertheless, the majority thought that the quantity should be increased. 78% of the FDMN mentioned that the quantity of rice was enough for a period that varies from 10 to 20 days. The majority of respondents (FDMN and Host) reported that the packaging for the rice/blankets received was fine or somehow fine to carry. 72% of the respondents got the information just one day earlier of the distribution. Due to some limitations, 26% of the beneficiaries were informed on the very same day of distribution. Majority of people interviewed did not know where to report a complaint.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{35}\) In June 2018, a woman used the COAST Trust Complaint Response Mechanism (CRM) to report that her husband died and that she had difficulties at the distribution site to carry the relief items herself with her two children. COAST assigned one volunteer to support her but this case and results from the PDMs surveys had implied that there was not a formal system in place to support most vulnerable group during NFI distribution.
conducted during Phase 1.

Main recommendations extracted from the PDM survey report:

1) The package should be more portable and easier to carry.
2) Report/Feedback mechanism should be put in place.
3) Quantity of NFIs should vary according to family size.
4) Beneficiaries should be informed about the distribution date at least two days in advance.
5) PDM should be taken place within 20-30 days of distribution.

Distribution of tree seedling in Nov 2018 for 256 HHs
Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey and report. (Nov 2018)

The package delivered (1 tree+25 sticks+1 sack) was too heavy to carry for some families. The distribution did not take place on the right season. Token for trees were not distributed early enough.

Distribution of clothes and charcoal to FDMNs
PDM report of Lungi Thami and Charcoal (June 2018) camp 1W of Kutupalong

The data analysis shows that beneficiaries were satisfied with the NFI content and quality. There were issues with the quantity of items and the distribution process. 24% of the surveyed beneficiary said they had to pay someone to help them carrying their items, most of the beneficiary did not know about the items that they were going to receive and did not get information on time prior to the distribution day.

56% of the respondents shared that the quantity was not sufficient for their household. People requested urgent need of LP Gas.

WASH

Overall view of the achievements of the WASH component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Planned output</th>
<th>No. of beneficiary</th>
<th>Unit of measurement</th>
<th>Admin Level</th>
<th>Comments as of 4 February 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1.1.1</td>
<td>Maintenance of existing tube wells (including water quality audit)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Water points</td>
<td>Palangi Khel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.2.1</td>
<td>Maintenance of existing latrines (cleaning and monitoring)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Latrines (individual)</td>
<td>Palangi Khel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.3.1</td>
<td>Hygiene promotion sessions with 2000 parents of children attending OSH/IPS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>Palangi Khel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.4.1</td>
<td>Farewell desludge management for existing latrines</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>Latrines (individual)</td>
<td>Palangi Khel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.5.1</td>
<td>Emergency provision of safe drinking water</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Palangi Khel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.6.1</td>
<td>Assessment of water underflying UNH and Terrel access to from future WASH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>Palangi Khel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Outcome C- Improved standard of WASH facilities for FDMN population

Unlike other organizations involved in the WASH sector, COAST Trust supported the desludging of a higher than planned number of latrines (950 against 550 planned) and waste management activities. As reported by the WASH focal agency in the camps, many other organisations would not be interested to conduct these types of activities and there is still a big gap in this sector. Therefore, the WASH intervention implemented by the project adds value to the overall emergency response and contributes to a better health environment. The main shortcoming is that the incentive scale for the garbage collectors needs to be revised to better match with the ISCG commonly agreed standards as the volunteers are currently receiving a lower incentive.
Strong points

- Hygiene promotion sessions are organized through interpersonal communication means that involve series of courtyards meetings composed of 10 HHs each. This is an effective way to disseminate key messages as the participants can also practice their skills. In addition, the hygiene promoters also conduct door to door post monitoring visits to ensure that knowledge is effectively translated into practice.

- Unlike other organizations involved in the WASH sector, COAST Trust supported the desludging of a high number of latrines (950) and waste management activities. As reported by the WASH focal agency in the camps, many other organisations would not be interested to conduct these types of activities and there is a gap in this sector.

- As evidenced by the OXFAM study, WASH’s priorities need to focus more on inclusion and quality and more particularly to address the needs of women and more vulnerable people such as People with disabilities. COAST has already implemented many good practices: Latrines constructed by the project effectively displayed logos of the organization, are gender segregated and for some of them include a specific handle attached to the door of the latrines to assist people with disabilities and elders.

Unaddressed sanitation and security issues at camp 1 W and camp 1 E

- One key factor that has complicated the desludging work of the latrines undertaken by COAST is that many of the toilet’s facilities are situated outside the 100 meters radius of an Faecal Sludge Management (FSM) site (See evidence below). To overcome this constraint, the project contracted a vendor with a mobile desludging mechanical unit that could carry the sludge up to the FSM existing sites.

Areas to improve

- Notwithstanding the effectiveness of interpersonal communication for the hygiene sessions, the result of the PDM survey conducted in December 2018 also show that there is room for improvement in terms of knowledge retention.

---
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Unskilled volunteers such garbage collector hired by the project are currently receiving incentives of 3,000 takas/month while they should receive 50 takas per hour work as per the agreed and validated guidelines of RRRC and ISCG. One garbage collector interviewed during this study reported working 4 hours/day since October 2018. If we consider an average of 22 working days per month X 4 hours/day, he should have received 4,400 Takas per month.

Handle use in some latrines to assist People with disabilities and elders. Photo credit: Eric Debert

---

Overall view of the achievements of the Disaster Risk Reduction component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome D</th>
<th>DRR and preparedness amongst FDMN and host population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1.1.1</td>
<td>Construction of drains to allow fast removal of water from settlement. 4 drains constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.2.1</td>
<td>Site management training with Majhees. 100 attendees. Pakka Khali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.3.1</td>
<td>DRF activities to reduce the negative impact of the monsoon season. 34 attendees. Pakka Khali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.4.1</td>
<td>Planting trees to reduce risk of landslide. 7500 trees planted. Pakka Khali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.5.1</td>
<td>Garbage collection and disposal. Pakka Khali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.6.1</td>
<td>Community awareness raising of DRR and environmental sustainability. 4 meetings. Pakka Khali</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Outcome D - DRR and preparedness amongst FDMN and host population

During the project, Majhees have received training on DRR and preparedness measures. The training sessions covered subjects like cyclone, flash flood, landslide preparedness, rescue, signals, etc. Nevertheless, the training curriculum would need to be further contextualized to the camp situation and includes fire safety activities. Also, the messages provided focused more on what to do before an event and less for the period during and after disaster. Parents and children interviewed reported having gained new knowledge and skills and feel more prepared in case of natural hazards. The project should also provide additional fire extinguishers as only 2 out of 12 CFS/AFS centers are currently equipped. In the host communities, schools identified still need to be retrofitted and DRR days organized.

- During the project, Majhees have received training on DRR and preparedness measures. The training sessions covered subjects like cyclone, flash flood, landslide preparedness, rescue, signals, etc.
- Majhees interviewed were able to point out what different signal stands for. They could also recall the messages that they have learned to do before, during and after a disaster situation. Nevertheless, most of the messages remembered concerned the period before disaster and were mainly related to cyclone preparedness only. (while there are other hazards occurring in the camps)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preserve dry foods.</td>
<td>Rescue elderly people and Children and keep them in a safe place.</td>
<td>Avoid walking into moving or deep water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie House with ropes.</td>
<td>Helping own family and members first and then Prepare for additional flooding. Be aware of swept debris and other hazardous materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep necessary/important papers in a safe place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Move to a safer place when there is a possibility of landslide.
- Keep a Torch
- Keep strong people from the community ready if there is any emergency.
- Prepare an exit plan.
- Keep an eye on warning sign.

| helping other neighbors and others. |
| Keep an eye on warning sign. |
| Don’t move during disaster. |

- They have organized a team of volunteers from the community (Safety Unit Volunteers) trained by American Red Cross similar to the Cyclone Preparedness Government Program (CPP) who have been given basic orientation by themselves on disaster preparedness and rescue. These volunteers are working within the community to discuss preparedness measures.
- During a disaster situation, even though there was no major disaster last year, they used mike to inform people about a possible risk and signal.
- The majdhis have also organized discussion session on DRR and Disaster preparedness after the prayer at the Mosque.

**Strong points:**
- CFS/AFS centers have been selected as evacuation centers in case of emergency. The centers are well equipped with mats, water filters, hand buckets and mugs. The centers are built with strong concrete poles and cement floor.
- Parents interviewed reported having gained new knowledge and skills and feel more prepared in case of natural hazards.

**Area to improve:**
- There was no special DRR training conducted specially for the women.
- There is no formal link between the COAST DRR program with the Cyclone Preparedness Program (CPP) that is being rolled out in the all camps, but there is informal communication on DRR specially on understanding flag/signal that are used during an emergency/cyclone.
- Majdhis trained on DRR by the project have mentioned that they were sensitizing the population on the key lifesaving messages to implement before, during and after an event. Nevertheless, there is no monitoring tool to assess the effectiveness of their awareness raising activity.
- In case of imminent natural hazard, access to camps will most likely be restrained. For this reason, the prepositioning of food supplies (biscuits) in the CFS/AFS centers (that are used as evacuation centers) needs to be ensured during rainy and cyclone seasons. In addition, roofs to beams connections should be reinforced to sustain strong winds as per instruction from the Bangladesh Red Cross.
- The centers have First Aid Kits available but only 2 out of the 12 centers have one Extinguisher. The two Fire Extinguishers (FE) were provided by Site Management agencies. The project plans to buy more FE.
- Fire prevention is not yet part of the curriculum for the CFS/AFS activities.

---

• Construction of drains are taking away the water, it is reducing the risk of contamination of water and germs that would spread within the refugees. Nevertheless, in one instance observed during the evaluation, the drained water ends up on a flat land surrounded by shelters which contributes to waterlogging. Coordination needs to take place to inform the site management agency to take action on this health hazard.

• DRR curriculum is not fully contextualized to the camp situation while it should focus mainly on the hazards encountered in the camps (fire, landslides, heavy rains, winds, cyclone).
LIVELIHOODS

Status of the achievements of the livelihood project component

Summary Outcome E - Improved livelihood opportunities for host community

At the time of the evaluation, the identification of the beneficiaries, the implementation of the main livelihood’s activities did not start yet. (market assessment, technical trainings and provision of Income Generating Activities IGAs). The project staff is confident that they can complete the activities before September 2019. The evaluation team believes that the project may not have time to measure the impact of the livelihoods component and undertake post-harvest assessments as well as measure gain in income. A cost or no cost extension may then be required. The evaluation team also believe that the selection of livelihoods options should not only take in consideration profitability and access to market but also risks related to disaster and climate change issues.

Discussion with the Host community show that they are also in a vulnerable position. Because of the consequences of the crisis, daily workers can now only find 2-3 days’ work in a week which is least 50% less than what they had access before the crisis. The wage has also gone down to less than 200 BDT per day compared to 500 BDT pre-crisis.

Host community respondents shared with the evaluation team that they were impacted by the humanitarian crisis:

"I used to cultivate 5 acre of land and had mango trees from which I earned BDT 150000/ per year. But this year as rohingha people came and occupied the land I had to sell all the mangoes a month before harvesting at BDT 25000/ "

Similarly, another respondent said:

"I had six cows which I used for cultivation but now I have no cows remaining. They are stolen and I am now out of work."

The livelihood project component is at planning stage and is awaiting approval from government NGO affairs bureau (FD6 approval for host communities).
Livelihood Need assessment has not been done yet. Tearfund is developing a format. The project has recently collected qualitative data to better understand the potential type of IGAs that could be selected by the beneficiaries and discussed the various group set up that could be developed.

The group formation is under process. The criteria are set for each group. The group (should be) homogenous in terms of religion/ gender (women preferably) and profession (Labor/non-agriculture/Agriculture).

The Beneficiary selection has been completed.

Market assessment is not done yet but the tool has been developed.

Post-Harvest Survey will be done when needed. No format has been developed yet.

