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1. GENERAL INFORMATION

Name of grant recipient: Strømme Foundation (SF)
Agreement number: GLO-0640 QZA-13/0587
Period of the agreement: 2014-2018
Report for year: 2017

1.1. Geographic areas of involvement

No need to answer – will be filled in by International Department

2. ORGANISATIONAL UPDATE

Partner: COAST Trust

COAST Trust is a non-profit development organization. It is emerged as an outcome of nationalization process of Action Aid Bhola project in 1998. Since then the organization has been working for wellbeing for the coastal community, especially for the women and children of the coastal poor. It is registered (No. 1242) by the NGO Affairs Bureau of Bangladesh Government. It has got registration (No. 00956-04041-00068) from Microcredit Regulatory Authority, Bangladesh Bank. COAST is also a certified organization by Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) International. COAST has its core program with peoples’ organization, microfinance, health, agriculture & livestock and disaster management. And noncore program with non-formal education, local government strengthening, and community legal aid services, and communication for development which are mainly donor funded development projects. Among the key donors there are Bangladesh Government, UNICEF, Stromme Foundation, DFID, European Commission, PKSF, MJF, Save the Children and The Asia Foundation. During 2001 COAST has extended its program in Cox’s Bazar district with fund and technical support by Stromme Foundation for implementing microfinance and education program for poor families and especially for adolescents and children of the district.

ASSETS AND BUDGET

COAST has tangible fixed assets BDT 125.939 (US$ 1, 57) million (Cost Value), net current assets BDT 1324.24 (US$ 16.55) million, capital fund BDT 110.55 (US$ 1.39) million, as on 30 June 2016 (last audited report). During the year 2017-18 it has the annual budget of BDT 485.32 ($6.07) million (the exchange rate is 1:80). Here micro finance income is BDT 378.61 (US$ 4.73) million and 83% of total expenditure is from micro finance. The percentage of administration cost is 3.40% while the program cost is 96.60%.

COAST will give the emphasis on significant horizontal expansion of the programs also in the urban areas. It will also give the priority on human resource development for running the quality program as well as the organization with the feeling of ownership.
3. PROGRAMME STATUS

3.1. The most important results achieved in 2017

Since this is early in the 2014-2018 framework agreement, the focus should be on both outputs (NOT activities but outcomes.)

PEOPLE’S ORGANIZATIONS

In 2017, 290 Self Reliant Groups (SRGs) who conducts their regular group meetings were organized regarding its interest based on their local problem and solution. In 2017, there were 6090 group meetings of SRGs done by fortnightly. 224 SRGs came under savings out of 290 SRGs by 2017. Under SEEDS program, 38 Ward Committees (WCs) have been formulated based on their plan. Small group now negotiated with local elected body and achieved some results through advocacy. During the period, they achieved important results. Total 686 families received Ration Cards from Unions Parishad. This result came because of group efforts. The graph showed that 55% SRGs were functional on the work in 2017. In 2017, those groups arranged their regular meetings, setting their agendas and wrote their decision in the register. 55 % SRGs also achieved results against their small group plan in 2017.

The president and the secretary of word committees at Islampur Union said that they were not aware and not united before. However, through several day observations and Exposure Visit under SEEDS Program, now they realised that their ward committee is a power. The most important thing is that local administration members gave importance to them and the majority of families under SEEDS Program were able to receive Ration Cards from the Union Parishad.”

38 secondary levels of Ward Committees were oriented on their responsibilities. Under those Ward Committees, 717 members were included and they set up their plans. Those secondary WCs work on larger perspectives such as advocacy. They work in collaboration with some well accepted persons in society. Another total 38 Advisory Committees were formulated to help Ward Committees on different purposes such as day observation, advocacy etc.
ECONOMIC AND LIVELIHOOD DEVELOPMENT

Total 48 Community Services Providers (CSP) promoted at 12 Unions in Cox’s Bazaar. Through Court Yard Session they have been providing services to SEEDS community. Besides, they provided services to community as per their needs. Also, they conducted 24 vaccination campaigns on chick and duck. They conducted 1,019 Court Yard Sessions to the SRG and were based on agricultural and livestock rearing.

With assistant of technical help those families established their family Income Generating Activities (IGA). As a result, those families have been improving their livelihood conditions since 2014. Now they are able to establish their IGA more effectively. 84% families engaged in chick rearing, 77.78% families engaged in vegetable gardening and around 17.14% and 15.25% cow and goat rearing respectively. Those families got directly technical and advisory support from CSPs at 12 Unions in 2017.

