



Evaluation of ShelterBox's 2024 Winterisation Response in Syria

Terms of Reference



I. Background and Context

The Syrian conflict 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 5.6 million people seeking refuge in neighbouring and further afield countries and 6 million IDPs. According to the Humanitarian Needs Overview¹ (HNO) 2024 16.7 million people need humanitarian assistance and 6.8 million of those in need of shelter and non-food item (NFI) assistance.

In the northeast of the country, approximately 165,000 individuals live in 253 IDP sites 95 per cent of sites are self-settled or collective centres of whom 57 per cent are under the age of 18 and 56 per cent are female¹. In Al-Raqqa governorate alone there are 12,822 tents occupied by IDPs as of March 2023. 62.5% of shelters across the governorate leak during rain, and 51.2 per cent have a lack of insulation from the cold.²

While the Idlib Governorate, in the northwest of the country, is the last remaining opposition stronghold and despite having relative stability since March 2020 (on the back of a ceasefire agreement guaranteed by Turkey and Russia), there are still daily aerial bombardments of direct and indirect fire across areas of Idlib.

The crisis in Syria was further compounded by the massive earthquake that struck southern Turkey and northern Syria in February 2023, killing at least 5,791 people and injuring more than 10,000 in Syria alone.³ In December 2022, before the earthquake, the northwest region hosted over 2.8 million IDPs.⁴ In April 2023, at least another 53,000 families were displaced following the earthquakes and were in need of dignified shelters.⁵

Northwest (NW) and Northeast (NE) Syria both suffer from long, extremely cold, and unpredictable winters which cause acute suffering for those living without adequate shelter. An ongoing economic crisis leaves families further unable to meet their own basic requirements and in severe need of NFI assistance. As of 27th April 2023, only 7.8% of the country-wide 2023 Syria Humanitarian Response Plan had been funded.⁶

One of the Shelter/NFI Working Group's top priorities for 2024 is to continue providing the annual winterization response. The harsh winters in northeast Syria cause acute suffering particularly for the IDP populations. In recent years, there

¹ UN OCHA (2024a) [Syrian Arab Republic: 2024 Humanitarian Needs Overview \(February 2024\) \[EN/AR\] - Syrian Arab Republic | ReliefWeb](#)

² REACH (2023) [Informal Sites and Settlements Profiling \(shinyapps.io\)](#)

³ UN OCHA (2024b) [North-west Syria | Situation Reports \(unocha.org\)](#)

⁴ Shelter Cluster [Syria | Shelter Cluster](#)

⁵ See footnote 3.

⁶ See footnote 3.



has been an increase in extreme weather conditions, such as sub-zero temperatures, heavy snowfall, and widespread flooding.

a. ShelterBox's Partnerships and 2024 Winterisation Responses

In 2024 ShelterBox, along with our partners, is delivering a winterisation response in NW and NE Syria. In NW Syria we have partnered with Relief Aid and in NE Syria with Bahar. Both of these responses share the same project impact: 'To contribute to the self-recovery of conflict affected displaced people in NE Syria through the provision of tarpaulins and rope, winter clothing and household items ahead of winter.' In both locations, households will be provided with emergency shelter kits, clothing, household items (HHIs). However, in the NE project a pilot voucher modality will be used for a case load of ~185 households. In this pilot participants will receive a voucher supplemented with in-kind tarpaulins and rope. The estimated household reach in NE is 1,700 households and is also 1,700 households in the NW.

II. Purpose of this Evaluation

This process evaluation follows an evaluation that was undertaken earlier in 2024 and which assessed ShelterBox's 2023 winterisation response in Syria. The purpose of this evaluation is to examine to what degree the implementation of the 2024 winterisation response has taken on board the recommendations of the 2023 evaluation and assess how effective the 2024 response has been.

III. Evaluation Objectives

The evaluation will be guided by the following overarching questions. These will be complimented by the questions in the Evaluation Framework (see section VI).

1. How did recommendations from the 2023 evaluation inform ShelterBox and Bahar's 2024 response in NE Syria?
2. How did recommendations from the 2023 evaluation inform ShelterBox and Relief Aid's 2024 response in NW Syria?
3. How have the responses in NE and NW Syria revised their approaches to accountability to affected populations? What has been the result of changes made?
4. To what extent did the 2024 responses in NW and NE Syria achieve the outcomes and outputs articulated in their respective project proposals and logframes?
5. What additional lessons and recommendations are there for ShelterBox's continued programming in Syria based on the 2024 responses?
6. What additional lessons and recommendations are there for ShelterBox's partnership approach in Syria based on the 2024 responses?