**Points of attention:**

- Additional Staff may be required to complete the remaining interventions as there will only be few months left to implement the activities between April and September 2019. There will a lot of pressure once the livelihood initiative starts (group formation, need assessment, market assessment, distribution, monitoring and assessment of impact).
- The evaluation team believes that the project may not have time to measure the impact of the livelihoods component and undertake post-harvest assessment as well as measure gain in income. A cost or no cost extension may be required.
- Selection of livelihoods options should not only take in consideration profitability and access to market but also risks related to disaster and climate change issues.

**FACTORS THAT HAVE INFLUENCED THE PROJECT**

Negative external factors that have influenced the project achievements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Measures taken by the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lengthy process to obtain the FD7 authorization to operate</td>
<td>Continuous engagement with NGO affairs bureau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow site selection and approval process from camp level authority who is also very busy and therefore difficult to access.</td>
<td>Continuous engagement with CiC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other NGOs provide in kind donations to children to attend the CFS/AFS activities while COAST Trust was not doing it and had difficulties to retain the children in the centers</td>
<td>COAST Trust provided snacks for the children which has resulted in increased attendance in the centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Palongkhali Chairman was not satisfied with NGOs and had delayed permission to implement livelihoods activities in his area.</td>
<td>Permission to operate was received after several meetings with the Chairman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy rain filled the latrines and entered in the CFS/AFS centers in June 2018</td>
<td>COAST contacted BRAC to support them (as the budget was not yet available) with desludging of latrines. COAST Trust used polythene sheet, tin, Sandbags, protection wall and dug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching to the NFI targeted beneficiary was a big challenge as government officials wanted COAST to distribute from their selected distribution point.</td>
<td>COAST showed their data base and succeeded to convince Gov officials that they needed to distribute the Rice husk from point 2 and 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small drains to prevent the rain water to enter into the centers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Negative *internal* factors that have influenced the project achievements are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Measures taken by the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toilets could not be desludged on time due to non-availability of funds in August &amp; Sept 2018.</td>
<td>Request was made for other agencies like BRAC to temporally desludge COAST Trust’s latrines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the budget was not provided on time, COAST Trust could not arrange child safety committee meetings in August 2018.</td>
<td>Continuous discussion between program and finance staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Technical Quality and accountability of the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF QS</td>
<td>Technical quality and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 4</td>
<td>Humanitarian response is based on communication, participation and feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 5</td>
<td>Communities and people affected by crisis have access to safe and responsive mechanisms to handle complaints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 12</td>
<td>To what extend the project conforms with the agreed Tearfund Quality Standards, including participation of Communities and accountability to record complaints, learn and continually improve?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Coast Trust started to capture feedback and complaints from beneficiaries starting from December 2017. The system was computerized in April 2018 and then the data was shared monthly with Tearfund since then. The Complaint Response Mechanism (CRM) captures an average of complaint of 2.5 cases per month (without considering the month of Nov 2018 where many more cases were registered) for a total of 44 cases over a period of 13 months. Big majority of the cases ended with a positive outcome after being followed up by COAST Trust staff. When it was not addressed, this was because the issue was beyond COAST Trust’s responsibility. In this case the complaint was referred to the relevant agency for action. In the database, we found many inconsistencies between the date the feedback & complaint was received, the refer date and the date the case was closed which prevented us to estimate the time spent to respond to the complaint received. This is currently being addressed by COAST Trust. Also we found that the project needs to continue improving its face to face interaction with the beneficiaries as this is the preferred way of communication and as this will increase the number of reported complaints which may be underreported as the number of cases is currently low as shown in the CRM database.

**Accountability with beneficiaries. Complaint Response Mechanism (CRM)**

Accountability is one of the quality standards Tearfund committed to ensuring all its work is based upon communication, participation and feedback with the communities Tearfund serves.

Coast Trust started to capture feedback and complaints from beneficiaries starting from December 2017. The system was computerized in April 2018 and then the data was shared monthly with Tearfund.

**Brief on the current practice:**
Community based Child safety committee’ members were consulted and oriented on the feedback and complaints mechanism system.

Every Child Friendly Space (CFS)/Adolescent Friendly Space (AFS) facilitators are maintaining feedback & complaint register/log for capturing face to face beneficiary feedback and complaints.

In addition, a Help desk is also operated by the CFS/AFS facilitators once a week.

Feedback and complaints are also captured from different group meeting or sessions with parents of children attending the CFS/AFS and members of the Child Safety Committees.

As specific mobile number has been circulated in different points, infrastructure or areas.

Community consultation takes place for giving preference on beneficiary choice, interest, priority etc. before implementing the various project interventions. i.e as seen previously FGDs were organized for some activities.

COAST maintained a feedback log book for keeping track of the feedback and the agreed response and follow up.

COAST staff valued highly the support provided by Tearfund to help them set up a Complain Response Mechanism and acknowledged the importance of accountability for improved qualitative programming.

The project conducted a beneficiary accountability assessment in March 2018\(^\text{41}\) to ascertain i) the level of involvement of the beneficiaries in the project; ii) the level of empowerment as a result of beneficiaries’ interaction with COAST trust, iii) the level of familiarity with the accountability system and iv) the preferred channels for providing feedback and complaints.

Main findings from the accountability assessment were that:

- Beneficiaries were satisfied with staff behavior but were not always able to identify the names and function of the staff with whom they interacted.
- Beneficiaries did not know how and where to report a bad behavior of a staff.
- Some of the beneficiaries interviewed reported that they had attended the community consultation meetings during which they provided their feedback on the location of the planned CFS, latrine, tube well, solar light installation. On the other hand, girls’ group and host community beneficiaries did not get enough information regarding any of the project activities.
- Mobile phone and community leaders were the preferred channel of communication for the host communities while feedback boxes and community meetings were the best avenues for the FDMNs.

Our analysis of the data set from the feedback log book\(^\text{42}\) shows that:

**Analysis of the data conducted by the evaluation team.**

Below a visual picture of the dataset for the period December 2017 to December 2018 (after cleaning the discrepancies related to the most relevant sector concerned by the case)

\(^{41}\) A total of 118 participants were consulted in eight FDGs with FDMN and host communities.

\(^{42}\) The dataset analyzed for the evaluation covered the period December 2017 to December 2018.
Note: Majority of the cases are related to camp 1W where the big majority of the activities are being implemented.

Strong points of the CRM:

- As per the recommendations from the March 2018 assessment, COAST effectively implemented the following actions as described thereafter: use of relevant and preferred methods of communication and set up a systematic process of collection of complaints.
- COAST Trust has effectively set up a Complain Response Mechanism (CRM) and collected data starting from December 2017 with an average of complaint received of 2.5 cases per month (without considering the month of Nov 2018) for a total of 44 cases over a period of 13 months.

Main reasons for complaints:

**Child protection**: issue with cultural appropriateness of games used in CFS/AFS, requests for segregation of sessions between girls and boys, request for more learning equipment and uniforms.

**Protection**: Request for solar lights

**Shelter/NFI**: Request for cooking fuel & clothes
As only few cases are reported per month, starting from November 2018, COAST became more proactive to disseminate the CRM system.

Big majority of the cases ended with a positive outcome after being followed up by COAST Trust staff. When it was not addressed, this was because the issue was beyond COAST Trust’s responsibility. In this case the complaint was referred to the relevant agency for action.

The database is segregated by sex, age and location but do not include yet disability information.

The database from the COAST CRM indicates that 91% of the cases were reported through face to face interaction, group discussion and help desk comforting previous findings from COAST assessment in March 2018 and from other studies\(^\text{43}\) that interpersonal communications are the preferred methods of communication of the FDMNs. This also indicates that COAST Trust’s CRM was relevant to the context of the camps where the levels of literacy is low.

During our field visit, in the FGDs, we have received at different occasions, requests for assistance (with many of them being beyond the mandate and program of COAST Trust). We noticed that COAST staff was always very responsive and proactive to register the name and telephone of the persons to be able to refer them later on to the relevant services.

**Points to improve and challenges:**

- The CRM database has no dedicated field to include DRR activities.
- In the database, we found many inconsistencies between the date the feedback & complaint was received, the refer date and the date the case was closed which prevented us to estimate the time spent to respond to the complaint received. This is currently being addressed by COAST Trust.
- Issues with data entry for appropriate recording of type of sector: Many cases have been reported in the database as a general protection issue while they are in fact related to the child protection (CFS/AFS), Shelter/NFI or DRR interventions.
- Publicize more the CRM system and encourage its use through the most preferred channels (face to face contact with NGO staff) as the number of complaints per month is still small.
- The database should have a column to separate request for services and complaints.
- As many other NGOs, COAST is struggling with the lengthy process that has to be followed to refer cases and handle complaints in the camps as demonstrated by the case study below:

A woman interviewed during our FDG reported to the Madjiis that her nearby latrine was full. After 15 days she still did not hear anything about when the facility will be desludged. Even though, COAST has a standby agreement with a vendor and a desludger team on the ground ready to work, the formal process in the camp if that the Madjiis should first report the request to the WASH focal agency who will then assign one organization to do the work.

Another woman who had received one month ago an LPG set from COAST Trust reported that she could not refill the empty bottle in the camp as the Madjiis told her that she had to wait for some times without knowing the reasons for it. This took place even though she had been previously given a voucher to refill her bottle with a nearby agreed vendor. After discussing the issue with COAST staff, the explanation was that COAST was currently awaiting approval of the FD7 to resume its work with the vendor who had been selected to ensure the refill of the bottles in the camp. The issue is that the project seems to rely much on the Madjiis to communicate with the beneficiaries and that this is not always done properly. In this case, the Madjii failed to provide the reason of the temporary suspension of the service.

\(^{43}\) Evaluation of the Common Service for Community Engagement and Accountability for the Rohingya refugee response. BBC Media Action and IOM. Sept 2018: “Face-to-face methods are the preferred method for feedback rather than mobile phones or complaints boxes: 80% said they had given feedback through talking to a mahji, 26% had spoken to an NGO staff member and 19% had visited an information hub.”
6.3.2. Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low or no visible contribution to this aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some evidence of contribution to this aspect but significant improvement required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Evidence of satisfactory contribution to this aspect but improvement required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evidence of good contribution to this aspect with some areas for improvement and change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Evidence that the contribution is strong and/or exceeding that which was expected of the project/programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EFFECTIVENESS: 2**

The evaluation study found many activities that were implemented with a good respect of the commonly agreed international and national standards. The evaluative criteria effectiveness has been given a score of 2 because the project has not yet started the livelihood component and also because there are rooms for improvement for all components before the end of the project.
6.4. Efficiency

**Efficiency**: A measure of the outputs in relation to the inputs; an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results.

### 6.4.1. Key findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Operational management: timely intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF QS</td>
<td>Technical Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 2</td>
<td>Communities and people affected by crisis have access to the humanitarian assistance they need at the right time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 7</td>
<td>How timely the intervention was in relation to the initial workplans? What was done to mitigate unforeseen events and speed up the assistance?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**: Key issue identified during the evaluation is that planned activities have often been delayed for several months as evidenced by the information extracted from the COAST Trust monthly reports. The delays have also some consequence on the spending rate of the project. Burning rate is at 25% (if we include the revised budget) instead of 50% at mid-term. COAST project staff believes that they would be able to spend at least 60% of the overall budget by June 2019 as many “big ticket’s items” would have been purchased (solar lights, remaining NFIs, DRR retrofitting of schools, provision of IGAs for beneficiaries.)

The main reason provided to the evaluation team for underspending was that the project team could not spend the allocated funding because of the time taken by the government NGO affairs bureau to approve the requested government authorizations (called FD7 and FD6) to implement the proposed actions in the camps and for host communities. National elections took place at the end of the year 2018 and some of the activities had to be postponed for security issues during this time. The COAST bank takes time to transfer the international funds received from Tearfund UK to COAST bank account in Bangladesh. Finally, an additional amount of 90,000 GBP was recently allocated by DEC/Tearfund to COAST Trust. The “burning rate” shown in December 2018 is now lower than before the increase of budget.

