

Terms of Reference (ToR) for consultancy service for Endline Evaluation of the Integrated Flood Resilience Programme (IFRP)

Summary of purpose	To evaluate the continued relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, timeliness, impact, and sustainability of the Integrated Flood Resilience Programme (IFRP): Phase 3 in Tangail district to identify key lessons and recommendations to improve future climate change, Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), epidemic/pandemic preparedness, and flood resilience initiatives.
Evaluation team	A hired external consultant/firm from the national level will conduct the evaluation. They can also include relevant Gender, DRR, Climate Change, Health & Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH), and other experts if needed. The Evaluation Management Team (EMT) will assist the evaluator in conducting the evaluation.
Scope of work of the Consultant	Submission of an inception report, preparation of data collection tools, implementation of data collection procedures, data cleaning and analysis, and reporting of the endline study.
Summary of methodology	The evaluation will utilize both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods
Audience	The results of this evaluation will be used by the Bangladesh Red Crescent Society (BDRCS) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), and will be shared with the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA), Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Republic of Korea (MoFA-RoK), and other stakeholders involved in the programme.
Commissioner(s)	This final evaluation is being commissioned by the Secretary General of the Bangladesh Red Crescent Society.
Reporting to	The consultant will report to the Evaluation Management Team (EMT) for IFRP: Phase 3
Location of project sites	Ward 7 & 9 of Dainya Union, Tangail Sadar Upazila, and Ward 7 & 8 of Durgapur Union, Kalihati Upazila, Tangail district
Expected start date	1 October 2026
Expected duration	2 months

2. Background of the Programme

The Integrated Flood Resilience Programme: Phase 3 is a comprehensive flood resilience programme comprising DRR, Climate Change, WASH, Health, Shelter, Livelihoods, and Capacity Development components, with explicit integration of epidemic and pandemic protection and prevention aspects into DRR and climate-resilient activities. The programme is being implemented by the Bangladesh Red Crescent Society (BDRCS) in four communities of Tangail district affected by recurring floods, to build community resilience. The programme is funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea, through the technical support of the IFRC, and is monitored by KOICA. The programme officially started in September 2024 and will be phased out by December 2026. The programme is supporting 12,279 direct beneficiaries from the four targeted communities, and approximately 16,000 indirect (catchment) beneficiaries from 2,688 households.

Type	Programme
Name	Integrated Flood Resilience Programme: Phase 3 through Community-based Disaster Risk Reduction Approach
Implemented by	Bangladesh Red Crescent Society (BDRCS)
Funded by	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea (MoFA, RoK)
Monitored by	Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA)
Technical support	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
Duration	September 2024 – December 2026
Number of people reached	12,279 direct beneficiaries from the four targeted communities, and approximately 16,000 indirect (catchment) beneficiaries from 2,688 households.
Location	Ward 7 & 9 of Dainya Union, Tangail Sadar Upazila, and Ward 7 & 8 of Durgapur Union, Kalihati Upazila, Tangail district

The delivery of programme interventions is targeted to increase the capacity to reduce life and livelihood risks of vulnerable people in the communities, including women, children, elderly people, and persons with disability. The programme approach ensures the participation of stakeholders in every aspect of the programme management cycle, including planning, implementation, and monitoring.

Goal of the Programme

To build community resilience and enhance their capacities to respond to floods and other climate-related hazards effectively and efficiently.

Objective of the Programme

To reduce the loss of life and damage to properties of communities by improving their livelihoods and well-being to increase their capacities to prepare, respond, and recover from disasters and reduce their vulnerabilities to floods and other climate-related hazards.

Outcomes of the Programme

- Outcome 1: Communities have increased capacities to effectively respond to floods, heatwaves, pandemics, and adapt to the changing climatic conditions.
- Outcome 2: Most vulnerable households have improved livelihoods and shelter to withstand small-scale floods and other climate-induced disasters.
- Outcome 3: Community people have increased access to appropriate and sustainable water, sanitation and hygiene practices focused on the pandemic and other epidemics.
- Outcome 4: BDRCS' capacity for effective coordination and collaboration with other relevant sectoral actors to deliver scaled-up climate-smart DRR and resilience programmes is enhanced.

