

**Terms of Reference for  
BEST VI-EiE Final Evaluation  
September 2025**

# I. PROJECT SUMMARY

<b>Type of study</b>	<b>Final Evaluation</b>
<b>Name of the projects</b>	Basic Education Support Toward Transition Phase VI (BEST VI) and Rakhine and Thai-Myanmar Multiyear Education in Emergencies Programme (EiE)
<b>Project Start and End dates</b>	BEST VI - 1 March 2023 – 28 February 2026 EiE -31 January 2023- 31 December 2025
<b>Project duration</b>	36 months
<b>Project locations:</b>	Asia, Thailand 9 refugee camps along Thai-Myanmar border in Tak, Mae Hong Son, Kanchanaburi, and Ratchaburi provinces.
<b>Thematic areas</b>	Education; Basic Education
<b>Donor</b>	BEST VI - European Union (INTPA) EiE – Australian’s Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)
<b>Estimated beneficiaries</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 19,216 children aged 6–17 years (10,091 girls, 9,125 boys, including 180 girls with disabilities and 177 boys with disabilities) enrolled in mainstream and special education in 58 basic education schools and 11 special education schools in the nine camps.</li> <li>▪ 1,044 refugee teachers, including 979 mainstream teachers (689f, 281 m) and 65 inclusive or special education teachers (60f, 5m).</li> <li>▪ 49 head teachers, 56 Resident Teacher Trainers (RTTs), and 26 local trainers</li> <li>▪ Implementing partner staff including 11 KRCEE staff, 49 OCEE staff, and 35 KnED staff</li> <li>▪ 961 Parent Teacher Association (PTA) members (731 f, 230m) benefit from support and capacity building</li> <li>▪ 25 advocacy stakeholders in Karen and Karenni Education Stakeholder Teams (KKEST)</li> </ul>
<b>Overall objective of the project</b>	<p><b>BEST VI:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overall objective: To improve the fulfilment of education rights of boys and girls refugees from Myanmar in nine camps in Thailand.</li> <li>▪ Specific objective: Increased access to inclusive, gender responsive, self-reliant basic education for child refugees in nine camps in Thailand</li> </ul> <p><b>EiE:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overall objective: Girls and boys, with and without disabilities, affected by conflict in Central Rakhine State and in refugee camps in Thailand learn from quality, meaningful inclusive and gender responsive learning in safe, protective education that is supported by communities and local organisations.</li> </ul>

## 2. INTRODUCTION

This document presents the Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation of the BEST VI–EiE projects. These two projects are implemented as a merged intervention under Save the Children Thailand’s Refugee Education and Protection Programme, which leads education initiatives along the Thailand–Myanmar border. This document serves as a roadmap for the assessment, defining its scope, objectives, methodology, and expected outcomes. Additionally, it establishes accountability by clarifying roles, responsibilities, timelines, and deliverables to ensure an effective and efficient evaluation process.

BEST VI, funded by the European Union, runs from March 2023 to February 2026, while the EiE project, funded by the Australian Government through DFAT, runs from January 2023 to December 2025. Together, the programme provides basic education to 27,041 refugee children through a holistic approach that ensures access to quality education, the availability of school facilities and learning materials, and strengthened capacity for teachers and education personnel.

BEST VI is implemented in nine refugee camps across Mae Hong Son, Tak, Ratchaburi, and Kanchanaburi provinces, while EiE complements these efforts by expanding access to inclusive, gender-responsive, and self-reliant education in seven camps administered by the Karen Refugee Committee (KRC). The programme is delivered through a consortium of implementing partners, with a strong focus on maintaining continued learning opportunities for conflict-affected children. Collectively, these initiatives aim to strengthen education access, improve teaching quality, and reinforce community-led education systems in some of the most challenging displacement settings.