**Planning**.
- Key issue identified during the evaluation is that planned activities were often been delayed for several months as evidenced by the table below with information extracted from the COAST Trust monthly reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Initial plan</th>
<th>Effectively implemented</th>
<th>Delays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROTECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Purchase toys for CFS/AFS</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Distribution of snack for children</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>4 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tree planting planned in July. 1250 trees seedlings have been planted in Nov 2018.

Surveying in Host community,

Distribution of 200 LP gas to FDMN

Paper work completed for winter clothing distribution in September for FDMN, distribution planned for November’18.

Repair tube-wells

Desludging of latrines delayed because of lack of funds.

10 Wash Promotion Session will be conducted in July.

Purchasing desludge materials and making Desludge dumping place.

Financial management: Spending and underspending

Technical Quality

Communities and people affected by crisis can expect delivery of improved assistance as organisations learn from experience and reflection.

What has been the spending rate of the various components of the project and why?

What was done to avoid underspending?

Findings:

Phase 2 of the DEC response is 18 months and runs from 1 April 2018 to 30 September 2019.

The overall budget allocated to COAST trust for this period is GBP 547,343 including the budget revision.

Indicative theoretical spending as of end of December 2018 should be: 9 months/18 months =50%. As indicated in the table below, the overall total spent as of end of December 2018 stands at 25.1%. (The revised budget was used for this analysis)

COAST project staff believes that they would be able to spend at least 60% of the overall budget by June 2019 as many “big ticket’s items” would have been purchased (solar lights, remaining NFIs, DRR retrofitting of schools, provision of IGAs for beneficiaries.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Spending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal A: Supplies/materials</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport (moto fuel/repair)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office costs (assets)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal B: Logistic</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal C: personnel</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal D: Personnel support</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Budget DEC appeal funds</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The analysis above shows that even though the protection component represents 26% of the Program costs, the spending is only at 17% end of December 2018. Also, the livelihood component did not start yet (beside the preparation of assessment and tools).
- The evaluation found the following internal and external factors (to the project) that explain the high rate of underspending:
**External reasons:**

- The main reason provided to the evaluation team for underspending was that the project team could not spend the allocated funding because of the time taken by the government NGO affairs bureau to approve the requested government authorizations (called FD7 and FD6) to implement the proposed actions in the camps and for host communities. Also, even though the project length is for 18 months, COAST Trust has to request a new authorization to operate every 6 months\(^4\). The problem has been further compounded by the fact that a new FD6/7 can only be issued only if the activity report from the previous period is approved. This whole administrative process has slowed down the implementation of the activities at different times of the project life.

- For each FD6/7 phases, the project has to seek authorizations from series of stakeholders before implementation: RRRC office, Deputy Commissioner, Union Officer staff, Camp In Charge, Tearfund and DEC donor and sometimes from the site management agencies.

- National elections took place at the end of the year 2018 and some of the activities had to be postponed for security issues during this time.

- The COAST bank takes time to transfer the international funds received from Tearfund UK to COAST bank account in Bangladesh.

**Internal reasons:**

- At the initial stage of the project, Tearfund took some time to approve the budget of COAST Trust.

- In addition, the supply chain of the project had to be strengthened. To work on this issue, Tearfund brought in a temporary international staff to support its partners.

- An additional amount of 90,000 GBP was recently allocated by DEC/Tearfund to COAST Trust. The “burning rate” shown in December 2018 is now lower than before the increase of budget.

- The evaluation team believes that the project could have developed a risk mitigation strategy to address anticipated constraints and foreseen issues that could arise such as the lengthy process to obtain the FD6 and 7 authorizations.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Cost efficiency. Monitoring.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF QS</td>
<td>Technical Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 9</td>
<td>Communities and people affected by crisis can expect that the organisations assisting them are managing resources effectively, efficiently and ethically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 9</td>
<td>What measures were taken to optimize outputs and reduce costs? What mechanisms have been put in place to monitor and manage costs and activities? What internal and external factors have influenced the efficiency of the project? Did the project put in place anti-corruption preventive measures?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** The evaluation found some good value for money initiatives: for example, the external WASH evaluator was costly but brought high value to the sector as his research’s findings were shared with the WASH sector who found them very relevant to revisit the way the pits of the latrines were built. Through a tender process, the project was able to significantly reduce the cost of the desludging of the latrines

---

\(^{4}\) In order to provide support to Rohingya and host communities, Non-Governmental Organisations need to acquire permissions from the Government of Bangladesh. FD6 (long-term development programmes including for host communities) and FD7 (humanitarian support) permissions must be obtained prior to spending any funding for the emergency response. COAST Trust requested a FD7 in April 2018 for 3 months, then a second time in July 2018 for the period June to December 2018. The latest application for the period January to June 2019 is still pending approval at the time of this evaluation.
and as a consequence covers many more latrines than planned. For the provision of the LPG, the project identifies a vendor that could not only distribute the LPGs bottles but also the cook stoves while ensuring the training of the beneficiaries and the refill of the bottles. The evaluation found that the project put in place a good monitoring system to track the progress of the project achievements through the design of an M&E framework that specifies tools and means of verification for each activity. Many valuable monitoring activities were conducted consistently for the activities that have been implemented up to the time of this evaluation. More importantly, the findings of the PDMs surveys were effectively used to improve the delivery of the subsequent phases of NFI distribution. COAST also recognized the very regular and useful presence of the management staff of Tearfund who is monitoring field activities twice a week and provides an appreciated coaching support. Areas to improve are related to the lack of monitoring tools and indicators for the work conducted by the Child Safety Committees. Also, the current format for the monthly report does not seem appropriate to track on time the long delays experienced for some activities. A planning exercise is required to provide an overview of all activities planned to be implemented before September 2019. Training may be needed on how to better report information originating from FGDs (used for the assessments) as the level of information is quite low at this stage.

Examples of “Value for Money” activities found:

- In November 2018, Tearfund commissioned an internal study to revise the design of its WASH intervention. The external evaluator was costly but brought high value to the sector as his research’s findings were shared with the WASH sector who found them very relevant to revisit the way the pits of the latrines were built. Ultimately, this will help to avoid future leakage in the latrines and will improve the safety and hygiene of the drainage system through the use of plastic pipes.

- The activities related to the desludging of latrines and the distribution of LPGs were among the top cost drivers in the budget. The initial budget for the desludging of the latrines was 4,000 takas/latrines. Following a tender process, COAST was able to reduce the cost of the desludging of the latrines up to 1,587 Takas/latrines. Thanks to the savings of funds, they managed to desludge 550 more latrines than the initial target of 400 WASH facilities.

- For the selection of the suppliers for the delivery of the LPG bottles and Gaz stoves, COAST initial’s thought was to sign an agreement with 2 vendors (one for the delivery of the bottles and one for the Gaz stoves). After a discussion with Tearfund, they agreed that it was more cost effective to partner with only 1 vendor that could provide both services and ensure the quality insurance after delivery. This was seen as a better value for money strategy as the move also prompted the vendor to reduce its price to provide a comprehensive service. Furthermore, with an additional 0.3 USD/beneficiary, the vendor accepted to develop a set of IEC materials and provided training to the beneficiaries on the safety use of the devices.

- The evaluation met with project staff who reported having diverse background experience that had been used in the response not only on the component they were in charge of but also to support their colleagues from other interventions. This strategy had proven to benefit the project achievements and contributed to a shared learning between the various project components.

Monitoring of activities:

The evaluation found that the project put in place a good monitoring system to track the progress of the project achievements through the design of an M&E framework that specifies tools and means of verification for each activity. Many valuable monitoring activities were conducted consistently for the
activities that have been implemented up to the time of this evaluation. More importantly, the findings of the PDMs surveys were effectively used to improve the delivery of the subsequent phases of NFI distribution. COAST also recognized the very regular and useful presence of the management staff of Tearfund who are monitoring field activities twice a week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector/activities</th>
<th>Monitoring tools used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NFI distribution (rice husks and blankets) conducted during Phase 1</td>
<td>Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey (April 2018) FDMN and 9 host communities ‘s villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of tree seedling in Nov 2018 for 256 HHs</td>
<td>Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey and report. (Nov 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of clothes and charcoal to FDMNs</td>
<td>PDM report of Lungi Thami and rice husk (June 2018). Camp 1W of Kutupalong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene promotion</td>
<td>Using the KOBO platform, a data collection exercise has been conducted for Hygiene promotion session knowledge assessment. Report yet to be prepared and share.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking of number of beneficiaries reached</td>
<td>Project Beneficiary Tracking Table (BTT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking activities through monthly reports</td>
<td>Monthly reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the feedback &amp; complaints system</td>
<td>Excel table to track Feedback and complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget follow up</td>
<td>Budget versus Expenditure tracking table and month wise budget breakdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring tenders</td>
<td>All the quotations of vendors go through scrutiny and careful examination and are send to Tear fund for a final check before the name of the lowest bidders is announced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strong points:**
- Findings from the PDMs surveys and analysis of the data originated from the Complain Response Mechanism have shown that the NFI most vulnerable beneficiaries were not getting enough support to carry the heavy goods to their shelters. Since November 2018, COAST is now ensuring that there is a dedicated line at distribution points and appointed porters to support the most needed persons.
- Monitoring data have shown that the Madjiis were sometimes selling the token they were supposed to handover freely to the selected NFI beneficiaries. Since then, the project is distributing directly the token to the beneficiaries prior to the distribution day.
- Tearfund shared with COAST Trust its strong expertise in monitoring and ensures a regular coaching process in this area.

**Area to strengthen in monitoring:**
- The effectiveness of the hygiene promotion activities has been captured through the use of a post session knowledge survey. Nevertheless, there was no baseline survey done before the
intervention to ensure that the increase in knowledge can effectively be attributed to the intervention. (to compare pre and post intervention assessments). In addition, the questions in the survey are mainly related to knowledge acquisition but there were no questions in relation to intended attitudes and effective practices.

- Most of the tools used for monitoring the activities are quantitative type of instruments (surveys). Additional small-scale research through the use of FGDs could also be useful to complement information received through the surveys. As identified previously, COAST Trust would require additional training on qualitative research for its project staff and particularly on reporting the findings from the FGDs.

- No monitoring tools have yet been developed and used for assessing the psychosocial well-being of children and adolescent benefiting from the CFS/AFS and for measuring the effectiveness of the awareness raising activities conducted by the Child Safety Committees.

- There is a provision in the monthly report format to describe the next month planned activities but a comprehensive and updated narrative project workplan table is missing to provide an overview on what was planned and what was effectively implemented. See previous point on planning that shows that many activities have been consistently delayed. Also, the template for the monthly report does not allow to track recurrent delays between workplans versus effective implementation. In addition, the current breakdown of the project budget per month can only be used as a cash flow forecasting tool but should not be considered as a project workplan as there is not enough narrative information in it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Coordination and complementarity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF QS</td>
<td>Technical Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 6</td>
<td>Communities and people affected by crisis receive coordinated, complementary assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 10</td>
<td>To what extent Tearfund and COAST coordinated with other local and national actors to ensure complementary of assistance to improve resilience?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: COAST Trust coordinated well with other organisations particularly for the WASH, site management and protection sectors. Information was triangulated and confirmed by the WASH focal agency, the Site Management agency and the Protection focal point for the camps we visited and where COAST is intervening. Improved coordination should take place between the protection and the education sectors as both sectors are currently offering some learning activities in their respective centers. This should happen at ISCG sectorial level but also within the COAST Trust organization who is implementing protection and education projects funded by different donors but where more cross learning between projects could benefit the overall response intervention. Also, the evaluation found very limited mentions and visibility of the partnership between Tearfund/COAST in the documents of the ISCG sectors examined during the desk review.

