



# **Review of ShelterBox's Responses in Syria 2012-2024 (Programme Review)**

---

Terms of Reference  
November 2024



## I. Background and Context

Conflict in Syria has been ongoing since March 2011, when peaceful anti-government protests descended into violence. The conflict has caused the displacement of over half the population of pre-war Syria with over 5 million people seeking refuge in neighbouring countries and over 7 million internally displaced people (IDPs).<sup>1</sup> According to the Humanitarian Needs Overview<sup>1</sup> (HNO) 2024 16.7 million people require humanitarian assistance and 6.8 million of those are in need of shelter and NFI assistance. This conflict-induced need was exacerbated by earthquakes that struck south-eastern Türkiye and northern Syria in February 2023.

ShelterBox has responded to the humanitarian need for shelter and NFIs in Syria since December 2012. We are currently delivering in two locations in Syria, the northeast (NE) and the northwest (NW). In both locations we are delivering in partnership. In the NE we are partnered with Bahar, a Syrian non-governmental organisation (NGO) which has a country office in Erbil, KRI and HQ in Gaziantep, Türkiye. In the NW with Relief Aid, a New Zealand based international NGO. Since the start of ShelterBox's programme in Syria there have been numerous partnerships, the vast majority of which have been with INGOs for one-off projects however, since 2019 ShelterBox has only worked with the 2 current partners.

## II. Purpose of this Review

As part of responsible portfolio management, ShelterBox periodically reviews its programmes to determine whether they align with our organisational strategy and represent the best use of funds. Syria is one of the three programmes selected for review in 2024.

## III. Review Objectives

This review will focus on the following five key areas. Review Questions are specified in line with these areas in the Review Framework set out in Table 1 (section V).

1. **Operational context** – Developing a better understanding of the operational barriers in the current Syria projects including overall operating environment and ShelterBox's current operational model.
2. **Impact** – Project impacts achieved by ShelterBox and our partners to date, highlights, lessons learned, to what degree these lessons have been integrated into subsequent responses, challenges faced, and adaptations made in response to these challenges.
3. **Partnership** – Reviewing the effectiveness of ShelterBox's partnerships to date and mapping potential new partners to explore working with in future.

---

<sup>1</sup> UNHCR 2024. Syria Situation. [Syria situation | Global Focus](#)



4. **Strategic alignment** – Examining the degree of alignment of ShelterBox’s responses to date with our current (2022-2027) strategy<sup>2</sup>.
5. **Value for Money (VfM)** – Value for money provided by the Syria programme.

#### IV. Principles & Approach

This review will be conducted by an impartial third party. The review should be guided by the following principles:

- It aims to promote **accountability** across the partnerships in respect to ShelterBox’s Syria response activities.
- Review processes are **objective, impartial** and **transparent**.
- Information gathered – particularly via any Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) – will be **confidential**, unless agreed otherwise with informants.
- The review seeks to stimulate a culture of **critical reflection** to improve the quality of future responses, partnerships, and regional approaches.
- The review should be conducted in a **timely** manner.

#### V. Review Framework and Questions

Table 1: Review Framework

Review Area	Questions / Areas of Inquiry	To Be Included in Summary of Findings
<b>Operational Context</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• An overview of governance and administration arrangements in Northern Syria and how they intersect with the humanitarian landscape. Focus should be on legislation, management of humanitarian policy and coordination of activities.</li><li>• Security synopsis and (potential) impacts of global geopolitical events/trends (e.g., Israel, an incoming Trump presidency etc.)</li><li>• An overview of the humanitarian landscape including donor/funding trends, shelter/settlement actors and response trends, prevalence of UN/INGO/NNGO/CSOs.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Operational barriers</li><li>• Operational opportunities</li><li>• To what extent can ShelterBox further <i>localisation</i> strategic goals in Syria?</li></ul>

<sup>2</sup> ShelterBox adopted a new strategy in 2022 which runs from 2022 through 2027. This strategy is available here [ShelterBox strategy 2022-27 - ShelterBox](#) and should be the strategy used for this review, although we recognise that a decade (2012-2022) of response was delivered before the launch of this strategy.