To assess the impact and effectiveness of the intervention, Save the Children Thailand is commissioning an external Evaluation Team such as an individual, consultancy firm, organization, or institution to conduct the final evaluation in Thailand. To ensure objectivity and credibility, the selected Evaluation Team must have no prior involvement in the Action. The evaluation, scheduled between October 2025 and February 2026 will measure the extent to which the Action has achieved its intended outcomes. Further details, including the projects background, evaluation scope, key questions, intended methodology, reporting and governance, key deliverables and timeframes for its implementation are provided in the sections that follow.

## 3. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Thailand has hosted refugees from Myanmar for decades, with more than 102,000 individuals currently living in nine camps along the border. Around one-third (34,173) are children of school age, many of whom face barriers to accessing quality education due to limited resources, policy constraints, and lack of recognition of their academic achievements. Ensuring inclusive and resilient education systems is therefore vital to safeguard children’s rights, well-being, and future opportunities.

The Basic Education Support Toward Transition (BEST) Phase VI project continues efforts to strengthen education in the camps, building on earlier phases while adapting to new challenges such as the COVID-19 pandemic and the political instability in Myanmar following the 2021 coup. Implemented by a consortium of partners including Save the Children Thailand (SC Thailand), Jesuit Refugee Services (JRS), the Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA), BEST VI provides comprehensive support through teacher recruitment and training, stipends for teachers and officials, distribution of learning materials, safe school initiatives, and advocacy for recognition of the Karen and Karenni education systems. Complementing this, the Rakhine and Thai–Myanmar Multiyear Education in Emergencies (EiE) Programme (2023–2025), funded by

Australian Aid, works in seven camps to ensure access to education for children affected by conflict. The programme focuses on expanding access to quality learning, improving teaching practices, and strengthening community-led education systems to provide stability and long-term opportunities for refugee children and their families.

## 4. SCOPE OF STUDY

### 4.1 Purpose, Objectives and Scope

This study is being conducted at the last phase of implementation of the BEST VI and EiE projects, with EiE scheduled to conclude in December 2025 and BEST VI in February 2026. It will build upon the baseline assessment and midterm evaluation. The evaluation will take place at the refugee camps in Thailand, which aims to measure the impact and the outcome indicators for BEST VI and EiE as follows;

#### BEST VI Logframe

Overall objective	To improve the fulfilment of education rights of boys and girls refugees from Myanmar in nine camps in Thailand.
Overall Outcome	Increased access to inclusive, gender-responsive, self-reliant basic education for child refugees in nine camps in Thailand
Specific Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Ensure the availability of teachers to provide inclusive, gender-responsive, self-reliant education to boys and girls in the nine camps.</i></li> <li>• <i>Increase the availability of learning materials for students in basic education schools in camps.</i></li> <li>• <i>Improve basic physical infrastructures of schools in nine camps.</i></li> <li>• <i>Strengthen the educational and teaching capacities of teachers in the camp's schools.</i></li> <li>• <i>Strengthen the capacities of school committees (children, parents, and community members) to ensure safety in camp schools.</i></li> <li>• <i>Strengthen the capacities of head teachers to monitor quality (safe, gender, socially inclusive and protective) learning environments.</i></li> <li>• <i>Increase awareness and opportunities for teachers and students to transition to education systems outside of the nine camps.</i></li> </ul>

#### EiE Logframe

Overall objective	Girls and boys, with and without disabilities, affected by conflict in Central Rakhine State and in refugee camps in Thailand learn from quality, meaningful inclusive and gender responsive learning in safe, protective education that is supported by communities and local organisations.
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Access:</b> <i>increased, inclusive and sustained access to education for children affected by conflict (Merged with BEST VI)</i></li> </ul>

- **Quality:** *Improved quality education through continuous teacher professional development and quality learning materials (Merged with BEST VI)*
- **System Strengthening:** *Improved conflict-sensitivity and sustainability of community systems and organisations to provide safe, inclusive, quality education in emergencies*

BEST VI and EiE (outcome 1 and outcome 2) are merged interventions contributing to the support for the basic education for refugee children along Thai-Myanmar border. Results or the raw data collected for the EiE projects will be shared with Save the Children Myanmar to consolidate and analyse for reporting.