Strong points:

---

45 In relation to the gaps identified for the reporting of information of the FGDs that had been organized prior to the implementation of some activities. See part on relevance in this report.
The following activities were conducted to ensure that COAST’s projects are well coordinated with other organisations. Information below was triangulated and confirmed by the WASH focal agency, the Site Management agency and the Protection focal point for the camps where COAST is intervening.

- COAST Trust Supervisor (Mr. Abdullah Al Mamun) attended regularly the newly set up special protection co-ordination meeting and CiC meetings in the camps.
- COAST trust coordinated its WASH intervention with BRAC to ensure the desludging of the latrines (while COAST was waiting for budget allocation to do it itself) and with site management agencies and CiC for the selection of its operational sites.
- COAST trust communicated regularly with the UNO for the implementation of the activities for the host community.
- Following decision from CiC, the schedule for CFS/AFS activities was aligned with the time of the Maktab learning centers to allow children to attend both facilities.
- In June, managing a room where minimum 50 participants (Majhi) could be gathered was a big challenge, but COAST Trust contacted the CiC who accepted that his office be used for the training.
- COAST Trust managed to obtain the verbal approval of the CiC to implement Cash For Work activities for garbage collection. (even though the FDMN are not allowed to receive cash in hand).
- The COAST Trust website provides useful links to access the Tearfund project proposal and newsletters related to the DEC funded project.46
- The LPG initiative supported by the project has been widely shared as a best practice in several coordination sectorial working groups and many organizations are now learning from the project experience in this area, while also using the tools developed by Tearfund/COAST.

Areas to improve

- If COAST Trust is fully aware of the need to rethink the current CFS/AFS intervention in a context where there is an increase demand for more learning opportunities, the evaluation team felt that there was not yet a strong coordination between the protection and education sectors (at sectorial level) but also within COAST TRUST organization who is implementing projects in both sectors of interventions.
- The evaluation found very limited mentions of the partnership between Tearfund/COAST in the documents examined during the desk review.47 For instance, in one of the latest 4W table for all sectors, dated on 11 Dec 201848, Tearfund/COAST collaboration is only reported twice in the Shelter sector for camp 1W and Kutupalong extension, which does not represent the entirety of the interventions of the project under review. The collaboration CARE/COAST and UNICEF/COAST is reported more systematically. Tube wells set up by COAST are not reported for all camps in the WASH sector mapping overview of WASH infrastructure within Kutupalong RC with GPS datasets collected from partners up to October 16, 2018. Similarly, the collaboration Tearfund/COAST is not reflected in the 4W table for the WASH sector dated on 16/01/2019.49
- This finding demonstrates that Tearfund and COAST should communicate more externally about their joint collaboration, activities and priorities as the current level of information sharing is not sufficient and could potentially have an effect on the collaboration and coordination with others organisations who may not be aware of the activities implemented.
- As evidenced by the field visits in the CFS/AFS centers, the evaluation team could not find strong evidences of information sharing and collaboration at field level between nearby CFS/AFS of

46 http://coastbd.net/tearfund-project/
47 See in annex 10.5, list of documents examined during the desk review.
49 cxb_wash_sector_compiled_4w_-2019_01_16.xlsx
different organizations or between CFS/AFS and the recently set up learning centers. (Even though in many cases the buildings are located next to each other’s)

6.4.2. Assessment

**EFFICIENCY: 2**

The evaluation found evidences of good practices in project efficiency as well as interventions representing good value for money. The project has developed and implemented a sound monitoring system and coordinate quite well with other stakeholders to remain relevant and avoid overlapping of activities. The criteria efficiency was given a score of 2 only as the project is underspending. Also, there has been some gaps to ensure sufficient visibility of the project among external stakeholders. Finally, the internal and external coordination between the education and protection sectors need to be strengthened.

Children in the CFS. Photo credit: Eric Debert
Section 7: Conclusions

To conclude, see below overall insights, successes and shortcomings of the project using the Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS) framework. Standard 8 (Staff are supported to do their job effectively) was not assessed.

The evaluation found that the humanitarian response was appropriate and very relevant to the needs identified by the project, by the beneficiaries met, by the technical focal agencies and by the latest IOM Bangladesh Needs and Population Monitoring Site Assessment Round 13 conducted in November 2018. Areas to improve are related to the needs to include more life skills trainings and participatory activities for the adolescents and to better contextualized the training curriculum used to the camp situation.

The planned activities have experienced some delays because of external and internal factors. The main factor that has contributed to slow down the implementation of the activities is related to the lengthy process to obtain authorizations to operate from the Government of Bangladesh. The project did not develop a risk mitigation strategy to address some of the known risks at the beginning. An overall planning exercise would be useful to ensure that the activities can be implemented before end of September.

The response contributed to build knowledge and skills in DRR, hygiene promotion and child protection issues, it could only build the self-reliance skills of the FDMNs to some extend as the government does not allow the FDMNs to earn an income. The use of volunteers is somehow tolerated and the project could enlist more FDMNs volunteers in the AFS/CFS centers and continue to empower the members of the parents meeting and the Child Protection Committees.

The project communicated well with the communities at all stages of the project cycle, from assessments to design and implementation. A sound monitoring system has been put in place and contributes effectively to inform the implementation of the activities. In addition, a Complaints Response Mechanism has been built gradually into the project but will gain to be disseminated further as the number of reported cases is still low. Face to face interaction need to be strengthened to complement information received through the Madjis system.

The evaluation found that efforts were put in place to coordinate with other agencies and more particularly the WASH, site management and protection focal agencies in the camps. More needs to be done to develop synergies of action between the education and protection sectors and more particularly for the component related to the adolescent programming. In addition, we found that external communication about the project should be strengthened at ISCG sectoral level.

Post Distribution Surveys and FDGs were conducted to learn from the activities implemented. Findings from these monitoring tools were used to improve programming (ex: A system of porters was put in place for vulnerable groups during NFI distribution times). The project has also been responsive to the changing context and was able to accommodate a bigger number of latrines to desludge.

The evaluation found some good value for money initiatives that also brought high impact such as the delivery of the LPGs. Management style observed from the two organisations appears to be conducive to a good working environment and the partnership is mutually appreciated and valued. Regular monitoring and coaching visits are organized and benefit all organisations. Learning could be strengthened between project funded by different donors with the COAST Trust organization.
Section 8: Key Learnings

- Parallels trainings on similar topics for various audiences (children, parents, members of CSC) is more effective as it reinforces the acquisition of learnings. (ex: better relationship between parents and their children following session on respect and positive parenting skills)
- There is less chance that NFI items would be resold after distribution if beneficiaries have been well consulted about their needs and if the items are of good quality.
- A focus on quality and relevance is sometimes more important than on quantitative achievement as it could bring positive visibility to an organization as evidenced by the interest shown by many agencies in relation to the system of selection, distribution and monitoring of LPGs items developed by Tearfund/COAST Trust (who only delivered 200 items out of the 13,000 distributed in the camps). Similarly, the project procured high quality solar lights whose battery lasted longer for the benefit of the refugees.
- An internal WASH mission turned to be used not only for the project but for the whole WASH sector as the findings of the mission was shared and recognized by many WASH stakeholders as it added value to the current discussion around the revision of the standards for the design of the latrines.
- Monitoring regularly the activities to seek feedback from beneficiaries about the services planned and NFIs delivered, has allowed the humanitarian response to remain relevant to needs, changing context and avoidance of overlapping of interventions with other stakeholders.
- Detailed planning and development of a risk management plan are important tools to develop at design stage. This tool could contribute to limit underspending of funds.
- Polyvalence of tasks among staff and joint collaboration between partners (Tearfund and Coast trust) through regular coaching and on the job, training offered good opportunities for learning.
- To strengthen their skills and ensure their well-being, Psychosocial counselors and CFS/AFS facilitators need to receive Psychosocial First Aid training before deployment as well as attend regular debriefing support from a mental health specialist.
- Qualitative research and triangulation of information are important to complement quantitative surveys to capture Most Significant Changes and unintended impact of activities (ex: link between LPG and SGBV).
- Every activity should have a monitoring tool. (ex: lack of monitoring tool for CSC).
- In the M&E framework, at project design stage, the project needs to ensure that there is an indicator related to the importance of reporting project activities to the ISCG sectorial groups to ensure project visibility, information sharing and coordination.

---

50 For example, post monitoring survey conducted by the project noted that the refugees were often requested a refill of their LPG container even though it was not yet fully empty. This was found after weighting the bottles after use.
Section 9: Specific Actionable Recommendations

As the evaluation has been conducted 9 months before the project ends, we thought that detailed operational and actionable recommendations could be useful to improve the implementation of the project. This explains the relatively high number of recommendations suggested below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Tearfund/ COAST TRUST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NFI distribution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Many studies have reported a growing demand for cash among FDMNs who are selling the aid they are given. Given the limitations on cash programming imposed by the Bangladeshi Government, this should be accompanied by sufficient advocacy at a policy level. As a non-partisan local NGO (who had developed positive engagement with the Government) and as an advocacy focused organization, COAST Trust is well positioned to relay these important unmet needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Ensure that an exit interview is done randomly right after the distribution session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ PDMs surveys highlighted that people faced difficulties in carrying the items distributed.(^{51}) Explore the possibility to organize few TOM TOM (Three wheelers) that could be made available free of charge for the FDMNs living far from the distribution points. (as the FDMNs are currently paying for this service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Improve information sharing with beneficiaries as the analysis of the PDMs surveys conducted during phase 1 and 2 of the DEC funding show that beneficiaries need at least 2- or 3-days lead time to be informed about the distribution days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Write a case study on LPG distribution and the various positive effects of the intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Continue working on Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM) in Emergencies(^{52}) as there is a huge gap in this area in the overall response by all humanitarian stakeholders involved in the WASH sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Use simultaneously Block ID along with local block name in project documents to better identify the location of the activities implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Follow up with DPHE for the testing of the water quality of the tube wells more particularly after they have been repaired (in case of contamination during repair work).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Revise the incentives scale for the garbage collectors as per ISCG and RRRC office guidance. If possible, pay the garbage collector also retroactively up to the date they started their volunteer job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The Post activity survey related to the hygiene promotion session conducted in Dec 2018 should be considered as a baseline survey. (as there was no baseline survey prior to this one). It should be repeated in few months in using the same questions while adding in the same time another set of questions to measure attitudes and practices. (and not only knowledge acquisition).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Protection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CFS/AFS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{51}\) One PDM survey found that 24% of the surveyed beneficiary said they paid someone for carrying their items to their houses.  
- In collaboration with the education and child protection working groups, adjust the overall objective of the CFS/AFS to transition gradually from recreational and psychosocial activities to more structured activities designed for a more non-formal education objective. For example, much more life skills training sessions should be incorporated into the weekly activity schedule for the children attending the AFS. This should be done in line with the newly designed Learning Competency Framework and Approach (LCFA)\(^{53}\).
- Another option could be to gradually transform the AFS/CFS into multi-purpose centers as currently explored by UNICEF. UNICEF is thinking to use its current CFS structures to accommodate possibly protection case managers, child Safety committees, psychosocial and non-formal activities or adolescents’ clubs. Priority should be given to adolescents programming as there is a big gap in this area. One idea to explore is to provide basic project management training to a group of adolescents that they can developed their own project and implement their own community-based action plan funded by the project. (ex: setting up small library, running adolescent clubs, conducting hygiene promotion activities, learning sewing skills, organizing drawing competition, debates on protection issues, include sessions on fire safety, first aid trainings, organisation of evacuation drills...)
- When they arrived to the camps, most of the parents were unaware of various forms of child abuse and its long-term impact on children as they grow old. Therefore, it is highly recommended to introduce age specific sessions on child and sexual abuse for the children and adolescents attending the centers but also for the parent’s trainings (through the parent meetings and CSC).
- Conduct qualitative or quantitative survey to demonstrate the effectiveness of the child protection interventions on improved psychosocial wellbeing among children attending CFS/AFS activities.
- Encourage study tours between the staff of the CFS/AFS run by COAST Trust and by other agencies to exchange learning and practices and obtain new ideas for age specific activities (particularly for adolescents).
- CFS/AFS facilitators and members of the child safety committee should be trained on Psychosocial First Aid (PFA). Also, debriefing psychosocial sessions for COAST staff should be organized regularly by a trained mental health consultant/specialist.
- Revise the budget of the CFS/AFS related to the provision of snacks for the children as to increase the number of children attending the centers.
- COAST Trust staff appreciated the various trainings received from Tearfund and recommended that they train all their staff on Child Protection as this is one of their core focus area.
- Regularly track and analyze data on attendance in all centers to identify earlier drop out trends and take necessary actions to maintain a good and continuous attendance rate. This exercise can also be used to monitor changes in interest and motivation of children to attend the centers.
- Explore existing NGOS materials/curriculum and IEC materials for CFS/AFS, on Child Safety and Protection and incorporate them into the existing program activities.
- Ensure all curriculum used are contextualized to the camp situation.

