

Terms of Reference (ToR)

for

Endline Evaluation of Strategic Partnership Agreement (SPA II) Project

About ActionAid Bangladesh

ActionAid Bangladesh (AAB), an affiliate member of ActionAid Federation, has been working in Bangladesh for last 43 years in solidarity with the people living in poverty and exclusion to end poverty and injustice. AAB's aims at facilitating people challenging poverty and exclusion through human, practical, politically intelligent, and open strategy underpinned by its Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA). AAB believes in a theory of change that requires purposeful individual and collective action, led by the people living in poverty and supported by solidarity, credible rights-based alternatives and campaigns that address the structural causes and consequences of poverty. AAB mobilizes and empowers the people living in poverty and exclusion to enable their collective analysis, identity, movements, and actions. In solidarity with citizens, partners and supporters, AAB fosters partnerships and networks for strengthening support, voice and actions to campaign and advocate with the state and non-state actors and institutions for influencing their policies and practices that safeguard the rights of the poor and excluded people.

Overview of the Projects

AAB is implementing 'Strategic Partnership Agreement (SPA II)' titled project since 2022 with the support of ActionAid Denmark and DANIDA. SPA II project has been implementing across 7 districts of Bangladesh through partnership with partner NGOs named CDOW (Satkhira), BBF (Chattogram), BMUS (Khulna), NSS (Barguna), SHED (Teknaf), USS (Kurigram) and NDBUS (Dhaka). The project was successfully phased out at Dhaka in 2025 and is scheduled to be in the remaining areas by 2026.

Project aims to enable young people to enjoy basic human and democratic rights and improved livelihoods through access to public services and alternatives. It also aims to build resilience to climate shocks and protection in fragile context by developing their potential and leadership in the process of SDG implementation.

Project Participants

| District | Upazila/Thana | Members of Youth Group |
|--------------|--|------------------------|
| Kurigram | Phulbari | 330 |
| Bagerhat | Bagerhat Sadar, Rampal | 306 |
| Satkhira | Satkhira Sadar, Tala | 390 |
| Barguna | Amtali, Patharghata | 330 |
| Cox's Bazar | Teknaf | 316 |
| Dhaka | Ward 8, 10, 11, 12 - Dhaka North City Corporation (Mirpur) | 240 |
| Chattogram | Ward no 19, 35 (Chattogram City Corporation) | 350 |
| Total | | 2,262 |

Objective of Endline Evaluation

The end-line evaluation is planned to systematically document the changes achieved throughout the implementation period. It will assess the overall efficiency, effectiveness, outcomes, and impact of the interventions, with a particular focus on progress against the intended objectives. The evaluation will examine the sustainability of results, including the likelihood that benefits will continue beyond the project lifecycle, as well as the capacity of stakeholders to sustain and further build on the achieved gains. In addition, it will identify key lessons learned and good practices, and provide actionable, evidence-based recommendations to inform future programming, strategic decision-making, and the potential scaling or adaptation of similar interventions.

Objectives of the endline evaluation are -

1. To measure changes in key outcome indicators of SPA II since the baseline (2022).
2. To assess the projects' relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability using OECD/DAC criteria.
3. To document promising practices, lessons learned and challenges to inform future programming and advocacy.
4. To provide evidence-based recommendations considering the gaps and learning.

Baseline Study Findings

Baseline study of the SPA II project identified major challenges related to youth participation, weak policy implementation, gender inequality, climate vulnerability, and limited access to public services in Bangladesh. The study highlighted persistent issues such as child marriage, gender-based violence, low literacy, poverty, and limited youth engagement in local governance and decision-making processes. It also found low adoption of climate-resilient agricultural practices and limited awareness of rights related to GBV, SRHR, and cyber protection. Despite these challenges, the study recognized strong leadership potential among young people and their growing engagement with communities and local government institutions. These findings informed the project design and targeted interventions.