The overall objective of the study is to evaluate the value of project goal and all outcome level indicators for the 2 projects in the targeted refugee camps (BEST VI covering 9 camps; EiE covering 7 KRC-administered camps) and identify any contextual elements or local/regional trends that affect or can affect reaching of the predefined outcomes. Furthermore, the study will verify/redefine assumptions laid out in the theory of change and will also assess impact, effectiveness, efficiency, connectedness, sustainability and gender sensitivity (using OECD/DAC Criteria) and compare the data against the baseline; where applicable, to understand the extent of change and progress achieved.

The primary purpose of the study is three-fold; Primarily, the study will seek to understand the outcome that the project has managed to achieve in the complex environment and different context of Myanmar and Thailand, depicting what positive and negative, primary, and secondary long-term effects, direct or indirect, intended, or unintended can be attributed to the programme. Secondly, the evaluation will seek to assess to which extent the programme was able to maintain relevance and effectiveness in addressing the underlying conditions that have affected key programme outcome level indicators. Finally, this study is to provide actionable recommendations based on the key findings to inform and strengthen future programming efforts and initiatives. Moreover, this evaluation aims to measure the effectiveness and outcomes of contingency response activities undertaken to support gender-responsive mechanisms and education resilience in emergencies

It will measure the effectiveness of overall programme implementation, Teacher Development Modules (TPD) intervention, the quality of learning infrastructure and environment improvement contributing to access to schooling for affected students. The evaluation will also analyse the impact of provided kits (teacher, student) and teacher and education personnel stipend distributions, WASH facilities, school furniture, and Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) activities in supporting displaced students, teachers and parents.

The consultant will be required to undertake consultation with the following SC Thailand staff at the commencement of the project to further refine the Study questions: the Education Technical Expert, Refugee Education and Protection Programme team, and Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) team

**Scope:** The study aims to examine the project in an integrated manner, following specific project components in education, child protection, gender, and disability inclusion, and also the interaction of these components on achieving the overarching project goal. The study, primarily focused on the refugee setting along the Thai-Myanmar border and evaluating the impact and

achievement of the project logframe and the designated evaluation criteria in coordination with the Save the Children Myanmar Team, will cover the entirety of project duration and is intended to ensure participation of all the relevant project beneficiary groups (**children, Child with Disability, Adult with Disability, Parents, Parent and Teacher Association, Teachers: both male and female assistant teachers (volunteers), community leaders, Implementing Partners and other relevant stakeholders**). The study aims to collect the data that aims to generalise to the all target implemented areas. This final evaluation is expected to take place from October 2025 to February 2026.

An estimated number of the beneficiaries and stakeholders in the projects (as of February 2025). The disaggregation by camps and locations will be later provided.

Group	Without disability			With Disability			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Students	12,275	14,700	26,975	43	23	66	12,318	14,723	27,041
Teachers	287	712	999	-	-	-	287	712	999
RTTs (Adult)	16	35	51	-	-	-	16	35	51
OCEE (Adult)	29	25	54	-	-	-	29	25	54
KRCEE (Adult)	6	12	18	-	-	-	6	12	18
KnED (Adult)	21	38	59	-	-	-	21	38	59
<b>Total</b>	12,634	15,522	28,619	43	23	66	12,677	15,545	28,222

The evaluation consultant team will work closely with the SC Thailand Study the project final evaluation, which guides the entire evaluation. SC Thailand Study team, comprised of the Senior Field Coordinator, Refugee Education and Protection Programme Coordinator, Education Technical Advisor, and MEAL team. Technical Advisors will be key in approving important evaluation documents such as the inception report and the final evaluation report. They will also ensure the evaluation is high-quality and relevant, offering input and helping to solve any issues that come up. Their main role is to connect the evaluation team with project stakeholders, ensuring the findings are useful and align with project goals. For the EiE components, the consultant will also work with the consultant from SC Myanmar in sharing the findings.