Review Area	Questions / Areas of Inquiry	To Be Included in Summary of Findings
<b>Impact</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>To what extent has Shelterbox been able to reach more people through partnership?</i></li> <li>• What has been the individual and the household reach of the Syria programme?</li> <li>• <i>Has the Syria programme been able to expand emergency response capacity through emergency preparedness?</i></li> <li>• How have ShelterBox responses in Syria to date performed against their intended impacts and outcomes?</li> <li>• How has expertise in emergency shelter delivery grown through innovation and knowledge creation throughout the Syria responses?</li> <li>• To what extent has ShelterBox (and partners) programming evolved in Syria? Is there evidence of innovation and knowledge creation? If so, what? Is it aligned to broader shelter programming?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of successes and summary of learnings</li> <li>• To what extent has the Syria programme contributed to organisational strategic objectives?</li> </ul>
<b>Partnership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has ShelterBox supported local and national responders to strengthen their capacity through skills and knowledge sharing?</li> <li>• Are there clear roles and responsibilities between ShelterBox and partners?</li> <li>• How have partnerships evolved, adapted?</li> <li>• To what degree are ShelterBox's current partnerships aligned with our current (2022-2027) strategy?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent are ShelterBox's partnerships aligned with its strategy?<sup>4</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> This question also responds to the Strategic Alignment area of the review.

<sup>4</sup> This this summary of partnerships should be linked to the summary on strategic alignment.



Review Area	Questions / Areas of Inquiry	To Be Included in Summary of Findings
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What other partners could ShelterBox consider working with in future responses?</li> </ul>	
<b>Strategic Alignment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent have ShelterBox's responses in Syria grown capacity through partnership?</li> <li>• To what extent has ShelterBox expanded emergency response capacity through emergency preparedness?</li> <li>• To what degree has ShelterBox grown its expertise in emergency shelter delivery through innovation and knowledge creation via its Syria responses?</li> <li>• How is ShelterBox supporting local and national responders to strengthen their capacity through skills and knowledge sharing?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent is the Syria programme aligned with its strategy?</li> </ul>
<b>Value for Money (VfM)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is ShelterBox spending on Syria responses at a reasonable price for the intended impacts? (Economy)</li> <li>• How well is ShelterBox (together with our partners) converting resources (time, money) into outputs? (Efficiency)</li> <li>• To what extent are the outputs of our responses in Syria having the intended effect (i.e., leading to intended outcome and impact)? (Effectiveness)</li> <li>• To what extent are we reaching marginalised groups? (Equity)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the Syria programme offer VfM?</li> <li>• How could VfM in the Syria programme be improved?</li> </ul>

## VI. Audience

The findings from this evaluation will be used by ShelterBox internal stakeholders. Findings of the review may be shared our partner organisations (Bahar and ReliefAid). It is not intended that this review will be publicly facing.



Internally within ShelterBox the primary audience is the members of International Programmes Directorate (IPD), particularly the MENA and Asia regional team and IPD management. Table 2 sets out the primary internal stakeholders within ShelterBox and their specific uses of the review findings. The findings from the review will be used by all internal stakeholders to facilitate decisions upon future programming in Syria.

Table 2: Primary Internal ShelterBox Stakeholder

Stakeholder(s)	Review Use
<b>Director of IPD</b>	Provide greater understanding of the collective work and quality of ShelterBox's responses and partnerships.
<b>Deputy Director of IPD</b>	Provide greater understanding of the collective work and quality of ShelterBox's responses and partnerships. Inform partnering approaches for future responses in Syria and feed into regional strategy.
<b>MENA &amp; Asia Regional Director</b>	Inform partnering approaches for future responses in Syria and feed into regional strategy.
<b>Syria Programme Manager</b>	Inform approach to future responses in Syria including partnerships, intended impact of responses, and project management of responses.
<b>Programme Quality Team</b>	Better understanding of the quality of programming of Syria responses to date. Value add of undertaking internal evaluative reviews/exercises with a view to increase impact and accountability.

## VII. Review Phases and Timeframe

Applicants should submit a proposed workplan with their proposals using the timeframe set out in Table 3. Applicants should also comment on the number of days per activity and indicate where they anticipate change from the indicative days set out in Table 3.