QUALITY EDUCATION (FORMAL AND NON FORMAL)

Moktab Based Pre-school

20 Moktab based pre-primary schools were started under SEEDS working areas in 2016. Those established Moktabs were run through active participation of members of SRGs. In fact, 9 pre-primary moktab schools out of 20 Moktabs had been run where Moktabs were not available. Similarly, in 2017 under SEEDS Program at 12 Unions in Cox’s Bazar 19 Moktab based pre-primary schools were set up. 9 Facilitators of Moktab pre-school received 10 days long training facilitated by government specialist trainer in 2017 also. They were capacitated providing and facilitating joyful
learning for learners. They ran the Moktab centres very smoothly. 88% of Moktab centres had child friendly environment and joyful learning environment in 2017. 529 learners out of 565 in Moktab 2017 were enrolled in primary on January 2018. 414 learners comes from FDP families. 19 Centre Management Committee (CMC) were formed where 171 members of CMC were from FDP families. Most of the parents of Moktab learners had been oriented on the importance of mainstream education. As a result, they were committed to send their children to mainstream schools. After completing one year program of pre-school in Moktab, 93% learners were enrolled in mainstream school in 2018. Having enrolled in the mainstream schools learners are very happy at present. It is well known to all that Moktab based pre-schools have great impact in society.

**Functionality of School Management Committee (SMC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target In 2018</th>
<th>In 2015</th>
<th>In 2016</th>
<th>Mid Year 2017</th>
<th>In 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under SEEDS Program there have been fourteen selected mainstream schools at three upazilas (Cox’s Bazar Sadar, Ramu and Pekua) in Cox’s Bazar District since 2015. In order to get sustained quality education at remote area like Pekua, COAST trust in association with Stromme Foundation organized several events. 3 upazila platforms/Forums under SEEDS Program were formed with the members of SMCs to ensure the functionality of SMCs and quality education. Among of events, an Exposure Visit at Faijunnessa Govt. Primary School with respected Head Teachers along with Presidents and Secretaries of Upazila Forums of SMCs from selected Schools was organized on the 9th December, 2017. The participants who were glad at the educational activities of Faijunnessa Govt. Primary Schools were 50. The objective of Exposure Visit was to strengthen the active participation of School Management Committees (SMCs) in Schoolings in order to ensure the quality education. Through the Exposure Visit, members of SMCs and the Head Teachers are more conscious and knowledgeable about the participatory educations with joyful leanings. Even they can get chance to know the new things and challenges at implementation level. Now all the selected schools have responsible SMC committee. They are oriented on their role and responsibilities. The above figure demonstrates functionality of SMCs and shows that 67% of SMCs are functional among the 14 schools.

**Joyful Learning Environment in the School**

The figure shows the joyful learning environment in the school. The aim is to ensure and enable joyful learning environment in the certain schools. From baseline survey we have found that 12.5% schools had joyful learning environment. In 2017 the joyful learning environment increases to 67% school. Gradually after intervention of SEEDS Program the scenario is being changed in the school. The most noticeable thing is that 3 Upazila Forums with members of SMCs of mainstream schools work to
ensure Joyful Learning Environment.

**Bridge schools**

8 Bridge schools were established in SEEDS working areas in 2017 all of those engaging the members of SRGs. 8 facilitators of Bridge school were trained. 155 school dropout learners were enrolled in Bridge schools. Out of them 145 learners were from SEEDS families. 8 Bridge School Management Committees (BSMCs) were formed of members of SRGs. After completing one year schoolings in Bridge School, 98% learners backed to mainstream school. It was evident that those who attended to bridge school were able to get better result in the final examination. Among all the learners in mainstreams schools it was comparatively proved that bridge schools’ learners have been performing better in the class than the regular learners of school. Another 121 learners got promoted next class who were learners of bridge school in 2016 and got only coaching support in 2017. Total 224 learners of Bridge Schools passed to next class in Cox’s Bazaar in 2017.

**Literacy and Life Skills Trainings**

Total 266 adolescent girls graduated from 12 Shonglap in 2017. Out of them 157 graduated adolescent girls from FDP community. 266 adolescent girls received general income generating training on Agricultural and Livestock in 2017. In fact, 115 adolescent girls got trainings on tailoring in 2017. Another 223 Shonglap adolescent girls received training on bag making. Besides some others special training (design quilt making, cap making etc.) provided from Shonglap adolescent girls in 2017.
Livelihood Development and Micro Enterprise Development

Third year action plan of 3,444 families were reviewed in 2017. They all are exclusively organized into 290 Self Reliant Groups (SRGs). 3,444 (FDP) families’ activities under FDP review were implemented in 2017. 290 Community Facilitators (CF) facilitate the SRGs with their facilitation skills. 48 Community services providers are functional. They provided court yard sessions to the SRGs members. Hence, members of SRGs now are having better IGA activities through 24 vaccination camps to improve the livelihoods development of targeted families of SEEDS Program.