3. Evaluation Purpose and Scope

3.1: Purpose

The purpose of the end line evaluation is to assess the performance of the Integrated Flood Resilience Programme: Phase 3 and to capture the programme's achievements, challenges, best practices, key lessons, and recommendations to improve future community resilience and climate change programmes of BDRCS and IFRC. The end line evaluation will also assess the overall quality of the implementation of IFRP: Phase 3, including its integration of epidemic/pandemic prevention aspects. It is important to include beneficiaries' opinions on the quality of the services they received. The end line evaluation findings and recommendations will serve as an important guideline for the management of BDRCS and IFRC for decision-making on ongoing and further resilience programmes. It will also be a significant advocacy document for further programme

improvements, strategic planning, and policymaking in the arena of DRR, climate change, and community resilience. Examples of best practices and innovations from the programme will be identified and shared with targeted stakeholders so that they understand the importance of the community resilience programme for reducing the vulnerability of communities.

3.2: Scope

The End Line Evaluation will be conducted in the four communities of Tangail towards the final quarter of the programme, while most programme activities have been implemented and a significant percentage of the funding has been spent. The results of the end-line evaluation would be helpful for future community resilience programme planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of IFRC and BDRCS. The evaluation findings and results will also be used by stakeholders involved in this programme and in implementing disaster risk reduction and community resilience interventions. The findings will also be utilized to develop and change upcoming programmes' implementation strategies, which is important to achieve the expected results of the resilience programme. The End Line Evaluation will follow the IFRC's Framework for Community Resilience and IFRC's Evaluation Guideline to articulate the findings and recommendations. The findings of the study will also be compared between end-line and baseline survey results, focusing on the programme indicators.

4. Evaluation Objectives and Criteria

4.1: Evaluation Objectives

The end line evaluation will be conducted for the following objectives:

- To evaluate whether the programme delivered effective, efficient, relevant, and timely activities to the targeted beneficiaries and community people as set in the programme's logical framework.
- To assess whether coordination and collaboration among BDRCS, local stakeholders, Government agencies, non-government and other humanitarian organizations were strengthened in implementing community-based resilience interventions.
- To identify and assess key lessons, challenges, best practices, and recommendations for utilizing in future community resilience programmes of BDRCS, IFRC and others.

4.2: Evaluation Criteria

The following are standard questions that will need to be adjusted with the successful consultant, in agreement with the Evaluation Management Team, at the stage of the inception report.

4.2.1: Adherence to Fundamental Principles and Code of Conduct

- To what extent were the Red Cross and Red Crescent (RCRC) principles followed while delivering interventions?

4.2.2: Relevance and Appropriateness

- To what extent is the programme plan relevant and meeting the needs of the target communities? Is there a need to change programme implementation and/or direction in the future?
- To what extent does the programme meet the outcomes and impacts articulated in the operational plan?
- Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal?
- Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?
- To what extent does the programme contribute to the fulfilment of relevant policies and strategies?
- How effective is the programme in seeking and responding to feedback from target communities?
- To what extent are the programme activities and results environment, climate change, and DRR focused?
- To what extent were the interventions and activities appropriate and responsive in addressing the needs of the community people and targeted stakeholders?

4.2.3: Efficiency

- How efficient was the delivery of the programme in terms of implementation of its interventions and activities?
- To what extent did the programme modality consider intervention quality?
- What preferences were given priority in terms of collaboration between BDRCS and other stakeholders during programme implementation?
- To what extent were programme information and learning shared among beneficiaries and stakeholders?