**Child safety Committees**

- Provide additional training to members of the child Safety committees (as they are agent of changes/gate keepers) that they can implement themselves structured protection awareness raising activities to start changing norms particularly around gender-based violence and other child protection issues. i) provide refresher trainings about their roles and responsibilities ii) add more trainings on other protection issues such as Gender based violence, sexual abuse on children and strengthen positive parenting skills.iii)

---

\(^{53}\)The education sector is currently developing a Learning Competency Framework and Approach (LCFA), which outlines a set of learning competencies across four developmental levels equivalency from pre-primary to grade eight (levels I-IV), covering English, Myanmar language, Mathematics, Life Skills and Science. This is happening in a context where the government of Bangladesh restricts access to education for the refugees and there has been a lot of uncertainties around the best way to go in formal and unformal education.
provide training on how to organize community sessions with hard to reach group of population such as women head of households or people with disabilities.

- Equipped them with IEC materials with key messages on protection related issues that they can conduct outreach activities.
- Ensure they prioritize hard to reach population such as Female Head of Households, isolated elders and people with disabilities. One avenue they could use is to sensitize adults who are attending “parents’ meetings” of other AFS/CFS but where child protection issues are not yet discussed (such as CODEC parent meetings for example). Other avenue to spread information are existing women centers run by other NGOs or WASH committees when they exist.
- Protection cases referred by the members of the child safety committees have been recently recorded in a register located in each CFS/AFS. Data originated from these documents should be regularly compiled and analyzed by project staff and used as an indicator of activity of the committees. PDM surveys could also be conducted in relation to protection awareness raising activities (similarly to what was done for the baseline study for the hygiene promotion activities.)

**DRR**

- More trees should be planted to address the challenge of ecological imbalance. In the meantime, an estimated 40% of the planted trees did not survive according to our discussion during the FGDs. One way of making people’s participation on protecting and taking care of the trees is to make them realize that trees would protect them from wind during cyclone and keep them cooler during summer season or explaining them how in different ways trees can contribute to day to day life. Trees need to be planted at the right season to increase their survival rate.
- Implement small and easy to set up retrofit structural features in the CFS/AFS buildings that they can better sustain strong winds as the buildings are also used as emergency shelter during the rainy season and cyclonic period.
- Explore the possibility to train children from CFS/AFS not only on acquisition of keys DRR messages (before, during and after a natural hazard) but also to undertake themselves a Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment of the main risks encountered in the CFS/AFS environment. This can be done in using child centered DRR methodology and followed by a small CFS/AFS level risk reduction action plan developed and implemented by the children themselves.
- Strengthen messaging in the DRR curriculum on actions that can be done during and after disaster (and not only before disaster). Cover also topics related to other hazards than cyclone, rain, strong wind but also fire safety. Contribute to the ongoing discussion related to the recently developed (by 3 EU funded experts) fire safety strategy in coordination with all relevant organisations.
- Organize small drills and practical exercises to implement messages learnt by the various audiences trained by COAST Trust (children and parents related to the CFS/AFS and child safety committee members).

**Livelihoods**

- Market assessment and livelihoods options need to take in consideration that some host communities have limited/no agriculture land available to do agriculture that would contribute to income generation.
- There should be a group-based livelihood intervention to maintain accountability and sustainability. (Already planned by project team)

---

- There is an immediate need to link the children of the host community to school so their education is not affected by the present crisis.
- Female members of the group should be included into the IGA activities. (planned by project team) Respondents have expressed that women members can do sewing or handy crafts, if opportunities are created and a linkage is made between them and the buyers.
- Beside profitability and access to market, the selection of IGAs should ensure that the chosen livelihoods options will be disaster proof and sensitive to long term impact of climate change. If feasible, priority should be given to livelihoods that allow a diversification of income at household level as this has proven to be a good climate change adaptation strategy. For example, small huts for animals should be raised in flood prone areas. Duck instead of chicken should be selected for IGAs in flood prone areas.

### Cross cutting recommendations

**Communication with Communities**

Mahjis (Rohingya community leaders) are the main source of information for Rohingya people (mentioned by 87% of participants in the ACAPS study) and are now the most trusted source of information but are also accused of corruption, bribing, GBV, arbitrary detention of men in order to sexually exploit female family members, withholding/confiscating aid distributions & physical violence.\(^{55}\) COAST should continue engaging with the Mahjis on humanitarian principles while in the same time supporting the development of more community own protection groups such as the already established Child Safety committees. UNHCR and site management agencies are now promoting community representation with elections taking place gradually which should improve the representation system and ultimately improve the sustainability of the interventions. While there have been some attempts to bypass Majhis as the intermediary between agencies and communities, there is no indication they will be any less pivotal moving forward. As long as Majhis continue to play this key role, it is important that their fairness and impartiality is monitored by speaking to Rohingya directly. Ideally, COAST should ensure that its Complaint Response and communication mechanism with the beneficiaries is well known and is prioritizing face-to-face interaction with Rohingya – by far the most popular direct communication channel.

**CRM**

- Review the datasets from the Complaints Response Mechanism (CRM) to remove inconsistencies and analyze time of response to the initial requests.
- Encourage more beneficiaries to use the CRM through sharing contact information of COAST in the NFI package during the distribution.
- Continue to promote direct contact with population in addition to Madjees.
- In the CRM, separate cases that are related to referral to services and cases related to complaints.

**Social cohesion, building of self-reliance, inclusion of age and disability**

- Use snowball technique\(^{56}\) to identify hard to identify facilitators (with Burmese language skills) from among the FDMNS population to team up with the current facilitators team to increase social cohesion, learning and coaching and diversify the type of activities provided to the children. (through inclusion in the centers of a facilitator with Burmese skills)

---

\(^{55}\) ACAPS & NPM Analysis Hub, “Rohingya Crisis - Governance and community participation” (June 2018)

\(^{56}\) In research, snowball technique is a nonprobability sampling technique where existing study subjects recruit future subjects from among their acquaintances. Thus, the sample group is said to grow like a rolling snowball.
▪ Empower gradually parents attending the parent meetings to become a Parent-teachers-Association (PTA) to be more involved in the governance and organizational aspects of the CFS/AFS and therefore increase ownership of the facilities by the FDMNs.

▪ Enforce recommendation to include Gender, Age and Disability Disaggregated Data (GADDD) and use of the Washington Group Short Set of Questions on Disability in data collection.

▪ Contact Handicap International to train facilitators of CFS/AFS on disability inclusive services using the recently published international standards on integration of age and disability in humanitarian response. 57

▪ Project team on the ground are respecting a good gender balance (CFS/AFS facilitators), nevertheless more need to be done to enroll more women at the more senior level positions in both organizations including at the level of project officer and manager.

Planning/monitoring/information sharing & visibility

▪ Train COAST Trust M&E staff on the importance of baseline and end line surveys to measure changes (impact), on how to better report information from FGDs and more broadly on qualitative research.

▪ Strengthen visibility and communication related to the outputs of the partnership Tearfund/COAST through better sharing of information in the various technical coordination sectors.

▪ Undertake an updated program planning exercise to draw a realistic and overall project workplan (covering the period Feb to Sept 2019) that includes all activities that can still be implemented before the project ends in September 2019.

57

https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Minimum_Standards_for_Age_and_Disability_Inclusion_in_Humanitarian_Action_0.pdf
Section 10: Annexes:

10.1. Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

TEARFUND
'Emergency Appeal for People Fleeing Myanmar - DEC External Evaluation
CALL FOR PROPOSALS

Tearfund is calling for proposals to lead on an evaluation of our emergency response for Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh, as described in the Terms of Reference (ToR) below.

Interested bidders should submit the following:

1. A covering letter confirming that the bidder can carry out the evaluation in the timeframe given in the Terms of Reference (ToR) and including an outline of how the bidder meets the skill requirements.
2. A brief proposed methodology for how the work will be undertaken (max 2 page), including details of the local team you would assemble to assist with the evaluation.
3. A succinct work plan and schedule of activities within the proposed timeframe (see ToR for rough outline of expected scheduling).
4. A budget (in GBP) setting out the full cost for the evaluation, including:
   a. the daily cost and number of days for the team leader
   b. any other costs
5. Curriculum Vitae (CV)
6. An example of an output from previous relevant evaluations, e.g. a report written by the bidder.

DEADLINE: proposals should be submitted by 22.00 on Sunday 21st October 2018 to the Tearfund Deputy Geographic Head for Asia, Crossida Thompson crossida.thompson@tearfund.org

Submissions to this call for proposals will be assessed based on the following criteria:
experience and qualifications of the consultant as outlined in ToR below, technical quality of past written reports, strength of the proposed methodology, work plan and schedule of activities, as well as the proposed budget and value for money.

It is expected that the contract will be awarded in November 2018, for travel preparation to start in January 2019, briefings to take place week commencing 20th January 2019 and field travel to begin in the first week of February 2019. Tearfund reserves the right to negotiate the proposals and budgets with the bidder before offering a contract.

The successful applicant will be expected to sign and adhere to the following policies: safeguarding; fraud, loss and bribery; whistleblowing; global security and Tearfund personal conduct policy. Copies of the above policies and/or the draft contract for this assignment may be provided to applicants on request (please email crossida.thompson@tearfund.org).

Tender reference number: TF-ASIA-10-18

Tearfund
Emergency Appeal for People Fleeing Myanmar - DEC External Evaluation
Terms of Reference for Lead Evaluator/Team Leader
October 2018

Final version of the terms of reference will be confirmed with the selected consultant.

1. BACKGROUND

Programme Title: Emergency Appeal for People Fleeing Myanmar 2017

Background to the Programme

Since the 25th August 2017 there has been a period of renewed violence in Rakhine State, Myanmar, resulting in a large scale movement of refugees crossing the border into Bangladesh. Recent estimates suggest that 727,000 Rohingyas have arrived in Bangladesh from Myanmar since 25th August 2017¹, all of whom continue to be in desperate need of humanitarian assistance. The scale of the influx has also adversely affected approximately 300,000 local Bangladeshi citizens (host communities) and the 300,000 Rohingyas who had previously fled to Myanmar and had been living in Bangladesh before the August conflict. There is further demand on already scarce resources, and due to the high concentration of the refugees in some areas, their numbers are higher than the number of the local population. The new arrivals have not been granted refugee status by the Bangladesh government, which first called the refugees ‘indocumented Myanmar Nationals. Agencies have now been told to refer to them as ‘Forcibly Displaced Myanmar Nationals (FDMN).’

The newly arrived Rohingya refugees are staying in hugely overcrowded camps - a mixture of spontaneous settlements, existing and new refugee camps - or with local host communities in the Ukhia and Teknaf sub-districts of Cox’s Bazar. Most of the new arrivals are women, children and adolescent girls, many of whom have experienced severe trauma. All of them are living in extremely difficult conditions without adequate food, shelter, water, or latrine facilities. From the start, the newly arrived Rohingya have required urgent life saving assistance, particularly regarding food, water, sanitation, healthcare, shelter and protection.