## 4.2 Key Study Questions

The study will focus on the following key criteria and questions:

Criteria	Key Study Questions

Effectiveness*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what extent have end of program’s intended outcomes been achieved? Have the children had safe and quality learning environment especially amid crisis and natural disaster in selected locations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Highlight how the action successfully meets or not meet the need of the primary actors (children, teachers, school administrators, RTT and education entities, partners and stakeholders in the changing context add contextualised sub-questions from SC Thailand</i></li> <li>○ <i>To what degree communities were safer</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ What were the most significant results achieved, and resources distributed among different groups and diversities of children (age, gender, ethnicity, disability, displacement, migration, and so on)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>What are the intended or unintended effects of the programme, either positive or negative, direct or indirect?</i></li> <li>○ <i>The relationship between the incentive and teacher drop out numbers, what are the key factors in maintaining teachers in the system</i></li> <li>○ <i>How effectively has the Action built the capacity of school administrators, teachers, and children? What were the most impactful training programs and tools developed, and how have they been applied in practice?</i></li> <li>○ <i>What skills have primary actors gained to prevent and respond to risks in the refugee camps?</i></li> <li>○ <i>What lessons can be drawn to inform more effective and context sensitive interventions in similar settings in the future?</i></li> <li>○ <i>What are the key factors for effective capacity building to RTT and teachers and have they contributed to system strengthening at camp level?</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ How big is the effectiveness of the project compared to the objectives planned? (TOC/ reference to logframes)</li> </ul>
Efficiency*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How has multi-year funding impacted the communities in which INTPA-DFAT-funded programs have operated on time and within planned budget? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Has actions been achieved on time, on budget and on scope</i></li> <li>○ <i>Were activities of the Action cost-efficient, and were alternative approaches considered?</i></li> <li>○ <i>How effectively has the Action engaged government organizations, partners, local CBO and target beneficiaries (community leaders, school leaders, RTT, teachers, and children) in relevant stages of implementation? How their engagement contributed to Action outcomes?</i></li> <li>○ <i>How effectively has co-ordination between partners, government organisations, local education entities and stakeholders been?</i></li> <li>○ <i>Were all partners’ ways of working flexible, collaborative, inclusive - what was good practice and what was challenging - did a strengths-based approach work well (or not working well?)</i></li> <li>○ <i>Has the programme brought synergy between the EU and DFAT-fund?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>Impact* (Impact in this context refers to the outcome level changes across the project course. How CPD has an impact on school safety, school management, education quality, and access to education)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does the program/project contribute to reaching outcome level objectives (access, quality, and system strengthening)? Why/ why not? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>What is the impact or effect of the programme or project in proportion to the overall situation of the target group or those affected?</i></li> <li>○ <i>What is the impact of CPD on quality education, quality system strengthening</i></li> <li>○ <i>How CPD have an impact school safety? And Are schools safer?</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ What are the intended or unintended effects of the programme, either positive or negative, direct, or indirect? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>What were the key barriers to increasing access to quality education among out-of-school children or new students. What challenges emerged in engaging communities, schools, and local education entities in the Action's implementation? How is the out-of-school children's situation after the action takes place?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Relevance*</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How was learning and evidence used throughout the program cycle to adapt and ensure the project remained relevant? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Are we doing the right thing? Does the intervention respond to clearly identified needs and priorities of the project participants? Was the intervention appropriately adapted to the local context and target population?</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Does the end of program outcomes clearly address the needs and priorities of the affected population, in a way that was most useful and accessible for them at the most needed time? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>How was learning and evidence used throughout the program cycle to adapt and ensure the project remained relevant?</i></li> <li>○ <i>Is the intervention consistent with the interventions of other actors in the same context, such as supporting complementarity, harmonization, and co-ordination with government and other relevant service providers?</i></li> <li>○ <i>To what extent did primary actors access and complete the learning program?</i></li> <li>○ <i>Did the program/project reach its intended target populations? Why/ why not?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Sustainability*</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are appropriate exit and transition strategies in place?</li> <li>▪ How has the program supported communities and teachers to prepare for and respond to crisis in terms of natural disaster, sporadic armed conflict, and political crisis?</li> <li>▪ To what extent the program interventions strengthened the community capacity to cope up with shock while maintaining sustainability for children access to quality teaching and learning? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>To what extent did the response make use of incentive that help strengthen local systems and local institutions?</i></li> <li>○ <i>To what extent do local partners and community members have ownership of the outcomes?</i></li> <li>○ <i>To what extent were risks to sustainability managed and addressed</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what extent the program has informed and engaged with the local stakeholders? To what extent local communities are involved in decision-making of the program design/interventions? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>To what extent are stakeholders confident that the benefits of the investment will remain - and why? e.g. What good practices and innovations may be continued in future?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How has the program/project approached accountability to children and the wider community, and ensured children participation, information sharing and availability of the child friendly feedback mechanism? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>How did children meaningfully participating in education provided to them?</i></li> <li>○ <i>How accountability system contribute to localization?</i></li> <li>○ <i>Were feedback complaint mechanisms provided and used effectively, in program implementation?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Inclusion: Gender sensitivity/ equality/ Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Did the investment make a difference to gender equality and empowering women and girls? What specific attitudes and barriers faced by girls, boys, children with disabilities were addressed in this program? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>What are the gender gaps that the program/project addressed and what remaining aspects need to be considered further?</i></li> <li>○ <i>To what degree communities have more inclusive and sustained access to education for children affected by conflict</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Did women, boys, girls and men, and people with a disability and the most vulnerable and other marginalized groups, have equal access to partner's programs across different layers of intervention? What are the disability inclusion gaps and gender gaps that the program/project addressed and what remaining aspects need to be considered further? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>How effectively was gender equality mainstreamed in practice - what made the most impact (participation, leadership, GBV support, tailored approaches etc.)?</i></li> <li>○ <i>What are the gender gaps that the program/project addressed and what remaining aspects need to be considered further?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Inclusion: Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How did this program contribute to the safety, protection, and wellbeing of children with or without disability?</li> </ul>
Value for Money	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what extent did the project reach the most vulnerable or marginalized groups in the community?</li> <li>▪ To what extent did the project minimize cost while maintaining required quality standards (What is the cost per child for the intended outcomes)?</li> <li>▪ How did the contextual change in inflation, and conflict intensified affect VFM over 3 years project?</li> </ul>