4.2.4: Effectiveness

- To what extent did the programme achieve its planned objectives and results, as defined in the logical framework and measured against the agreed indicators?
- To what extent did programme interventions and activities contribute to achieving the programme goal?
- To what extent did the programme reduce the vulnerability of communities and strengthen their capacity to prepare for, respond to, and take timely action during floods to protect lives, livelihoods, and assets?
- What types of opportunities for collaboration between BDRCS and other stakeholders were explored and strengthened, and how did the collaboration contribute to increasing effectiveness for the flood resilience programme?
- To what extent did the programme encourage community engagement and ensure accountability during the programme life cycle?

4.2.5: Coverage

- Were community people, beneficiaries, and targeted stakeholders reached as per the programme indicators and targets?
- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in the programme's planning, implementation, and monitoring aspects?
- To what extent have socially excluded groups, including Persons with Disabilities (PWD) and minorities, been included, considered, and targeted throughout the programme?
- Is there a need to include any other target groups in the programme in the future?

4.2.6: Impact

- To what extent have the activities brought positive change to reduce vulnerability and build resilience capacity of the community? What changes have occurred among beneficiaries and targeted stakeholders?
- Did coordination and collaboration among BDRCS, the government, and humanitarian organizations have an effective impact on community people, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders?
- To what extent have communities built their capacity to respond to floods and adapt to changing conditions?
- To what extent have community people changed their economic condition through livelihood support?
- To what extent have community people adopted water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) behaviours to improve their lifestyle?
- Are there any unexpected changes, outcomes, or impacts noted as a result of the programme?

4.2.7: Coherence

- What concrete examples of successful coordination, collaboration, or joint approaches contributed to better coherence and complementarity of programme interventions?
- To what extent did coordination and collaboration with other stakeholders help avoid duplication, address gaps, and create synergies in community resilience interventions?
- What key barriers and enabling factors affected coordination and collaboration among BDRCS and other stakeholders, and what lessons can be applied to strengthen future programmes?

- Did the programme's activities complement the work of other stakeholders in contributing to community resilience initiatives in Bangladesh?

4.2.8: Sustainability and Connectedness

- Will the achievements accumulated under the programme be sustained in the targeted communities and among stakeholders?
- What mechanisms were set up in programme areas to retain key programme outcomes in the future?
- Were there potential risks to retaining programme results and continuing the achievements?
- Are there any changes within the overall operating environment that might contribute to the sustainability of the programme (e.g., government policies or resourcing)?
- To what extent have the capacities of different stakeholders, including BDRCS, been built by the programme?

4.2.9: Sustainability and Connectedness

- How did the programme work with the Community Disaster Management Committee, Community Disaster Response Team, Unit (Branch) Disaster Response Team, Union Disaster Management Committee, Upazila Disaster Management Committee, and other local stakeholders to increase their capacity in a sustainable way?
- To what extent are the relationships between key stakeholders likely to be sustained beyond the end of the programme? Is there anything that could be done to strengthen these?
- To what extent is the programme linking, coordinating, learning from, or sharing learning with external partners and agencies?

4.2.10: Equity

- To what extent were resources, support, and benefits under the programme distributed equitably among community people, beneficiaries, and targeted stakeholders?
- Did the programme ensure fair and equal access to interventions for all groups, regardless of gender, age, disability, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status?
- To what extent were marginalized and vulnerable groups, including women, persons with disabilities (PWD), elderly people, and minorities, prioritized in the distribution of aid and services?
- Were there any disparities observed in access to or benefit from the programme's interventions among different community groups, and if so, what factors contributed to them?
- How effectively did the programme address existing inequalities within targeted communities through its design and implementation?

4.2.11: Protection and Safety

- To what extent did the programme ensure the safety, dignity, and wellbeing of community people, beneficiaries, staff, and volunteers throughout implementation?
- Were adequate measures in place to prevent the programme's activities from exposing communities, especially vulnerable groups, to additional risks or harm?
- To what extent did the programme uphold the principle of "Do No Harm" in its design and delivery of interventions?
- Were there accessible and functional mechanisms (e.g., complaints and feedback mechanisms) in place for community people to raise protection concerns during the programme?
- To what extent were staff and volunteers trained and supported to identify and respond to protection risks, including safeguarding concerns, during programme implementation?