The number of people per settlement varies, with the largest home to approximately 614,667 people. Access to basic services remains insufficient in the camps; lots of the early interventions were of insufficient quality (e.g. tube wells at risk of contamination) and have required further investment to upgrade and improve technical quality. In March 2018, the UN estimated that over 1.6 million litres of safe water are needed per day to sustain the population of refugees in the area.² As of March 2018 it was estimated that 50,000 latrines needed to be constructed and maintained, requiring the creation of at least 30 cludge management facilities to maintain existing latrines.

In the camps, most shelters are constructed using bamboo and plastic sheeting or tarpaulins, highly vulnerable to the impact of natural disasters including flooding and cyclones. The government authorities are not allowing any permanent structures to be constructed and have severely limited what shelter items can be given to refugees by NGOs. JOM is in charge of shelter and is able to distribute what is needed. Refugees are

¹ Inter Sector Co-ordination Group (ISCG) situation update - 27th September 2018
² Inter Sector Co-ordination Group (ISCG) situation update - 20th September 2018
³ Joint Response Plan for Rohingya Humanitarian Crisis, March - December 2018
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not allowed to access local markets. Some traders come in to the camps but refugees lack resources to buy items they need as they are also forbidden to work and therefore cannot earn as income. Refugees in the camps need basic NFI items such as cooking stoves, cooking fuel, clothing, mats and blankets. The World Food Programme is responsible for regular food distributions to refugees, but these are very basic and malnutrition continues to be a major concern as refugees have limited ability to purchase additional ingredients like fruit and vegetables.

One year after the influx first began on 20th August 2017, refugees now face additional threats. They continue to live in congested sites that are ill-equipped to handle the monsoon rains and cyclone seasons, with limited options for evacuation. Many refugees have expressed uncertainty about their future, explaining that they would not agree to return to Myanmar until questions of citizenship, legal rights, access to services, justice and restriction are addressed. The long term future of the new arrivals remains very uncertain.

The influx has also had a negative impact on local host communities who were already amongst some of the poorest communities in Bangladesh. The sudden arrival of so many refugees has pushed up food prices and lowered day labouring wages. The population density has also put a significant strain on the environment by contributing to deforestation (trees are cut down for use as fuel), and depleting water resources. It is important that agencies also address host community needs in their interventions to prevent tensions arising between the two groups. The government of Bangladesh has requested that all NGOs split interventions 70:30 between refugees and host communities.

**Tearfund response – partner profile and projects to date**

The Disasters Emergency Committee (DEC) launched a public appeal on 4th October 2017 and Tearfund launched their own appeal alongside this. Whilst Tearfund has been working in Bangladesh since the 1970s, Tearfund did not have an existing presence in Cox’s Bazar. Tearfund therefore entered into new partnerships with local NGOs to respond to the crisis. Tearfund partnered with local NGO COAST Trust in September 2017 and partnered with another local NGO, CCDB (Christian Commission for the Development of Bangladesh) in October 2017. Tearfund also supported a project run by a global partner organisation, World Concern, who were working with Medair.

Our first project with COAST Trust began in September 2017 and provided immediate relief to the newly arrived refugees in Bangladesh, with a focus on healthcare, food and water distributions. Phase 1 of our DEC response lasted for 6 months from 4 October 2017 to 31 March 2018. (Tearfund worked through COAST Trust and a global partner, World Concern). CCDB’s intervention focused on protection and NFI’s whilst World Concern distributed shelter and hygiene kits to 3,375 households. Phase 2 of the DEC response is 18 months and runs from 1 April 2018 to 30 September 2019. Tearfund is responding through COAST Trust and the focus is on NFIs, WASH, DER, host community livelihood support, as well as continuing to strengthen the Protection work from Phase 1.

Tearfund’s own appeal, along with funding from other Integral Alliance member agencies, supported partner CCDB with projects focusing on WASH, NFIs, DER, Protection, and host community livelihood support. Through Tear Netherlands, Tearfund with CCDB has received further funding from the Dutch Relief Alliance for a project focusing on further WASH activities and NFIs including gas fuel distributions based on a voucher system.

**How the need for the requested assignment arose**

Tearfund has been selected as one of three DEC Member Agencies to commission and publish an independent evaluation of the DEC funded response to the sudden influx of refugees arriving in Bangladesh from Myanmar. The evaluation is a means of accountability to the British Public who generously gave through the DEC Appeal, and aims to examine the impact, relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of Tearfund’s Phase 2 response. It will therefore only focus on the activities of the DEC funded partner, which for phase 2 is COAST Trust only.

The following main audiences will utilise findings from this evaluation:

**Tearfund, implementing partner and programme participants**

- To assess programme achievement, generate knowledge, and learn and document lessons for replicating good practices and use findings to inform future responses.
- To assess and demonstrate accountability for the funding received to communities we work with and the Disasters Emergency Committee
- To share findings with the affected communities we worked with for the emergency response to the sudden influx of refugees arriving in Bangladesh from Myanmar.

**The DEC team**

- To share findings, information and impact on the Emergency Appeal for People Reeling Myanmar to external stakeholders and supporters.

2. **PURPOSE**

**a) Evaluation Goal & Objectives**

The aim of this assignment is to assess Tearfund’s DEC funded, partner-led intervention since 1 April 2018 in FCMN camps and host communities. This exercise will evaluate implementation against project plans to determine whether the project is delivering on time, meeting objectives, what changes the project encountered and whether adjustments are needed.

In addition, the aim would be to produce recommendations for improving the effectiveness of future operations in Bangladesh’s Rohingya Response and provide recommendations and lessons learnt which can be applied to current and future interventions in camps and host communities.

**Objectives**

1. To assess the quality of emergency project delivery against the key evaluation criteria (relevance, impact, efficiency, effectiveness) considering how the response is aligning with the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS).
2. To assess the project effectiveness, including intended and unintended impact, and the level of adaptation to the changing context in the target communities.
3. To identify key good practices and lessons learnt, including how these have been used throughout the project to improve delivery and to make recommendations for future programming.

**b) Tearfund Outcomes**

The evaluator will assess the Tearfund Outcomes ‘Disasters Responded To’ using the criteria explained in section 5.

**c) OECD-DAC and Core Humanitarian Standard**

The evaluation will use the OECD-DAC criteria as a framework and will consider
Tearfund’s Quality Standards (QS) and Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS) within this framework. The selected consultant will focus on specific DAC criteria for this evaluation and incorporate the related CHS and QS within the chosen criteria. For this evaluation the chosen criteria are impact, relevance, efficiency and effectiveness.

- Impact: The positive changes that Tearfund’s response has had to date, which can be replicated. The negative impacts that our response activities have had to date, which should be amended to ensure positive impact.

When looking at impact please consider Tearfund QS of Resilience and CHS 5: Communities and people affected by crisis have access to safe and responsive mechanisms to handle complaints.

Areas for consideration include:
- the intended and unintended effects (social, physical, environmental, economic), both positive and negative, of the project on beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The views of beneficiaries about the impact should be sought;
- the major factors influencing the impact of the project on beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries;
- the extent to which the most vulnerable have been targeted.

- Relevance: The extent to which the activities of Tearfund’s response are suited to the priority needs of affected communities.

When looking at relevance please consider: Tearfund QS of Accountability, Impactability and Targeting, Protection and Gender. Population with specific needs identified by ISCG-Protector sector and CHS 1: Communities and people affected by crisis receive assistance appropriate and relevant to their needs.

Areas for consideration include:
- the validity of the project objectives;
- the relevance of the project with the needs and vulnerabilities of the target group;
- the extent to which target beneficiaries felt involved in the process of design, implementation and monitoring of the project;
- the ways in which the project design reflected lessons learned from previous experience;
- the use and enhancement by the project of the existing skills, knowledge and coping strategies of the target group;
- the consistency of the project with the vision, values, strategy and resources of Tearfund;
- the major factors influencing the relevance of the project to the priorities and policies of the target group, the partner and Tearfund;
- flexibility of the response taking into account the changing context and how relevant the current intervention is in terms of geographical targeting

- Efficiency: The extent to which Tearfund’s response is cost effective, delivering good value for money. Efficiency measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.

When looking at efficiency please consider: Tearfund QS of Technical Quality AND CHS 2: Communities and people affected by crisis have access to the humanitarian assistance they need at the right time and CHS 9: Communities and people affected by crisis can expect that the organisations assisting them are managing resources effectively, efficiently and ethically.

Areas for consideration include:
- the cost-efficiency of project activities;
- the achievement of objectives to time and to budget;
- comparison of the implementation of the project with alternatives;
- the major factors influencing the efficiency of the project;
- the extent to which Tearfund co-ordinated with other local and national actors to ensure complementary assistance to improve resilience.

- Effectiveness: A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives. This will include the extent to which different actors’ interventions are coordinated, promote synergy, and avoid gaps, duplication, and resource conflicts.

Areas for consideration include:
- the achievement of the project outputs;
- the achievement of the project purpose;
- the contribution towards the project goal;
- the major factors influencing the achievement / non-achievement of the project objectives and outputs;
- the requirements (FD-3, FD-7 and external audit) and the impact on effectiveness;
- the challenge of how to be most effective with limited resources when faced with a very large scale of need;
- the project conformity to agreed Tearfund Quality Standards, including communities fully participating in its design and implementation, transparency of information provided by Tearfund/partners, complaints handling, learning and continual improvement.

3. METHODOLOGY
The selected Lead Evaluator / Team Leader is to develop an ‘Inception Report’ detailing how the evaluation will be carried out, in discussion with the Bangladesh Country Team. An evaluation team will be selected, to include a local consultant and 2 local team members. A gender balance of 2 women and 2 men will be ensured. Prior to the field trip, a desk-based review of all proposals, reports, evaluations, and learning documents will be conducted by the Lead Evaluator / Team Leader as well as interviews with Thematic team advisors and other staff who have recently visited or been involved in supporting the response.

Activities are expected to include:
- Desk review of key documents prior to departure
- Review of Tearfund and NGO project documents as well as any third party reviews eg DEC Response Review
- Review of partner implementation and monitoring documents such as reports and distribution lists
- Interviews with key Tearfund staff supporting the programme
- Semi structured interviews with FOMO in camps and Host population in surrounding communities, assisted by Tearfund partners
- In-country key informant interviews with local government officials, sector leads and other humanitarian actors in sectoral areas where Tearfund partners have intervened
- In-country Tearfund and partner staff interviews
- Community Focus Group Discussions
- Direct Observations of the work being carried out during visits to the camps and host communities in Cox’s Bazar area
4. CONSULTANT SUITABILITY

All applicants should demonstrate experience and competence in the following areas:

1. Degree or Masters qualification, or equivalent, in Social Science/Disaster Risk Reduction/WASH Engineering/Psychosocial Studies or similar relevant subject.
2. Previous experience working in Bangladesh.
3. Proven experience of conducting crisis response evaluations, including in refugee or displacement contexts.
4. Provision of a strong proposed methodology, work plan and schedule of activities for the evaluation.
5. Knowledge and understanding of the humanitarian system in an emergency response, including the cluster/sector system, UN/NGO coordination.
6. Familiarity with the international quality standards applied in emergency contexts, including the Core Humanitarian Standard.
7. Experience of programming in an emergency response, in particular some or all of the following sectors: psychosocial, WASH, DRR, NFI, livelihoods programming.
8. Experience in the use of participatory methodologies including strong facilitation and coordination skills.
9. Excellent report writing and analytical skills, including proven ability to form concise, actionable recommendations.
10. Suitable cost and required availability.

These criteria will be used in the tender committee to compare applications and select a consultant.