Table 3: Process and Timeframe

Phase	Activity(ies)	Timeframe	Days	Deliverable
<b>Inception</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detailed review plan</li> <li>- Methodology and workplan articulated</li> <li>- Inception report drafted</li> </ul>	Within 2 weeks of contract signature	3 days	Inception report inclusive of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Methodology</li> <li>- Data collection tools/matrixes</li> </ul>



Phase	Activity(ies)	Timeframe	Days	Deliverable
	and validated with ShelterBox - Finalisation of data collection tools and analysis matrixes			- workplan (inclusive of regular meetings with ShelterBox) - skeleton of final Review Report ShelterBox to approve workplan before work commences
<b>Review Data Collection and Synthesis<sup>5</sup></b>	Document Review	Within four weeks of approved Inception Report and workplan	5 days	Analysis matrix Findings to be included in final Review Report
	Focus group discussions (FGDs) or individual interviews (KIs) with key informants	Within four weeks of approved Inception Report and workplan	7 days	Analysis matrix Findings to be included in final Review Report
<b>Reporting and Validation</b>	Writing Review Report that contains findings from the Data Collection and Partner Mapping Phases	Within eight weeks of approved Inception Report and workplan	5 days	Full draft Review Report
	Preparation of presentation of findings and Report	Within eight weeks of approved Inception Report and workplan	.5 day	Presentation
	Presentation of Report and findings to ShelterBox in a validation meeting	Within 5 days of submission of draft Review Report to ShelterBox	.5 day	
<b>Closure</b>	Amendments to Review Report following Evaluation meeting	Within 5 days of Presentation of draft	1 day	Final Review Report

**Commented [HA1]:** For 20 or so total interviews, would around 5 days instead be sufficient?

**Commented [DS2R1]:** I think this is a time-intensive process that we want them to focus on. I suggest keeping at 7.

<sup>5</sup> It is anticipated that the Review Data Collection and the Partner Mapping will overlap.



Phase	Activity(ies)	Timeframe	Days	Deliverable
		Review Report to ShelterBox		
	Submission of final Review Report to ShelterBox and availability for any follow-up questions/comments to facilitate final approval	Within 5 days of Presentation of draft Review Report to ShelterBox	.5 day	Approval of final Review Report by ShelterBox
		<b>Total Days:</b>	<b>22.5 days</b>	

### VIII. Methodology

The successful consultant/firm will be responsible for the development of a final methodological approach for this evaluation. Indicative activities include:

- Document review (see indicative list of documents below)
- Key informant interviews (see indicative list of key informants (KIs) below)

The evaluation process will be compliant with data protection principles, code of conduct and 'do no harm' principles.

#### Document Review

##### Bahar

- [Earthquake project \(emergency\) documents](#)
- [Winterisaton 2022 documents](#)
- [Winterisaton 2023 documents](#)

##### ReliefAid

- [Earthquake project \(emergency\) documents](#)
- [Winterisaton 2022 documents](#)
- [Winterisaton 2023 documents](#)
- [Bahar and ReliefAid joint Evaluation of winterisaton 2023](#)
- [All earlier Bahar project documents](#)
- [All earlier ReliefAid project documents](#)

Table 4: ShelterBox Staff KIs

Key Informant Name	Role	Project(s)
<b>Jack Bailey</b>	Programme Manager	NE: P4-P11 NW: P9-P25
<b>Sophia Novelli</b>	Supply Chain Specialist	NE: P11





Key Informant Name	Role	Project(s)
		NW: P25
<b>Daniela Schofield</b>	MEAL Coordinator	NE: P11 NW: P25
<b>Poppy Hobbs</b>	MEAL Coordinator	NE: P8-P9 NW: P20- P22
<b>Dave Ray</b>	Technical Shelter	NE: P9 NW: 2012 – 2015
<b>Haroon Altaf</b>	Regional Director MENA Asia	NE: P8- P11 NW: P23-P25
<b>Sam Hewitt</b>	Regional Director (ESA)	NE P1-P7 NW P1- P22
<b>Miranda Harington</b>	Deputy Director IPD	NE: P10-P11 NW: P24-P25
<b>Tosin Adenuga</b>	Safeguarding Advisor	NE: P11 NW: P25