5. Evaluation Methodology and Process

The end line evaluation will be conducted in the four communities of Tangail by a hired national/international consultant/firm. BDRCS and IFRC Bangladesh Country Delegation will provide the required assistance to the lead evaluator/consultant to complete the evaluation. The consultant will undertake desk review of secondary materials before fieldwork. Documents to be reviewed include the programme proposal, work plan,

Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA) report, baseline study report, contingency plans, monitoring reports, event reports, bi-annual reports, annual reports, etc. Necessary field visits will then be conducted for primary data collection. Baseline survey data and end line evaluation data will be compared to assess the achievement or impact of the programme. Both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies will be used. Secondary data and programme documents, research and policy papers, books, and scientific/authoritative research articles on disaster risk reduction, climate change, flood resilience, vulnerability, adaptation, livelihood strategies, WASH, and epidemic/pandemic preparedness will also be reviewed as needed.

The following methods could be used for data collection and conducting the evaluation:

- **Desk review:** Review of relevant programme documents, including the programme proposal, logical/results framework, baseline and end-line reports, monitoring and progress reports, event reports, assessments, and other relevant programme documentation.
- **Field visits and direct observation:** Visits to selected programme locations to observe programme interventions, outputs, community resilience measures, and other relevant activities.
- **Baseline and end-line comparison:** Analysis and comparison of available baseline and end-line data against programme targets, indicators, and intended results.
- **Household survey:** A structured survey will be conducted among targeted households in the four programme communities of Tangail District. An appropriate and statistically justified sampling methodology will be used to ensure adequate representation of the targeted communities and relevant population groups.
- **Key Informant Interviews (KIIs):** Interviews with BDRCS staff and volunteers, local government representatives, programme partners, community leaders, and other relevant stakeholders.
- **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs):** FGDs with relevant community and disaster management structures, including Upazila, Union and Community Disaster Management Committees, Community Disaster Response Teams, Unit/Branch Disaster Response Teams, and other relevant groups. Where appropriate, specific groups such as women, persons with disabilities, older people, and other vulnerable groups will be consulted.
- **Stakeholder consultations:** Interviews and consultations with local government authorities and other relevant stakeholders to assess coordination, complementarity, institutional capacity, and sustainability.
- **Data analysis and triangulation:** Quantitative and qualitative data will be analysed using appropriate methods, and findings from different sources will be triangulated to validate evidence and identify key findings, lessons, and recommendations.

Key Informants:

- BDRCS governance/management and programme staff.
- KOICA officials.
- IFRC Bangladesh Delegation: Head of Country Delegation, Project Manager, and other concerned staff.
- BDRCS district unit/branch committees, programme committees, community committees, volunteers.
- Beneficiaries (direct beneficiaries who received support directly from the programme, e.g. livelihoods, shelter, livestock, WASH, and other beneficiaries) and other relevant stakeholders such as school teachers, school students, and commercial service providers.
- Relevant officials from district, Upazila, and Union Parishad levels, such as UP Chairman and members, Deputy Commissioner/UNO, District Relief and Rehabilitation Officer, Upazila Agricultural Officer, Upazila Social Service and Welfare Officer, DPHE Official, and others.

6. Evaluation Deliverables

Inception Report: The inception report will be a scoping exercise for the evaluation and will include the background/introduction, proposed methodologies, data collection and reporting plans with draft data collection tools such as interview guides, the allocation of roles and responsibilities within the team, a timeframe with firm dates for deliverables, and the travel and logistical arrangements for the team, etc. The inception report should be approved by the Evaluation Management Team (EMT) or commissioner.

Debriefings/feedback to management at all levels: The evaluation team will report its preliminary findings to the Secretary General of BDRCS and operational partners, and the IFRC Asia Pacific Regional Office (APRO).

Draft Report: A draft report identifying key findings based on facts, and separating opinions, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons for current and future operations, will be submitted by the consultant within one week of the evaluation team's return from the field. Briefing on initial findings and results will be shared by the consultant with IFRC and BDRCS before submitting the draft report.