Social protection

Overall 229 children under SEEDS program and near community got financial support in 2017 with regard to health and education. The children got emphasis specially who were disable and live economic hardship. Some Shonglap adolescent girls got support to re-admit in school. Likewise, in SRGs meeting social protection especially for the children is discussed. The member of Shopner Sriri small group at Kawerkup Union said, “I care to my son all time. I learnt the mental development of children depend on parents care in the group meeting.” She also said that my home is secure for the children.”
From the graph, it is proved that 81% families reported that they secured home environment for their children in 2017. Instead, it was only 9% in 2015. Under SEEDS program, a special message was carried out to sensitize the children home environment. The message was that “Safe home for children make a developed society”. Through 700 monthly meeting, parents were sensitized for the children.

3.2. A representative example of achieved results (outcome)

[Please suggest 2-3 examples, writing no more than 3 sentences for each; If possible, provide examples of broader achievements or an interesting case study, not the story of an individual.]

Asset increased:

Yeasin Arafat, disable child of Md Hashem and Khurshida, is trying to walk at the yard. Khurshida (mother of Yeasin Arafat) said that she likes to see her son as a normal child.
Violence Reduced gradually:

Women often are victimized of violence by the men. SEEDS Program has special and specific objectives for reducing the violence against women. In 2015, the violence reduction rate was only 4% in Cox’s Bazaar but in 2016 it was reduced to 33%. Women have better opportunities to work outside of the families. Instead, it was very difficult to think that women work outside the home two years ago. In Cox’s Bazaar, a woman is usually treated as housewife and not given the chance to work for even the economic purpose because the conservative practice is existed. Gradually scenario is being changed for women’s lives. So, they are allowed to work along with men at the field levels. Everything worked to reduce poverty. Graph showed the statistics of violence reduction. In 2017 report showed that it was a downturn at 53% violence against women.

Financial Services and Saving increased:

In Cox’s Bazar, 290 small groups have another objectives to acquire better financial services. By this time, total 224 SRGs engaged with saving activities. Out of them 74 small groups opened bank account in favour of the group name total BDT 47,65700 saved in 2017. Initially, those groups used their saving to general IGA. In some extent, they used thier savings money to productive sector. For instance, group members buy goats or cows by their saving. Then it provides to someone for rearing. But end of the production, the profit divided equaly to group and the person who rear. Those group
meetings and participatory decisions have been taken in their all affairs. Cashier of the each group managed group savings and bank transaction as well. Now, they are well known about financial transaction. Local members of respective unions are more responsible to provide service to SEEDS households. In 2017, 1,045 families received ration card from union Parishad. Those results came in the combine group efforts and advocacy initiatives of small group.

**Increased back to school tendency of Shonglap adolescent girls**

266 adolescent girls graduated from 12 Shonglap centers so that they become more aware about their rights. All of them were dropped out children from school and 157 adolescent girls came from SEEDS target households in 2017. 63% adolescent takes part in decision making process in family level.

We have total 27 Shonglap II where as 556 Shonglap graduated are engaged in different social activities. It is true that they are united now at their society. At present they participate in different campaigns on awareness raising, human trafficking, drag addiction etc. The Graph showed that 70% participants of Shonglap centre participated in family decision making process in 2016. They are pro-active on social issues. They talked about early marriage and against dowry in the family. Even they have grown

---

Khairun Ness, a participator of Shonglap Centre at Shilkhali Union at Pekua, reads in class X with a prosperous dream.
capacity to say no in case of early marriage and force marriage.

Ayesha Akter, an active participator of Shonglap Centre at Khurushkul Union at Cox’s Bazar Sadar, is a student at class IX and keeps contribution to her family. Her mother said that her daughter has learnt how to survive in the society and continues her studies after attending Shonglap Centre. As a result, now she is able to meet her dreams with her family.