#### Potential Key Informants (KIs)

Table 5: Bahar KIs

Key Informant Name	Role	Project(s)
<b>Sami Benni</b>	Former Program Coordinator - HQ	P7 -10
<b>Abdulghafour Aljafaar</b>	MEAL Manager	P10
<b>Bassel Alimam</b>	Current and Former Program Manager	P5 - P11
<b>Rezgar Alo</b>	Supply Chain Specialist	TBD
<b>Saleeem Araban</b>	MEAL Manager	P11
<b>Faisal Aljaber</b>	Supply Chain manager	P11

Table 6: Relief Aid KIs

Key Informant Name	Role	Project(s)
<b>Mike Seawright</b>	Founder and Executive Director	P1- P25
<b>Daniel O'Brien</b>	Programme Manager	NW: P25



Key Informant Name	Role	Project(s)
Mohammad Nour	Team leader	P1-P25
Mustafa Ratel	Team Manager	P1-P25

## IX. Deliverables and Payment Schedule

Table 7: Deliverables and Payment Schedule

Deliverable	Due	Percent of Contract Payable Upon Deliverable Completion
Contract signature	n/a	10%
Inception Report inclusive of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Methodology</li><li>- Data collection tools/matrixes</li><li>- Final workplan (inclusive of regular meetings with ShelterBox)</li><li>- Skeleton of final Review Report</li></ul>	TBD	25%
Draft Review Report	TBD	25%
Presentation of draft Review Report		15%
Final Review Report and sign-off from ShelterBox	TBD	25%

The consultant/firm's main point of contact for this evaluation will be Jack Bailey [jackbailey@shelterbox.org](mailto:jackbailey@shelterbox.org).

## X. Requirements

The selected firm/ consultant should possess the following minimum qualifications as follows:

- Higher university degree in humanitarian / development studies or any related academic discipline or an affiliation with a research institution
- At least five (5) years of experience evaluating/reviewing humanitarian response and/or strategic programming by non-governmental organisations in humanitarian settings.
- Excellent analytical, communication, writing, and presentation skills in English.
- Ability to analyse complex interventions
- Conversant with the context in Syria and the evolving security situation in the region
- Fluency in English and Arabic

Desirable qualifications include:

- Knowledge of the Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS)



- Experience evaluating shelter, gender, and protection programming in emergencies
- Experience of emergency shelter and/or winterisation projects.

#### XI. Budget

The total budget for this evaluation is ~~£13,000~~. Please submit financial proposals in GBP Sterling. Please note that if the successful consultant is bidding in a currency other than GBP Sterling they may need to absorb any changes in the contract value due to currency fluctuations.

**Commented [DS3]:** Estimated based on a day rate of £550 x 33.5 = 18,425 and rounded up to 18,500. Do we have this sort of money for this review?

**Commented [DS4R3]:** Update: Budget up to £25k

**Commented [DS5R3]:** @Haroon Altaj please clarify amount following email chain with John.

**Commented [HA6R3]:** Amended to £13,000

#### XII. Submission of Proposal

The interested firm/consultant should submit a proposal no later than 09 December 2024. The submission of proposals and/or related questions should be sent marked 'PROCT-223' to [tenders@shelterbox.org](mailto:tenders@shelterbox.org)

The submission should include the following:

1. **A cover letter** of no more than two pages introducing the reviewer/organisation and how the skills and competencies described above are met, with concrete examples. Please also use this cover letter to indicate the firm/consultants' availability for the proposed period.
2. **Technical Proposal:** The technical proposal should include:
  - a) An interpretation of the Review Objectives
  - b) Organization/individual capacity statement
  - c) Detailed methodology and workplan
  - d) Examples of relevant experience
  - e) At least two references for similar completed consultancies
  - f) Approach to safeguarding/Protection Policy
  - g) Data protection/Information Sharing Policy
  - h) CVs of all team members proposed to undertake work on this evaluation, their proposed roles for this assignment, names, country of residence, availability, and three professional referees.
3. **Financial Proposal:** The financial proposal should include a one-page budget of the offer covering all major anticipated costs. Please note that proposed budgets should not be included in the technical proposal.
4. **Demonstration of delivering similar assignments:** Two or three samples of reports for evaluations or reviews of humanitarian and development interventions. These reviews should have been chiefly conducted by the same team members proposed to undertake this assignment.



# THANK YOU

---

ShelterBox.org

ShelterBox and Rotary are project partners in disaster relief. ShelterBox is a charity independent of Rotary International and The Rotary Foundation.

Reg Charity no: 1096479