Final Report: The final report will contain a short executive summary (no more than 1,000 words) and a main body (no more than 10,000 words) covering the background of the intervention evaluated, a description of the evaluation methods and limitations, findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and clear recommendations. Recommendations should be specific and feasible. The report should also contain appropriate appendices, including a copy of the ToR, cited resources or bibliography/reference, a list of those interviewed, and any other relevant materials. The final report will be submitted one week after receipt of consolidated feedback from IFRC and BDRCS.

All products arising from this evaluation will be owned by the BDRCS. The consultant/evaluator will not be allowed, without prior written authorization, to present any of the analytical results as his/her own work or to make use of the evaluation results for private publication or any other purpose.

The draft and final reports will be submitted to the Evaluation Management Team, which will ensure the quality of the report by providing input if necessary. The Evaluation Management Team will submit the report to the key stakeholders interviewed for review and clarification.

The Final Report will be structured with the following headings:

- Acknowledgements
- Acronyms
- Glossary
- Executive Summary
- Introduction/Background
- Rationale and Objectives of the End-Line Evaluation
- Scope of the End-Line Evaluation
- Evaluation Methodology
- Findings and Discussion
- Recommendations
- Conclusion
- Lessons Learned
- References
- Annex

7. Proposed Timeframe

The End line Evaluation is expected to last a maximum of 2 months, from 01 October 2026 to 30 November 2026. The following tentative timeframe will be applicable for the evaluation:

- Inception report to be submitted to the BDRCS and IFRC by 14 October 2026.
- Desk work/secondary document review and finalization of data collection tools by 20 October 2026.
- Data collection (both quantitative and qualitative) at field level from 22 October to 04 November 2026.
- Debriefing/sharing draft report findings with IFRC and BDRCS on 11 November 2026.
- Draft report submission by 20 November 2026.
- Submission of the final evaluation report to IFRC by 30 November 2026.

Time Schedule	Activities	Deliverables
First & Second week (01–14 Oct)	• Desk review: review programme documentation, and related primary/secondary resources for the evaluation • Submission of detailed inception report	• Final inception report including methodology and data collection tools etc.
Third week (15–20 Oct)	• Preparation and piloting of data collection tools	• Finalised Data Collection Tools

Time Schedule	Activities	Deliverables
Fourth & Fifth week (22 Oct–04 Nov)	Data collection in the targeted communities according to the inception report	Completed Survey and Data Collection from communities and stakeholders
Sixth week (05–11 Nov)	Debriefing with the IFRC and the BDRCS on initial findings, recommendations, etc.	Debriefing with the IFRC and the BDRCS/ Lessons Learnt Workshop
Seventh & Eighth week (12–20 Nov)	Prepare first Draft Evaluation Report	First Draft Evaluation Report
Ninth week (21–27 Nov)	- Submission of Draft Evaluation Report - Address feedback in the report where applicable	Draft Evaluation Report submitted and feedback addressed
By 30 November	Revise and submit final Evaluation Report upon getting the feedback from IFRC and BDRCS	Final Report of End Line Evaluation

8. Evaluation Quality and Ethical Standards

The consultant/evaluator should take all reasonable steps to ensure that the evaluation is designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of the people and communities involved, and to ensure that the evaluation is technically accurate and reliable, conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organizational learning and accountability. The evaluation team should adhere to the evaluation standards and applicable practices outlined in the IFRC Framework for Evaluation.