\*[OECD DAC Criteria](#)

## 5. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

The study deliverables and tentative timeline (subject to the commencement date of the study) are outlined below. The consultancy team lead and SC Thailand will agree on final milestones and deadlines at the inception phase.

No.	Deliverable milestones	September				October				November				December				January				February			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1	Contracting with the consultancy team																								
2	Meeting with the project team																								
3	Inception report preparation & submission																								
4	Finalizing data collection tools																								
5	Outline study submission for ethical review																								
6	Data collection by consultancy team																								
7	Data analysis																								
8	Development and Submission draft report																								
9	Draft report review (SC Thailand)																								
10	Feedback round by EU and DFAT																								

No.	Deliverable milestones	September				October				November				December				January				February							
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4				
11	Final study report and donor submission																												
12	Evidence to Action Brief and Summary Presentation																												

## 6. REPORTING AND GOVERNANCE

The evaluation consultant is to provide reporting against the project plan. The following regular reporting and quality review processes will also be used:

- *Verbal reporting each bi-weekly to the [Steering Committee / SCI Myanmar and its consultant team/ SC Thailand Study team by outlining progress made over the past periods.*

A written Progress Report (1-page) by email to the SC Thailand Programme Coordinator, documenting progress, any emerging issues to be resolved and planned activities for the next month. Coordination and Collaboration with Save the Children Myanmar on EiE project components.

The Education in Emergencies (EiE) project was funded by Australia's Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) through the Education Consortium, with Save the Children Myanmar serving as chair. For EiE project components in this evaluation, the consultant will be required to share raw data, frameworks, tools, results and findings from data collection with the consultant under Save the Children Myanmar. This will enable joint analysis and contribute to the development of their report. The purpose is to ensure data alignment and consistency, and to facilitate cross-border analysis related to the EiE project.