Major Interventions of SPA II Project

- Capacity building of young people on leadership, online activism, youth-led evidence generation, advocacy, and government policies through Global Platform (GP) and localized youth hub.
- Support young people to identify social movements, analysing and addressing the communities' vulnerabilities and organize campaigns to raise public awareness, exert pressure, and promote long-term reforms on climate action, water rights and green transition.
- Facilitate for young people to create community-led social protection mechanisms that promote social cohesion and combat GBV.
- Support young people in building networks and collaboration to facilitate advocacy and campaigning on public service accountability and hold local service providers accountable by developing working relationships with local government and various departments.
- Seed Funding for model development for alternative solution and scaling up.

Methodology

The endline evaluation will adopt a mixed-methods approach, integrating both quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques to ensure a comprehensive and balanced assessment of the project outcomes and impacts. The quantitative component will be led by the external consultant, focusing on structured data collection through surveys aligned with the established indicators and endline benchmarks.

The qualitative component will be facilitated by the AAB MEAL team, employing participatory approaches to capture in-depth insights and reflections of project participants and key stakeholders. Methods may include focus group discussions (FGDs), key informant interviews (KIIs), and impact stories to explore contextual factors, perceptions of change, and unintended outcomes.

The evaluation will be guided by a structured research framework and questionnaire, aligned with the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. Cross-cutting issues such as gender, inclusion, and accountability will also be considered throughout the evaluation process. AAB proposes this as a tentative methodology, which may be further refined in consultation with the selected consultant to ensure methodological rigor, contextual appropriateness, and alignment with the evaluation objectives.



A. Quantitative Data (By external consultant)

Youth Group and Hub Members Survey: This method allows surveyor to gain information from Youth Group and Hubs in a structure's way according to specific questions, often in ways they allow for statistical analysis. These can range from being very simple to complex, which makes them useful in both development/empowerment contexts. They can include a structured set of closed questions (yes/no or multiple-choice questions) or they can include open-ended questions such as semi-structured interviews.

Considering intervened the sample size 438 or more measurements/surveys are needed to have a confidence level of 98% that the real value is within $\pm 5\%$ of the measured/surveyed value ([Sample Size Calculator](#)). To minimize the sample error and make more representative results with reference to seven geographic areas, it will be considered 490 as round figure (proportionately distributed among working areas. Data will be collected by Enumerators using

mobile-based data collection systems design with KOBO toolbox). External evaluation team will develop self-explanatory assessment tools and orient respective enumerators.

B. Qualitative Data (By AAB MEAL Team)

Literature /Document Review: All relevant project documents i.e., Project Baseline Report, projects research/study/publication review, Quarterly reports, IPTT, and annual reports as well as all kinds of project reports, plans and budget, financial documents, and other related documents to review.

Participatory Evaluation Exercise by Youth Hub: AAB MEAL team will also facilitate the process for participatory evaluation exercise with Youth hub. Within this exercise the Youth Hubs will evaluate themselves including identifying impact results, collective weightage of the impact and mapping the factors for impact, identify challenges to sustain the impact and finally share their reflections for prolongation of the impact.

Impact Story and Promising Practices Documentation: Issue-based impact stories and promising practices from all project areas will be collected and documented by AAB MEAL team.

Questions to be Answered with Integrated OECD-DAC Evaluation Criteria

Indicator 1: Number and significance of policy & practice outcomes by local, national, regional, international duty-bearers or private sector actors to:

- increase young people's access to decision-making spaces, improve access to GRPS and to public services, fulfilment of rights, improve the ability of people to adapt and build resilience to climate changes, increase taxes or limit polluting industries through regulations, adequately secure public and private financing of climate mitigation and adaptation, and loss and damage in the Global South, ensure governments implement commitments on climate plans and policies in North and South, shift investments away from harmful businesses, shift investments towards sustainable solutions, improve accountability and localisation in fragile contexts, disasters, and protracted crises and access to livelihood and protection services in fragile contexts, disasters, and protracted crises.