3.3. To what extent programmes were carried out as plan

[Please describe any major deviations from plans, the extent to which planned for targets were reached, etc., the focus should be on outputs (but NOT activities). However, where information on outcomes is available please include this.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl</th>
<th>Name of Activities</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Target in 2016</th>
<th>Achievement in 2017</th>
<th>Deviance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family Development Plan review</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>3444</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56 Migrated families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SRG Group Formulation</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Micro Plan of Self Reliant Group</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Facilitation and skill Development Training Community Facilitators(CF)</td>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Training on Cash Management</td>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Exposure visit of SRG leaders</td>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SRG got training on entrepreneurship development.</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Exposure visit of SPA leaders</td>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Livestock Training for CSP</td>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Agricultural Training for CSP</td>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Training on Facilitation skill development training of Community Service providers.</td>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work plan Development of Ward Committee</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Leadership Development training of Ward Committee leaders</td>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sharing ward committee plan with Union Parishad</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ward Committee leaders training on Advocacy and Networking</td>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Training on Social Safety net support of Ward Committee leaders</td>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Workshop with Line Agencies</td>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Union Committee formation</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Union Committee leaders training on Advocacy</td>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Moktab Facilitators Basic Training</td>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Moktab Learners Enrolment</td>
<td>Learners</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bridge school selection</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bridge school establish</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bridge School Facilitator Basic training</td>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Workshop on Material Development</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>School Development Plan review</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>School management committee received daylong training on their roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Teachers of primary quality schools received training on English</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Education service provider selection</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ESP Basic training</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rest 1 year Experience
3.4. Risk Factors

(Were there particular risk factors (internal or external) that had a negative (or positive) influence on completion of the programmes?)

Internal:

Cox’s Bazar is one of the conservative areas where few program highly risk on implementation. Staff dropout may have deviation on achieving results.

External:

Political unrest may have possibilities to hamper SEEDS program’s implementation. Heavy rain and flash floods also are risk factor in order to run program. Besides, Cox’s Bazaar is one of the disaster prone areas in Bangladesh. It is clear that frequent cyclones interrupt program’s implementation.

4. ADDITIONAL RESULTS

(Please limit responses to the following to maximum half a page each.

4.1. SF’s value-added contribution to partners (capacity building, etc.)

SEEDS program is going to achieve its desire goals. This may be possible for consistent capacity building program by the Stromme Foundation Bangladesh. Besides, frequent field visit by the personnel of Stromme Foundation minimized the gap. Moreover, SF provided proper guideline and concept paper on each issue. Those things led us to accomplish SEEDS destination.

4.2. Cooperation with governments and other INGOs

Local government of Cox’s Bazaar cooperated SEEDS Program on different trainings. For example, they worked jointly on capacity building program for the purpose of attaining the sustainable development. Different parts of local government in Cox’s Bazar district are helpful to our SEEDS program too. Especially, district and Upazila education officers are cooperative and helpful on implementing SEEDS program providing necessary books for Moktab and Bridge School learners. District PTI is also cooperative during trainings what we organize. All rearing of livestock and agriculture was facilitated by local government officers. It is noticed that Upazila livestock officer support us during necessity of vaccine and others material that we needed.

4.3. Cross-cutting issues

Gender equality:

SF has given support to maintain the gender equality in COAST Trust. COAST Trust is also sensitive for maintaining the gender equality. There is a gender policy which is being practiced by COAST. COAST have special department where any gender related issues deal in. Any staff can drop their complaint against gender violation. Female and male staff ratio also tries to be maintained 50-50. In SEEDS program, we have total 24 permanent staffs out of them 9 are female. We always emphasis and encourage female staff on our program to establish gender equality. Finally, during planning and
decision making process of a FDP both male and female will be given equal importance and involvement.

Environmental sustainability:

COAST is working for environmental sustainability. We have no program or activities which are harmful to natural environment. Also, we have no program or activities which affect any animal or bio-spheres. COAST Trust works national and international advocacy on climate change. Equity BD network of COAST play vital role last conference on climate change in Paris. We have a network which promotes human rights. We don’t use plastic bottle in office and cold drink is forbidden officially. COAST encourage using public vehicles if available to minimise burn of fuel.

Inclusion:

In SEEDS program there is no obligation to include any participants. It is maintained indiscrimination in all programs. We include disable and ethnic people in our program.

4.4. Anti-corruption

Objective 1: Communities where SF is operating are aware of, preventing and taking action against corruption

Objective 2: SF and our partners have functional financial control systems and are actively working to mitigate risks

5. FOLLOW-UP OF RESULTS AND EVALUATIONS

[Please give a list of all evaluations carried out in 2016]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was evaluated?</th>
<th>Country / countries?</th>
<th>Internal, semi-external or external?</th>
<th>Submitted to Norad? (Filled in by Int. dept.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midterm evaluation of SEEDS program</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Report not submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each evaluation: In what way(s) did the review/evaluation contribute to learning and improvement of the programmes?