Consultants from Save the Children Thailand and Myanmar will collaborate closely through joint online coordination meetings to review progress, address challenges, and synchronise data collection plans. Draft tools (e.g. survey instruments, FGD/KII guides) and interim findings will be shared with both teams before data collection begins, particularly those relating to the EiE project components.

The consultant from Save the Children Thailand will produce a single consolidated report for the BEST VI–EiE final evaluation. This report will reflect Save the Children Thailand's BEST VI and EiE merged interventions and programming, structured in line with the objectives and evaluation criteria outlined in this ToR.

## 7. CONSULTANCY TEAM AND SELECTION CRITERIA

Interested consultants will be required to submit an Expression of Interest (EoI) together with the proposed budget for the whole fieldworks in line with the provided template, which should demonstrate adherence to the following requirements.

### **Understanding of Requirements and Experience**

To be considered, the study team members together must have demonstrated skills, expertise and experience in:

To be considered, the consultancy team members together must have demonstrated skills, expertise, and experience in:

- Post-graduate degree in Education, Social Sciences, Statistic, Development Study, GESI or related field.
- 5-10 years of experience in monitoring and evaluation, including participation in at least three programme level baseline/evaluation processes (lead positions will be preferred)
- Demonstrated the proven tracks of conducting the research/evaluation in the refugee context along the Thai Myanmar border.
- Preference to be given to candidates who have integrated projects in the Education in Emergencies (EiE) and Child Protection in Emergencies (CPiE) sectors.
- Demonstrated experience in multi-country evaluation coordination
- Experience in and knowledge of statistical analyses (familiarity with data processing and common statistical analysis approaches: correlational, means comparison, regression or non-parametric) is highly desired
- Experience in and knowledge of qualitative data collection methods and analysis is preferred.
- Experience in preparing high quality reports in English.
- Strong written and verbal skills in communicating technical and/ or complex findings to non-specialist audiences (especially report writing and presentation skills)
- Demonstrated fluency in English, Kareni/Karenni/Burmese is an asset.
- Demonstrated ability to work in a multicultural environment and establish harmonious and effective relationships with national partners.
- Demonstrated to apply flexibility, cultural sensitivity, and the ability to work effectively within established humanitarian coordination structures.
- Conducting studies in the field of Education, child protection, Gender, ethical and inclusive studies involving children and children's participatory techniques

There is a high expectation that:

- Members (or a proportion) of the consultancy team have a record of accomplishment of previously working together. The team has a strong record of accomplishment of working flexibly to accommodate changes as the project is implemented.
- A team leader will be appointed who has seniority and experience in leading complex study projects, and who has the ability and standing to lead a team toward a common goal.
- The team can commit to the terms of the project and have adequate and available skilled resources to dedicate to this study over the period.
- While the SCT field office supports the facilitation of necessary arrangements with the beneficiary and targeted groups, the consulting team will be responsible for independently managing all logistical arrangement and hiring enumerators including travel, accommodation, and subsistence, throughout the fieldwork period.

## Financial Proposal

Save the Children seeks value for money in its work. This does not necessarily mean "lowest cost", but quality of the service and reasonableness of the proposed costs. Proposals shall include personnel allocation (role / number of days / daily rates / taxes), as well as any other applicable costs.



## 8. SCHEDULE OF PAYMENT

The total budget available for this evaluation, including all professional fees, travel, accommodation, data collection, hiring and training for enumerators, applicable taxes is expected to fall within the range of USD 20,000 – 23,000. Proposals should provide a clear financial breakdown within this range.

The following payments will be made to the consultant using and agreed mode of payment

No. Payment	Condition of payment	Amount
1	Upon signing the contract	40%
2	Upon submission of the first draft	30%
3	Upon approval of the final report	30%
	Total	100%

## 9. HOW TO APPLY

If interested in applying for this study, please refer to the [Consultant EOI Form](#). Contact person for this study is [porntip.sarnsuwan@savethechildren.org](mailto:porntip.sarnsuwan@savethechildren.org)