The IFRC evaluation standards are:

- **Utility:** Evaluations must be useful and used.
- **Feasibility:** Evaluations must be realistic, diplomatic, and managed in a sensible, cost-effective manner.
- **Ethics & Legality:** Evaluations must be conducted in an ethical and legal manner, with particular regard for the welfare of those involved in and affected by the evaluation.
- **Impartiality & Independence:** Evaluations should be impartial, providing a comprehensive and unbiased assessment that considers the views of all stakeholders.
- **Transparency:** Evaluation activities should reflect an attitude of openness and transparency.
- **Accuracy:** Evaluations should be technically accurate, providing sufficient information about the data collection, analysis, and interpretation methods so that their worth or merit can be determined.
- **Participation:** Stakeholders should be consulted and meaningfully involved in the evaluation process when feasible and appropriate.
- **Accountability:** Evaluations should be conducted ensuring accountability by adequately documenting the evaluation process and products, aligning evaluation practice with an equity approach, and implementing the recommendations into actions.

It is expected that the evaluation will respect the seven Fundamental Principles of the RC/RC Movement.

9. Evaluation Management Team

An Evaluation Management Team (EMT) will manage and oversee the evaluation and ensure that it upholds the BDRCS and IFRC policies for evaluation. The Evaluation Management Team will consist of 5 members from BDRCS, including the central PMER team, IFRC PMER, CEA and PGI representatives, and IFRC.

Based on the IFRC Framework for Evaluations 2024, here are the Roles and Responsibilities of the Evaluation Manager or Management Team (EMT):

- **Logistical and contractual oversight:** Oversees the logistical and contractual arrangements of the evaluation, in coordination with field focal points.

- Consultant management: Manages any external consultants engaged for the evaluation.
- Delegation: Delegates responsibilities among team members and stakeholders as needed throughout the process.
- Deliverable approval: Secures approval of key deliverables (e.g., inception report, draft report, final report) according to the agreed evaluation contract/timeframe, up to and including the final evaluation report.
- Quality control: Ensures adequate quality control is maintained throughout the entire evaluation process.
- Supporting access to information: Along with Commissioners and/or project teams, supports the evaluator(s) in obtaining unrestricted access to relevant information during data collection.
- Reviewing the inception report: Checks that the evaluation plan/inception report is in agreement with the TOR, in coordination with Commissioners and other stakeholders.
- Upholding legitimacy/independence: EMT members are expected not to have a vested interest in the IFRC operation being reviewed, in order to uphold the legitimacy of the evaluation.

10. Evaluation Team and Qualifications

An evaluator/consultant will facilitate the entire evaluation process. The Evaluation Management Team will assist the evaluator/consultant throughout. The evaluator/consultant must have the following qualifications:

- A post-graduate university degree in Social Sciences, Disaster Management, Anthropology, Development Studies, or a related field.
- Demonstrated experience in conducting Mid-Term Reviews, Results Based Evaluations, and End Line Evaluations, specifically in the field of community resilience, disaster risk reduction, and climate change.
- Working experience with the RCRC Movement may receive priority.
- Strong knowledge of KoBo Toolbox for data collection.
- Proven experience in fieldwork, flood resilience, monitoring and evaluation.
- Proven competence in managing quantitative data and statistical analysis.
- Proven track record in conducting qualitative research, including the development of interview schedules and qualitative data analysis.
- Familiarity with epidemic/pandemic preparedness and public health in emergencies is an advantage, given the programme's integration of these aspects.
- Excellent analytical and presentation skills.
- Experience in training relevant staff for field data collection.
- Ability to manage/arrange the data collection team.
- Strong computer skills in spreadsheets, word processing, database management, and familiarity with statistical analysis software (SPSS, Stata, SaaS).
- Demonstrated capacity to work both independently and as part of a team.
- Excellent writing and speaking skills in English.
- Excellent communication and report-writing skills.

The consultant will take full responsibility to ensure that the end line evaluation is designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of community people, and to ensure that the evaluation is technically accurate, reliable, and legitimate, conducted transparently and impartially, and contributes to organizational learning and accountability. The evaluation team should adhere to the evaluation standards and applicable processes outlined in the IFRC Framework for Evaluation.

11. Application Procedures

Interested consultants/firms should submit their proposal with a technical offer and a financial offer in 2 (two) separate sealed envelopes with **two samples of previous assessment/evaluation reports or published articles most similar to that described in this ToR**, marking each envelope with the title ("Technical" or "Financial") respectively. Both envelopes should be placed inside a single bigger envelope, with the name of the addressee mentioned on the right side and the sender's/applicant's name mentioned on the left side, marked with the subject line "End Line Evaluation of the Integrated Flood Resilience Programme: Phase 3."