- During the project period, what policy or practice changes were introduced by duty-bearers/private sector actors through influence of youth hub/group (number and type)? (effectiveness)
- What advocacy activities did your youth hub/group conduct to influence duty-bearers or private sector actors? (Efficiency, Effectiveness)
- To what extent have these policy or practice changes improved young people's access to decision-making spaces, vulnerable people's access to public services, rights, livelihood, or protection services? (Impact)
- What barriers did your youth hub/group face in influencing policy or practice changes? (Efficiency, Effectiveness)
- How significant are the achieved policy or practice outcomes in terms of scale, influence, and sustainability? (Impact, Sustainability)
- How relevant were the advocacy priorities and activities of the youth hub/group to the needs and priorities of young people and vulnerable communities? (Relevance)
- What key lessons have emerged from the youth hub/group's advocacy and influencing efforts that can inform future initiatives? (Learning)

- **For Quantitative:** number of outcomes, extent of implementation and level of participation etc.
- **For Qualitative:** significance, influence, sustainability, challenges, and perceived changes.

Indicator 2: Number of formal or informal decision-making positions at all levels to which young people are elected or appointed.

- How many young people have been elected or appointed to formal or informal decision-making positions? (Effectiveness)
- What types of decision-making positions have young people been elected or appointed to (e.g., government committees, youth councils, school boards, advisory groups, private sector forums)? (Effectiveness)
- To what extent are young people actively participating and influencing decisions in these positions, beyond just holding the role? (Impact, Effectiveness)
- What factors (project support, capacity building, advocacy, institutional changes) contributed to increasing youth representation in decision-making spaces? (Relevance, Effectiveness)
- What barriers or challenges do young people face in being selected, appointed, or effectively participating in decision-making roles? (Efficiency, Effectiveness)
- To what extent are young people likely to remain engaged in these decision-making roles after project support ends? (Sustainability)
- What key lessons have been learned from promoting youth participation in decision-making structures? (Learning)
- **For Quantitative:** number and type of positions filled by young people
- **For Qualitative:** influence, quality of participation, inclusiveness, and enabling/barrier factors

Indicator 3: Number of people receiving direct humanitarian assistance.

- How many people received direct humanitarian assistance through the intervention? (Effectiveness)
- What types of humanitarian assistance were provided to the affected populations (e.g., food support, cash assistance, shelter, WASH)? (Relevance, Effectiveness)
- How timely, accessible, and appropriate was the humanitarian assistance provided to the beneficiaries? (Effectiveness, Efficiency, Relevance)
- What challenges or barriers were faced in delivering or accessing humanitarian assistance? (Efficiency, Effectiveness)
- To what extent did the humanitarian assistance meet the immediate needs of the most vulnerable groups (e.g., women, children, persons with disabilities)? (Relevance, Impact)
- What changes in well-being or coping capacity have been observed among beneficiaries as a result of the assistance? (Impact)
- What lessons can be drawn to improve future humanitarian response delivery? (Learning)
- **For Quantitative:** number of beneficiaries, types of support
- **For Qualitative:** relevance, effectiveness, challenges related to the assistance provided

Indicator 4: Number of young people that have access to influencing spaces at local, national, regional, and international level.

- How many young people gained access to influencing spaces at local, national, regional, or international levels? (Effectiveness)
- What types of influencing spaces were accessed by young people (e.g., policy dialogues, youth forums, government consultations, advocacy platforms, community committees, international conferences)? (Relevance, Effectiveness)
- What support or opportunities enabled young people to access and engage in these spaces (e.g., training, mentorship, networking, project facilitation)? (Efficiency, Effectiveness, Relevance)
- To what extent did access to influencing spaces lead to meaningful participation and actual influence on decisions or agendas? (Impact, Effectiveness)
- What barriers limited young people's access to or meaningful engagement in influencing spaces? (Efficiency, Relevance)
- How likely is it that young people will continue accessing and engaging in these influencing spaces beyond project support? (Sustainability)
- What key lessons have been learned about improving youth access to influencing spaces? (Learning)
- **For Quantitative:** number of youth accessing influencing spaces, types and levels of participation
- **For Qualitative:** quality of engagement, inclusiveness, influence, empowerment, and barriers to participation

Indicator 6: Number and significance of changes in public narratives, discourse, or agendas, that young people, their movements, and their allies have contributed to.