5. TIMINGS

The field work for the evaluation is scheduled to take place in February 2019. A suggested itinerary is below but this may be finalised in consultation with the Consultant and the Country Team:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Suggested dates</th>
<th>Number of days required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading of key programme documents before travel</td>
<td>To be mostly completed by 15th January 2019</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss approach and finalise visit itinerary with In-Country Team</td>
<td>Week of 17th January 2019</td>
<td>1.5 hours by skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-departure briefing with Asia Geo Head</td>
<td>Week of 17th January 2019</td>
<td>1 hour by skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final arrangements - if needed, or reading</td>
<td>Week of 24th January 2019</td>
<td>1.5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with UK staff by skype</td>
<td>To be completed by 1st February 2019</td>
<td>0.5 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed number of days: 16 days

6. EVALUATION LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

6.1 Management of Visit

The Bangladesh Country Representative, Jacob Sarker, will oversee the Consultancy and is the first point of contact in Bangladesh for all logistical support and issues.

6.2 Evaluation of Consultancy

The Bangladesh country team and UK staff working on the Emergency Appeal for People Fleeing Myanmar response, will review and comment on the draft report. Comments will be incorporated into the final report.

Tearfund UK will send the Consultant a feedback form at the end of the consultancy.
7. STAKEHOLDERS
The Bangladesh Country Representative and team will provide guidance and direction in country. The Consultant and the evaluation team will be accompanied in the field by designated in country staff. Tearfund and partners will support all logistics required to fulfil the planned itinerary.

- Project participants and communities (women, children, youth, men, elderly, people with a disability, marginalised groups and others)
- Local community leaders e.g. nazis
- Tearfund partners
- Local Government
- ISCG in Cox's Bazar and other coordinating bodies (sector groups, UN, IOM)
- Tearfund Asia team
- Tearfund Bangladesh team
- Tearfund Humanitarian Support team
- Tearfund Thematic Support team

8. EVALUATION OUTPUT
The expected outputs of this evaluation include:

- An in-country feedback on initial findings to Tearfund and partner staff
- A report in Tearfund recommended reporting format (please refer to the consultant's briefing pack), including the following sections:
  - Section 1: Executive Summary (no more than two pages)
  - Section 2: Methodology
  - Section 3: Context Analysis
  - Section 4: Project Overview
  - Section 5: Key Findings
- Section 7: Conclusions
- Section 8: Key Insights
- Section 9: Specific Actionable and Prioritised Recommendations (maximum of 10 recommendations)
- Section 10: Annexes (indicative)
  - Draft member response and action plan
  - Terms of Reference for the Evaluation
  - Profile of the Evaluation Team
  - Evaluation Schedule
  - Protocols for the Evaluation
  - Documents consulted during the Evaluation
  - Persons participating in the Evaluation
  - Field data used during the Evaluation, including baselines
  - Bibliography

- A self-evaluation of the evaluation using the BOND evidence principles as per the linked google form
- A summary of the evaluation using the summary form (linked here)

9. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The following criteria are used to assess the contribution that the intervention has made to the Tearfund Outcomes and the OECD-DAC criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention was not intended to contribute to the outcome</td>
<td>Intervention has made no contribution to the outcome</td>
<td>Intervention has made little contribution to the outcome</td>
<td>Intervention has made some contribution to the outcome</td>
<td>Intervention has made a significant contribution to the outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) OECD-DAC Criteria: The intervention is to be assessed against the DAC criteria using the following scale:

- Impact
- Relevance
- Efficiency
- Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low or no visible contribution to this criterion</td>
<td>Some evidence of contribution to this criterion but significant improvement required</td>
<td>Evidence of satisfactory contribution to this criterion but requirement for continued improvement</td>
<td>Evidence of good contribution to this criterion but with some areas for improvement remaining</td>
<td>Evidence that the contribution is strong and/or exceeding that which was expected of the intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. UTILISATION OF EVALUATION FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

a) Dissemination of Findings

The lead evaluator is to submit the evaluation report to the Bangladesh country office and Tearfund UK. On approval, Tearfund will pass the report onto the DEC and a summary will be published on the Tearfund and ANAP websites. Tearfund UK will then ensure that findings and actionable recommendations are disseminated across the organisation as appropriate for action and learning purposes.

b) Action Plan: A draft action plan is to be developed as part of the evaluation report using the linked template. This is also attached at Annex B.

11. EVALUATION OF CONSULTANCY

The evaluation is to be assessed against the Bond Evidence Principles (Voice and Inclusion, Appropriateness, triangulation and contribution and transparency). The assessment is to be completed using the google form (as above) as this ensures that the data is automatically captured.
10.2. Profile of the Evaluators

Team leader (International consultant)- Mr. Eric Debert
Email: ericdebert@yahoo.com

Eric Debert is an evaluation specialist and program manager with more than 25 years of hands-on technical and managerial experience in 22 countries in Asia and Africa working for the United Nations (UNICEF and UNDP) and for reputable INGOs (CARE, Save the Children, Plan International, Oxfam, Handicap International, Tearfund, Solidarites International).

His main expertise is in the field of disaster risk management, emergency preparedness and response, child protection, health, disability, mine action, BCC and M&E. He has led and participated in several needs assessment, program evaluations and gained practical experience in developing and implementing policies and strategies and in the coordination of multi-stakeholder’s consortium/network. His previous work included workshop facilitation, public relation, program management, assessment, design, implementation, monitoring/evaluation and knowledge management related to large development projects funded by the US department of State, European Union, the United Nations, DFID and by some foreign embassies.

Mr. Debert is graduated in the field of Social Sciences (master degree) and economics (degree). He is a French citizen and can work in English, French and Portuguese. Mr. Debert is currently based in South Africa.

National Researcher- Dr. Harold Sougato Baroi
Email: sarothi_baroi@yahoo.com

Dr. Baroi is an Associate Professor of Public Administration at University of Rajshahi. He has had his PhD in Law (Human Rights) in Australia and MPhil in Norway in Public Policy. He is a trained disaster management practitioner has a diploma in disaster management from Oxford Brooke University in the UK. Prior to his academic career he served in several international organizations. He has over 15 years’ association with NGOs and has an extensive experience in the development sector. He has extended consultancy support to Tear Fund, HEKS Switzerland, EED Germany, ISD India, CASA India, Baptist Aid and Leprosy International. He has represented Bangladesh as a Technical expert on Do No Harm at South Asian Local Capacity Building for Peace Initiative of Bread for the World in South Asia. He has published several articles in the international journals and have presented papers in different parts of the world. Dr. Baroi is currently based in Bangladesh.
## 10.3. Evaluation schedule

### Overall view of the evaluation schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>Desk review and inception report (including development of tools). Recruitment of the evaluation team</td>
<td>Home based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 1(^{st}) Feb</td>
<td>International consultant travel to Bangladesh from South Africa. Arrival in Dhaka, Friday 1(^{st}) Feb at 16:55 PM with EK 586</td>
<td>Dhaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 2(^{nd}) Feb</td>
<td>AM: Resting, reading documents PM: Dhaka to Cox’s bazar. Depart: 15:00 pm arrival in Cox’s bazar: 16:05 pm</td>
<td>Dhaka to Cox’s bazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 3(^{rd}) Feb</td>
<td>AM: Camp Pass (RRRC) &amp; TF’s Briefing with evaluation team PM: Evaluation Team preparation</td>
<td>Cox’s Bazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 4(^{th}) Feb</td>
<td>AM: Briefing with COAST PM: Separate KIIs with COAST’s project staff (direction, program, M&amp;E, finance, procurement)</td>
<td>Cox’s Bazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 5(^{th}) Feb</td>
<td>Field work (see below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 6(^{th}) Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 7(^{th}) Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 8(^{th}) Feb</td>
<td>Consolidating notes</td>
<td>Cox’s Bazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 9(^{th}) Feb</td>
<td>Consolidating notes</td>
<td>Cox’s Bazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 10(^{th}) Feb</td>
<td>Field work (see below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 11th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 12th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 13(^{th}) Feb</td>
<td>AM: Debriefing with COAST</td>
<td>Cox’s Bazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 14(^{th}) Feb</td>
<td>PM: Travelling from Cox’s (10:50 am to Dhaka 11:55am)</td>
<td>Dhaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 15(^{th}) Feb</td>
<td>International consultant travelling back to South Africa. Leaving Dhaka at 9:55 am.</td>
<td>Dhaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of February</td>
<td>Production of draft and final report</td>
<td>Home based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Detailed field work schedule
### 5th Feb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>COAST Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFS Staff KII</td>
<td>Sohel Barua (AFS 9)</td>
<td>10 am - 11 am</td>
<td>Team 2</td>
<td>Dileep Bhowmik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFS Children FGD</td>
<td>AFS 9 Girls</td>
<td>11.15 am - 12.45am</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
<td>Shanewaz Babu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS Staff KII</td>
<td>Rajia Akter (CFS 8)</td>
<td>10 am - 11 am</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
<td>Shanewaz Babu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS Children FGD</td>
<td>CFS 8</td>
<td>11.15 am - 12.45am</td>
<td>Team 2</td>
<td>Dileep Bhowmik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AFS Child safety Committee FGD</td>
<td>AFS 9 (Male)</td>
<td>2.15 Pm - 3.15 Pm</td>
<td>Team 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFS Child safety Committee FGD</td>
<td>CFS 8 (Male)</td>
<td>2.15 Pm - 3.15 Pm</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6th Feb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>COAST Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>AFS Children not attending parents</td>
<td>AFS 9</td>
<td>10 am - 11 am</td>
<td>Team 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFS Parents FGD</td>
<td>AFS 9 (Male)</td>
<td>11.10am - 12.10Pm</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
<td>Shanewaz Babu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI FGD (FDMN)</td>
<td>NFI Beneficiary (Male)</td>
<td>10 am - 11 am</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
<td>Arafat Uddin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFS Parents FGD</td>
<td>11.10am - 12.10Pm</td>
<td>Kamal Hossain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>WASH VISIT(LATRINE,TUBEWELL,SOLAR)</td>
<td>Latrine 10,11</td>
<td>1.10Pm - 2Pm</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tubewell 10,host</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KII PSYCHOSOCIAL COUNSELLORS</td>
<td>Latrine 10,11</td>
<td>1.10Pm - 2Pm</td>
<td>Team 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tubewell 10,host</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Niliur kabir</td>
<td>Shubrata Barua</td>
<td>2PM - 3PM</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helal Hossain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VISIT DRR/SOLAR</td>
<td>Drain beside CFS 2</td>
<td>1.10 PM - 2PM</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FGD MAJHI TRAINING</td>
<td>Beside CFS 2</td>
<td>2 PM - 3 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7th Feb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>COAST Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES FGD/KII</td>
<td>Beneficiary (Male)</td>
<td>10 Am - 11 Am</td>
<td>Team 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NFI FGD (FDMN)</td>
<td>NFI Beneficiary (Female)</td>
<td>11.10 am - 12.10 Pm</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NFI FGD (HOST)</td>
<td>Beneficiary (Male)</td>
<td>Start at 10 am</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELDERS FGD</td>
<td>Beneficiary (Female)</td>
<td>12.30 Pm - 1.15 Pm</td>
<td>Team 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFS Children not attending parents</td>
<td>CFS 8 (Male)</td>
<td>11.45 Am - 12.45 Pm</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10th Feb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>COAST Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>AFS Staff KII</td>
<td>10 am - 11 am</td>
<td>Beside 7 no. center Host yard</td>
<td>Team 2</td>
<td>Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFS Children FGD</td>
<td>11.15 am - 12.45am</td>
<td>Beside 7 no. center Host yard</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
<td>Sayif/Razaul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFS Staff KII</td>
<td>Shahadat Hossain (CFS 6)</td>
<td>10 am - 11 am</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
<td>Harold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFS Children FGD</td>
<td>11.15 am - 12.45am</td>
<td>Beside 6 no. center Host yard</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
<td>Dileep/babu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AFS Child safety Committee FGD</td>
<td>AFS 7 (Female)</td>
<td>2.15 Pm - 3.15 Pm</td>
<td>Team 2</td>
<td>Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFS Child safety Committee FGD</td>
<td>CFS 6(Female)</td>
<td>2.15 Pm - 3.15 Pm</td>
<td>Beside 6 no. center Host yard</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Feb</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>AFS Children not attending parents</td>
<td>AFS 7</td>
<td>Team 2 Eric Sayif/Razaul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFS Parents FGD</td>
<td>AFS 7 (female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NFI FGD (FDMN)</td>
<td>NFI Beneficiary (Female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>CFS Parents FGD</td>
<td>CFS 8</td>
<td>Team 1 Harold Dileep/Babu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KII with WASH focal agency (BRAC)</td>
<td>1.10Pm - 2PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KII SITE MANAGEMENT agency BRAC</td>
<td>Pankoj, Javed</td>
<td>Camp 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VISIT DRR/SOLAR</td>
<td>Drain beside CFS 3</td>
<td>Team 1 Harold Dileep/Babu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FGD MAJHI TRAINING</td>
<td>Beside CFS 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Feb</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES FGD/KII</td>
<td>Beneficiary (Female)</td>
<td>Team 2 Eric Sayif/Razaul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KII Protection focal agency (MoWCA)</td>
<td>10 Am - 11 Am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NFI FGD (HOST)</td>
<td>Beneficiary (Female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beside 7 no. center Host yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beside 6 no. center Host yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10.4. Persons interviewed during the Evaluation