Hard copy documents should be submitted to the address below:

Director, Logistics

BDRCS Logistics Department, National Headquarters

684–686, Red Crescent Sarak, Bara Moghbazar, Dhaka 1217

by **23 September 2026 before 3:00 pm.**

The financial proposal will be opened only for technically qualified bidders.

12. Evaluation Criteria for Selection of Consultant

Applications will be assessed on a combined technical and financial basis using the following weighted criteria:

- **Technical Proposal Quality (40%):** Based on the Scope of Work, the consultant/firm's demonstrated understanding of the assignment, proposed methodology, and work plan will be assessed.
- **Qualifications and Experience (40%):** Alignment of the consultant's/firm's education, professional experience, and quality of prior work samples with the requirements set out in Section 10 (Evaluation Team and Qualifications) of this ToR.
- **Financial Proposal (20%):** Value for money, transparency, and reasonableness of the proposed budget.

The financial proposal will be opened and evaluated only for candidates found technically qualified.

13. Proposal Opening

Proposals will be opened on **23 September 2026** at 3:15 pm in the BDRCS Logistics Meeting Conference Room, 684–686, Red Crescent Sarak, Bara Moghbazar, Dhaka-1217, in the presence of one representative of each bidder (if any). If proposal dropping and opening is not possible on the said date due to unavoidable circumstances, it will take place on the next working day at the same time and venue, and other information will remain unchanged.

14. Contractual Agreements

Upon selection, a formal contract will be established between BDRCS and the consultant/firm, outlining the terms and conditions of the engagement, including deliverables, timelines, payment arrangements, and intellectual property rights.

15. Payment Terms

Payment will be made within 30 (thirty) days from the date of receipt of the agreed deliverables/services, along with all supporting documents in order, i.e., commercial invoice and acknowledgement issued by BDRCS. While collecting payment, the consultant/firm must bring the money receipt and a revenue stamp of BDT 10.00 (BDT ten only). Payment will be made after deducting VAT and income tax as per applicable National Board of Revenue (NBR) rules.

16. Performance Security

The successful consultant/firm shall provide Performance Security equivalent to 3% of the Contract Price for intellectual/consulting services within seven (07) calendar days of issuance of the Notification of Award (NOA), in accordance with applicable BDRCS policy. The Performance Security shall be released after satisfactory completion of the contractual obligations, subject to the terms of the contract.

17. Disclaimer, Penalty Clauses, and Reservation of Rights

BDRCS reserves the right to accept or reject any or all proposals/applications, or to split the order, without assigning any reason whatsoever, and will not be bound to accept the lowest bid. Failure to comply with any of the requirements of this ToR may justify rejection of the proposal.

In case of failure to produce the deliverables (due to technical difficulties, unavoidable situations, etc.) within the agreed period, the consultant/firm must inform BDRCS in advance or immediately, with justification. Otherwise, a penalty of 0.5% of the total contract amount will be charged per day of delay. If the consultant/firm fails to complete the assignment within 15 working days of the delayed delivery period without any valid and well-documented reason (subject to BDRCS management approval), the contract will be considered void and null.

18. Contract Termination / Non-Performance

BDRCS reserves the right to terminate the contract in the event of non-performance, misconduct, or material breach of the contractual obligations by the consultant/firm.

19. Contact Information for Queries

For only any technical queries, please contact: Md. Mominul Haque, PMER Officer, IFRP, DCRM, BDRCS – mominul.haque@bdracs.org, with a copy to the Director In-Charge, DCRM Department, E-mail: shahinur.rahman@bdracs.org, and Logistics Department E-mail: logistics@bdracs.org.

BDRCS is an equal opportunity organization and encourages applications from qualified individuals regardless of gender, age, ethnicity, or disability status.