- What changes in public narratives, discourse, or agendas were observed related to youth priorities, rights, governance, climate action, or social issues? (Impact, Effectiveness)
- How did campaigns, public discussions, media engagements, or advocacy initiatives contribute to influencing public narratives or agendas? (Effectiveness, Relevance, Efficiency)
- What platforms or channels were most effective in influencing public narratives (e.g., social media, community dialogues, campaigns, traditional media, policy forums)? (Efficiency, Effectiveness, Learning)
- To what extent have shifts in public narratives been sustained over time beyond individual campaigns or events? (Sustainability)
- How inclusive were the narrative changes in reflecting the voices of marginalized or vulnerable groups? (Relevance, Impact)
- What challenges were faced in shifting public narratives and societal perceptions? (Efficiency, Effectiveness)
- What key lessons can be drawn for future advocacy and communication strategies? (Learning)
- **For Quantitative:** number of campaigns, engagements, media outputs, or discourse changes
- **For Qualitative:** significance, influence, perception changes, contribution of youth movements

Indicator 7: Number and significance of collective actions led by young people to either influence or hold duty-bearers to account or take initiative themselves to:

- Provide for green, well-resourced and gender responsive policies, plans and public services, protect human rights, provide protection, adequate resourcing, and delivery of community-led programmes, reduce vulnerabilities, build resilience, lead humanitarian action, increase social cohesion and prevent conflict in the communities.

- How many collective actions were initiated or led by young people to influence duty-bearers or address community issues directly? (Effectiveness)
- What types of collective actions were conducted by young people (e.g., advocacy campaigns, community initiatives, dialogues, awareness campaigns)? (Relevance, Effectiveness)
- What visible changes or outcomes resulted from the youth-led collective actions? (Impact, Effectiveness)
- What factors enabled or strengthened young people's ability to lead collective actions effectively? (Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness)
- What barriers or constraints limited the scale, quality, or continuity of youth-led collective actions? (Efficiency, Effectiveness)
- To what extent have these collective actions been sustained or replicated beyond the initial intervention support? (Sustainability)
- What key lessons have been learned from youth-led collective action processes? (Learning)
- **For Quantitative:** number and type of collective actions, participation levels
- **For Qualitative:** significance, effectiveness, inclusiveness, outcomes

Indicator 8: Number and type of alternative solutions that have been brought to scale within: food security, alternatives to agri-business, alternatives to polluting energy-sector, local actions, youth-led responses.

- How many alternative solutions were developed, piloted, or scaled? (Effectiveness)
- What types of alternative solutions were introduced or supported? (Relevance, Effectiveness)
- To what extent have these alternative solutions been scaled up beyond pilot or community level (e.g., expansion to other communities, institutions, or geographic areas)? (Impact, Sustainability, Effectiveness)
- Who are the main actors involved in implementing and scaling these alternative solutions (e.g., youth groups, private sector, local government, communities)? (Relevance, Efficiency)
- What factors enabled or constrained the scaling of these alternative solutions (e.g., funding, policy support, technical capacity, community acceptance)? (Efficiency, Sustainability, Effectiveness)
- How appropriate and responsive were the alternative solutions to the needs and priorities of target communities? (Relevance)
- What measurable changes or benefits have resulted from these alternative solutions for the intended beneficiaries? (Impact)
- **For Quantitative:** number and types of solutions, scale of implementation
- **For Qualitative:** effectiveness, scalability, inclusiveness, and impact

Indicator 9: Number of young people (m/f) trained.