#### COAST Trust’s staff interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation COAST staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Md Razul Karim</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>M. Kamal Hossain</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>M. Arafat Uddin</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>M. Dileep Bhowmik</td>
<td>Field Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>M. Shanewaz Babu</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>M. Nur Ahmed</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>M. Lutfor Rahman/Ali Abbas</td>
<td>Accounts and Admin officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Md Eakub</td>
<td>Regional finance officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>M. Muhammad Saiful Islam</td>
<td>M&amp;E Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional team leader</td>
<td>M. Jahangir Alam</td>
<td>Team leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Tearfund’s staff and other interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>KII Interviewees</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mr. Chris Mc Donald</td>
<td>Acting Country representative</td>
<td>Tearfund Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mr. Tom Board</td>
<td>Program Support &amp; Finance Officer</td>
<td>Tearfund UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mr. Steve Collins</td>
<td>Head of Asia team</td>
<td>Tearfund UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mr. David Badal Gomes</td>
<td>Program manager and EES</td>
<td>Tearfund Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mr. James Rana Baidaya.</td>
<td>Response Manager Cox’s bazar</td>
<td>Tearfund-Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mr. Emon Paul Dcosta</td>
<td>Finance and admin manager</td>
<td>Tearfund-Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mr. Sonny Dcosta</td>
<td>DMEAL officer</td>
<td>Tearfund-Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mr. Peter Sarkar</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Tearfund-Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Pankaj Kumar</td>
<td>BRAC Site management coordinator Camp 1E and 1W (tel: 018 47 45 58 17)</td>
<td>BRAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Abdal Hosen Tabed</td>
<td>BRAC WASH coordinator camp 1E and 1W (tel: 01847 455602)</td>
<td>BRAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Anita Rani Saha</td>
<td>Coordinator Regional Trauma Counseling centre</td>
<td>Ministry of Women and Children Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>FDG/KII</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Female/Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Children AFS 9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>COAST Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Facilitator AFS 9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Child Safety committee AFS 9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Parents not attending AFS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Parents attending AFS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Psychosocial counselors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>People with disabilities and elders</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FDG</td>
<td>Elders women</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Women beneficiaries of NFI</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Child Safety Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FDG</td>
<td>Adolescent boys</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Facilitator AFS 7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Parent of children attending AFS 7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Parents of children not attending</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Persons with disabilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KII</td>
<td>One girl with disability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KII</td>
<td>One boy with disability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team 2: Similar type of FDG than team 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of respondents who participated in the FGDs was 105 (65 male and 40 female). In addition, 2 KII with CFS Facilitators were also conducted</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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10.6. Refugees population.

Rohingya refugees estimated by location as of 12 Dec 2018

(source: RRRC-UNHCR Family Counting Exercise & NPM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugees in Camps and Settlements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutupalong Expansion Site</td>
<td>609,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutupalong RC</td>
<td>17,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 14, 15, 16</td>
<td>102,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 21 (Chakmarkul)</td>
<td>12,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 22 (Unchiprang)</td>
<td>22,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 23 (Shamlapur)</td>
<td>10,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 24 (Leda)</td>
<td>33,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 25 (Ali Khali)</td>
<td>9,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 26 (Nayapara)</td>
<td>41,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 27 (Jadimura)</td>
<td>14,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayapara RC</td>
<td>26,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>900,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugees in Host Communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teknaf</td>
<td>4,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukhla</td>
<td>2,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>6,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Rohingya</strong></td>
<td>907,952</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.7 Functioning of the CFS/AFS centers.

- Each AFS has two session-Morning and afternoon and opens to the children for six days in a week. The team has found that the AFSs are timely opened and closed.
- The AFS follows a lesson plan and the facilitators are following a set routine that includes:
  - Preparation and Welcome
  - Drawing and Entertainment/ Rhyme (Burmese and English) and Entertainment
  - Number and Alphabet Learning/ Washing hands/ Cyclone preparedness/ Hygiene Education-check / Food and Nutrition
  - Play time
- The facilitators of CFS have received training on child protection and child right, first aid training, DRR and disaster preparedness.
- The CFSs are well equipped with learning and playing materials that include- paper, drawing pencil, notebook, Lego and other playing items, drawing book. It also has first aid box and hygiene kits.
- The age group of the children are 5-10. The team noticed a significant number of students are girls and there is no uneasiness/inertia among these children, particularly, among girls. They confidently recited the rhymes and can read the letters.
- Children cut their nails (Have Checked all the children of the CFS and found the nails clean), wash their hands before having food and after coming out from the toilets. They are also wearing sandals and brush their teeth daily.
- Children are referred to AFS when they turned 11. If someone wants to stay longer at the CFS, they are not forced to go to AFS.
- There is a child register which is maintained regularly. The CFS also keeps parent’s consultation form and holds parent meeting twice in a month.
- If a child is absent in the AFS, the facilitator visits their house and checks if there is any problem, particularly physical illness. If requires, they refer them to health clinics.
- Children Attendance register rate is above 80%.
- There is a map of the area which shows all the important places of the block which include clinic, mosque, CIC office, Learning center, distribution point, child friendly space, psychological support center, women friendly space, site management office, elderly friendly space, etc.
- Home visit is made on a regular basis.
- Complaint register is maintained and action taken appropriately.
- The center has monthly and weekly routine.
- If children want to go to a learning center after finishing their sessions CFS, the facilitator encourage them to go there keeping it in mind that it is only benefiting the children learning new things.
- Coast trust has collaborated with Handicap international on hygiene promotion.
- CFS has enough space to accommodate 4 groups to do their work simultaneously.
- CFS is using local materials, traditional games/rhymes, for example-Burmese Rhyme.
- Not all the CFS has outdoor place to play or do activities.
10.8 Perceived impact of the crisis on host community.

Below few testimonies shared during the evaluation by representatives of the Host communities in relation to the impact of the crisis on their livelihoods.

- Many people from host community have lost acres of land or cannot grow anything due to refugee influx. They used to cultivate lands for their livelihood. Whiling explaining his situation, a respondent said:

  “I used to cultivate 5 acre of land and had mango trees from which I earned BDT 150000/ per year. But this year as rohingha people came and occupied the land I had to sell all the mangoes a month before harvesting at BDT 25000/”.

Similarly, another respondent said:

  “I had six cows which I used for cultivation but now I have no cows remaining. They are stolen and I am now out of work.”

- The people of host community who are day laborer have also lost employment. Previously they had work for at least five days a week, which is now reduced to 2-3 days. The wage they now get is between 150 to 200/day, which is half of what they used to get previously.

- Their children are not going to school as the government school is far away from their place and the NGO School which was previously giving education to their children are now focusing on the Rohingyas children. Also, the school at the Upazila level is now overcrowded with children from different locations due to shift of focus of NGO schools.

- The Rohingyas community is also getting intolerant and threaten the host community as there are several incidents of verbal and physical assault happening on daily basis.

- Local business-like shops are now completely controlled by the Rohingha people as the host community are small in number and they cannot keep their business due to the perceived threats.

- There is hardly any place for cultivation or farming activities as the entire field is occupied with the people from the guest community (Rohingyas).

- The host community is not receiving any food cards or support from the government even though the level of vulnerability is higher among them according to them.

- The host community received non-food items from Coast Trust. The Items included- blanket, jacket for children, Shawl.

- The need assessment was done by Coast Trust before the distribution of items.

- During the distribution, the people with disability were given priorities to collect the items ahead of others.
10.9 Questionnaire for staff of CFS/AFS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of staff interviewed: Male:</th>
<th>Female:</th>
<th>Total:</th>
<th>Name of interviewees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum standards for CFS/AFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff should be recruited from both the refugee and the host communities to support social cohesion and address language barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Training received:</strong> Basic training package for CFS staff or workers includes: facilitation of age appropriate activities, instruction on how to develop, child rights, Psychological First Aid (PFA), Child Protection in Emergencies, identification and registration of vulnerable children, safeguarding and reporting mechanisms, and inclusion of children with disabilities. Basic First Aid training is highly recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identification of unaccompanied and separated children and staff know who to contact for case management including family tracing and reunification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CFS staff are aware of alternative care arrangements for unaccompanied children and know how to make referrals to relevant services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Staff have signed the organization’s Code of Conduct and child safeguarding policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The children staff ratio should be minimum 2 staff for 25 children, regardless of the number of children there should always be 2 staff present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Enlist and train community volunteers and youth group members to assist in running activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you keep a record with the <strong>number of children registered</strong> in the CFS/AFS? If yes, can we see the document? Is the list segregated by age, gender, and disability? (Individual number of children access PSS support: Children are registered individually on the first time they join the CFS. The cumulative number constitutes the total number of children accessing CFS.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you keep a record with all children in attendance? If yes, can we see the document? Is the list segregated by age, gender, and disability? (Daily attendance in CFS is recorded on a daily basis and constitute the number of children attending the CFS. This number cannot be cumulated over a period of time, and thus cannot be used as number of children as it would result in double counting individuals (children attend multiple times over a period of time).)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you refer children to other services? If yes how do you do it? For example, do you track the children you refer and follow up with the services. Which services do you refer children referred to specialized services including health, mental health, nutrition, shelter, food, NFI, education, and GBV?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do you have an activity plan/ a weekly activity schedule of the activities implemented by the CFS? Can we see it? thanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities should be tailored to different age range and stage of development. Separate CFS sessions or group activities for girls and boys of ages 0-3 accompanied by caregiver, 4-7, 8-11, and 12-15 years for a minimum of 1.5 hours. Schedule should be visible and available in relevant languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. CFS’s should not replace regular schooling and children should be encouraged to attend camp learning spaces. Mechanisms for supporting schooling developed. How do you ensure children from CFS/AFS also attend other learning centers (schools, madrasats..)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. <strong>No more than 125 children per static CFS/per shift</strong> should be in attendance. Children should attend CFS at least 2 shifts/week on different days and during each shift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Have you coordinated with other agencies and sectors to provide additional support such as health and hygiene education, breast-feeding, supplemental feeding, information on humanitarian assistance, etc in the CFS/AFS? Please provide examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. <strong>Inclusion:</strong> What did you do to make the AFS/CFSs accessible and inclusive for girls and excluded children (such as those with disabilities) and their distinctive needs and capacities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. What do you do to ensure the participation of children? (Meaningful participation of children in activities (i.e group works), sharing of implementing social cohesion and addressing language barriers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of CFS construction &amp; safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Static CFS’s should be built according to UNICEF/Ministry of Social Services design standards of at least 80 square meters and should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. CFS should provide adequate space for small groups to conduct different activities simultaneously. The space can be divided by rope or string.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Ensure properly maintained WASH facilities, and water for drinking as well as for hygiene purposes are available; i.e.: separate boy/girl latrines, water and soap for handwashing, and safe water for drinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Mobile CFS’s should be protected from sun and rain whenever possible using a temporary structure or plastic tarp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Access to outdoor area for recreational activities whenever possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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