- How many young people received training under the intervention? (Effectiveness)
- What types of training were provided to young people (e.g., advocacy, leadership, governance, climate action, livelihood skills, protection, civic engagement)? (Relevance, Effectiveness)
- How effective were the training methods and facilitation approaches in building knowledge, skills, and confidence among participants? (Effectiveness, Efficiency, Learning)
- To what extent do trained young people apply the knowledge and skills gained in real-life or community contexts? (Impact, Effectiveness)
- What factors supported or hindered the application of learned skills in practice? (Efficiency, Impact)
- How sustainable is the capacity built among young people beyond the training period? (Sustainability)
- What key lessons have been learned from the training design and delivery process? (Learning)
- **For Quantitative:** number of youths trained, satisfaction, effectiveness, application
- **For Qualitative:** training relevance, effectiveness, learning outcomes

Indicator 10: Number of people reached by online campaigns, media, etc.

- How many people were reached through online campaigns, social media activities, and other media interventions under the project? (Effectiveness)
- What types of online and media channels were used to reach the target audience (e.g., Facebook, YouTube, television, newspapers, websites)? (Relevance, Effectiveness)
- Which types of content or messages generated the highest reach and engagement among the target audience? (Effectiveness, Learning)
- What challenges were faced in maximizing reach and engagement through online campaigns and media activities? (Efficiency, Effectiveness)
- To what extent did online and media outreach contribute to changes in awareness, attitudes, or behaviors among the target audience? (Impact, Effectiveness)
- How efficient were the resources (time, budget, staff) used in achieving the digital/media outreach results? (Efficiency)
- What key lessons can be drawn to improve future online campaigns and media strategies? (Learning)
- **For Quantitative:** number of people reached, engagement metrics, media outputs, platform analytics
- **For Qualitative:** effectiveness, audience understanding, content relevance

Indicator 11: Number of young people and their organisations attending activities at convening spaces, platforms, and fora facilitated by the programme.

- How many young people and youth-led organisations attended programme-facilitated convening spaces, platforms, or fora? (Effectiveness)
- What types of convening spaces or fora were facilitated by the programme (e.g., policy dialogues, youth assemblies, consultation meetings, forums, advocacy workshops)? (Relevance, Effectiveness)
- What roles did young people and their organisations play during these convenings (e.g., presenters, participants, facilitators, co-organisers, decision influencers)? (Effectiveness, Relevance)

- What outcomes emerged from participation in these convening spaces (e.g., collaborations, advocacy actions, policy inputs)? (Impact, Effectiveness)
- To what extent did these convening spaces enable meaningful influence of young people on decisions, agendas, or stakeholder commitments? (Impact, Effectiveness)
- How inclusive and accessible were the convening spaces for diverse groups of young people, including marginalized groups? (Relevance)
- What challenges were faced in ensuring meaningful participation and influence of young people in these convenings? (Efficiency, Effectiveness)
- What key lessons have been learned from facilitating convening spaces and platforms for youth engagement? (Learning)
- **For Quantitative:** number of participants and organisations, level of representation
- **For Qualitative:** quality of participation, inclusiveness, influence. Outcomes

Indicator 12: Number of young people involved with the SPAll programme taking action on common causes.

- How many young people have taken action on identified common causes (e.g., climate justice, governance, human rights, gender equality, or social inclusion)? (Effectiveness)
- What types of actions have young people taken individually or collectively? (Relevance, Effectiveness)
- What role did SPAll programme interventions (training, mentorship, networking, resources) play in enabling young people to take action? (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency)
- To what extent have young people's actions contributed to visible changes or outcomes? (Impact, Effectiveness)
- What factors enabled or constrained young people's ability to take sustained action on these issues? (Efficiency, Sustainability, Effectiveness)
- How sustainable is youth engagement in these causes beyond the duration of programme support? (Sustainability)
- What key lessons have been learned from supporting youth-led action on common causes? (Learning)
- **For Quantitative:** number of youth taking action, outcomes, types of actions
- **For Qualitative:** influence, effectiveness, inclusiveness, and youth engagement

Indicator 14: Number and significance of changes observed in movements, networks, or alliances that the programme supports.

- What movements, networks, or alliances have been strengthened by the programme? (Effectiveness, Relevance)
- What changes have occurred within these movements, networks, or alliances as a result of programme support? (Effectiveness, Impact)
- What role did young people and groups play within these movements, networks, or alliances? (Relevance, Effectiveness)
- To what extent have these movements, networks, or alliances become effective in influencing policy, public discourse, or decision-making processes? (Impact, Effectiveness)
- How sustainable are these movements, networks, or alliances beyond programme support? (Sustainability)

- What factors enabled or constrained the strengthening and functioning of these movements and networks? (Efficiency, Effectiveness)
- What key lessons have been learned from supporting movements, networks, and alliances? (Learning)
- **For Quantitative:** number of networks supported, structural or functional changes
- **For Qualitative:** significance of changes, effectiveness, influence of movements and alliances

Indicator 15: Number of alternative solutions co-created by young people and AADK, AA, and partners.

- How many alternative solutions were co-created by young people in collaboration with AAB and partner organizations? (Effectiveness)
- What types of alternative solutions were developed (e.g., climate adaptation innovations, community resilience models, livelihood solutions)? (Relevance, Effectiveness)
- To what extent were these co-created solutions relevant to the identified community needs and local context? (Relevance, Effectiveness)
- How effective are the alternative solutions in addressing the targeted challenges (e.g., climate change, governance gaps, service access, livelihoods)? (Effectiveness, Impact)
- What factors enabled or constrained the co-creation and implementation of these alternative solutions? (Efficiency, Relevance)
- To what extent have these solutions been adopted, replicated, or scaled beyond the initial intervention sites? (Sustainability, Impact)
- What key lessons have been learned from the co-creation and implementation of alternative solutions? (Learning)
- **For Quantitative:** number and types of co-created solutions, effectiveness.
- **For Qualitative:** relevance, innovation, implementation experience.

Indicator 17: Number and quality of youth-led alternatives (tools, methods, and solutions) developed and tested.

- How many youth-led tools/methods/solutions were developed and tested? (Effectiveness)
- What types of youth-led alternatives were developed? (Relevance, Effectiveness)
- How innovative and relevant were the developed tools/methods/solutions in addressing community challenges? (Relevance, Effectiveness, Impact)
- To what extent were these tools/methods/solutions adopted or used by communities, institutions, or other stakeholders? (Impact, Sustainability)
- What factors enabled or constrained the development and testing of youth-led innovations? (Efficiency, Effectiveness)
- What measurable changes or improvements resulted from the use of these youth-led tools or solutions? (Impact)
- What key lessons have been learned from developing and testing youth-led innovations? (Learning)
- **For Quantitative:** number and types of alternatives developed, effectiveness
- **For Qualitative:** quality, innovation, relevance

The evaluation should meet ActionAid's quality standard requirements which can be shared on request but in practical terms the standards require the evaluation and evaluator to consider the points highlighted in the following extract:

- **Community voice and representation:** It is essential that the evaluation reflects the voices of Youth, women and men involved in the project. People should be consulted as part of the evaluation, and their voices included in the evaluation report as direct quotes and impact stories. In line with ActionAid's mandate, the evaluation should prioritize people living in poverty and exclusion, especially women.
- **Feedback:** as a minimum the evaluators should commit to feeding key findings and recommendations back to the communities engaged in the evaluation.
- **Transparency and ethical standards:** the evaluators should explain clearly to communities engaged in the evaluation what the purpose of the exercise is, and how their information will be used. ActionAid's ethical standards for research and data collection should be followed, including a risk assessment covering security risks to communities. As a minimum the evaluation should 'do no harm'.
- **Women's rights:** Women's rights must be respected in all evaluations. All evaluations should seek to explore how women have been affected by an intervention and the effect on gender relations. It is essential that women's voices are heard clearly in the evaluation. The timing and location of evaluation activities and the composition of the evaluation team should be designed to maximize women's ability to participate in the evaluation.
- **Transparency about methodology:** The evaluation should include a detailed and transparent discussion of the methodology used and key decisions taken in designing and implementing the evaluation. This should include information about the sampling (approach to sampling, numbers of people/communities covered, how representatively), what tools were used and why, methodological limitations and gaps.
- **Disaggregated data:** Data must be disaggregated in as much detail as possible. As a minimum this means disaggregation by age, sex and location. Where possible data should also be disaggregated by other relevant factors such as disability.

Timeline

The evaluation is expected to be completed within **six weeks**, including fieldwork, data analysis, report preparation, and presentation. A detailed timeline will be agreed upon with the AAB team.

Specific Tasks of the Consultant

1. Develop an inception report with methodology, tools and techniques, questions, and field work plan.
2. Conduct quantitative data collection in project areas.
3. Analyze and interpret findings compared to baseline data.
4. Incorporate qualitative findings in the baseline report and align with the quantitative data.
5. Develop a draft and final report including a PowerPoint presentation.
6. Submit raw data, tools, transcripts, and visual documentation (photos, etc.).
7. Generate an Evidence Brief (4/5 pages) for broader audience.

Qualifications

- Postgraduate degree in Development Studies, Social Sciences, Climate Change, or a relevant discipline.
- Minimum 10 years of experience in conducting baseline/midline/endline evaluation, preferably in youth empowerment and rights-based programming.
- Proven expertise in quantitative methodologies.
- Strong analytical and English report writing skills.
- Computer skills, including MS Office.
- Ability to work in remote vulnerable areas and ensure ethical data collection.

Deliverables

1. **Inception Report** with tools and work plan.
2. **Draft Evaluation Report** with preliminary findings and
3. **PowerPoint presentation** with final findings.
4. **Final Evaluation Report** (Max 30 pages excluding annexes), structured as:
 - Executive Summary
 - Table of Content
 - Introduction
 - Background of Study
 - Methodology and Limitations
 - Findings and Analysis (with comparisons to baseline)
 - Project Implications
 - Conclusions
 - Lesson Learn
 - Recommendations
 - Annexes (Tools, pictures)
5. **Evidence Brief** (Max 4/5 pages),
6. Cleaned datasets, tools, pictures.

Budget and Payment

Budget for the whole assignment is **BDT 650,000 (Including Vat Tax)**. Payment will be made based on deliverables upon submission of invoice and completion of work.

- 1st Payment: **20%** of contract value will be paid based on submission and acceptance of inception report, tools and workplan.
- 2nd Payment: **40%** of the contract value will be paid based on submission and acceptance of the collected data set and PowerPoint presentation.
- 3rd Payment: **40%** of contract value will be paid based on submission and acceptance of final evaluation report, evidence brief and other documents (pictures, cleaned data set, transcripts).

Contact & Reporting

The consultant will report to **Manager – MEAL**, AAB and **Lead- Young People**, AAB. Close coordination with AAB project team and project partners is expected during fieldwork and analysis. Regular updates and milestone reviews will be expected.

Application Process:

Interested consultants/firms should submit:

- A technical proposal detailing the methodology, work plan and previous experience.
- A financial proposal including a breakdown of costs.
- CVs of key personnel.
- Two references from previous assignments.

Submission of Proposal:

Deadline for Proposal Submission: 17 June 2026

- Please click below the link to submit your proposals
- **Link:** <https://jobs.actionaidbd.org/consultancy>

Disclaimer: ActionAid Bangladesh reserves the right to accept or reject any or all applications without assigning any reason thereof.