IV. Audience

The findings from this evaluation will be used by ShelterBox internal stakeholders as well as our partner organisations (Bahar and Relief Aid). It is not intended that this evaluation will be publicly facing and will be for the use of the three organisations.



Table 1 - Evaluation Stakeholder

Stakeholder(s)	Evaluation Use
Head of IPD	Greater understanding of the collective work and quality of SB's responses, particularly to use of evaluation findings in informing follow on responses.
Asia Regional Director	The use of evaluation findings and learnings in informing the design of future responses.
Programme Quality	Better understanding of the quality of programming. Value add of undertaking internal evaluative reviews/exercises with a view to increase impact and accountability. Accountability to affected populations and how to work with partners to improve this.
Partner Organisations	Additional learning to follow from the 2024 evaluation. The role of recommendations in shaping future responses.

V. Principles & Approach

This evaluation will be conducted by an impartial third party. The evaluation 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 evaluation seeks to stimulate a culture of **learning through critical reflection** to improve the quality of future responses and partnerships.
- The evaluation should be conducted in a **timely** manner.

VI. Evaluation Framework

The evaluation framework has been set out in Table 2 - Evaluation Criteria and Questions and is structured along OECD DAC evaluation criteria.⁷

Table 2 - Evaluation Criteria and Questions

Evaluation Criteria	Questions
1) Relevance <i>Have our responses and partnerships been doing the right things?</i>	1A) Was there a robust contextual analysis and participatory needs assessment that informed the project design?
	1B) Were community capacities effectively assessed and capitalised on during project implementation
	1C) To what extent were appropriate accountability mechanisms embedded throughout project delivery? E.g. participatory needs assessment, timely information sharing and FCRM etc.
	1D) Was gender, equity and inclusion effectively mainstreamed throughout the project cycle.

⁷ [Evaluation Criteria - OECD](#)



Evaluation Criteria	Questions
	<p>1E) Did the project follow a standard PCM flow, were activities well defined during project design, and if not what were the reasons?</p> <p>1F) Was a clear, impartial and transparent participant selection criterion developed and applied to the recipient targeting?</p> <p>1G) Did the project reflect needs and priorities of affected population?</p> <p>1H) To what extent was the project able to adapt and provide appropriate response to context changes and emerging local needs?</p>
<p>2) Coherence <i>How well do our responses and the partnerships fit to the need?</i></p>	<p>2A) Was the project in line with national laws and priorities</p> <p>2B) What coordination mechanisms existed and to what extent was project participation regular and meaningful?</p> <p>2C) Was the partnership's work complementary to locally led and community-based actions, and those of relevant stakeholders?</p> <p>2D) Did ShelterBox or the partner identify and refer any unmet priority needs to relevant stakeholders with relevant technical expertise and capacity to address them.</p> <p>2E) How was the partner selected and was there clear justification</p> <p>2F) If ShelterBox did not have a partner, what was the reason? and could a partnership model have been effective?</p> <p>2G) Was the relationship between ShelterBox and the partner productive, equitable and efficient? and did ShelterBox add value?</p> <p>2H) What was ShelterBox's added value to the project?</p>
<p>3) Effectiveness <i>Are the responses/ partnership achieving their objectives?</i></p>	<p>3A) Was the partnership clearly framed e.g. roles and responsibilities and scope of work, etc?</p> <p>3B) Were the activities and inputs / outputs timely, were activity plans followed and did the project lead to the intended outcome?</p> <p>3C) Did the project have unintended consequences?</p> <p>3D) What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving stated project deliverables?</p> <p>3E) Were differential results observed for different groups/identity characteristics?</p>
<p>4) Efficiency <i>How well are the resources (i.e., time, financial) being used?</i></p>	<p>4A) Taking into consideration the importance of needs assessments and accurate targeting, did the recipients consider that the project delivered in a timely manner?</p> <p>4B) Did Value for Money (VfM) considerations/analysis contribute to decision making?</p>



VII. Methodology

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

- Key informant interview and/or focus group discussions with selected recipients in camps supported by the winterisation response.
- Key informant interviews with camp management.
- Key informant interviews with ShelterBox and partner staff.

ShelterBox and partners will make the following documents and data available to the firm/consultant:

- Evaluation of the 2023 response
- 2024 needs assessment data
- 2024 project meeting notes
- 2024 FCRM data and reporting
- 2024 project monitoring and reports
- Endline findings from the 2024 response in both locations

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

VIII. Timeline & Milestones

The evaluation is planned for January / February 2025. The consultancy is for 24 days

Activity	Timeframe	Indicative Consultant Days
Kick-off meeting (following contract signature)	Week of 6 January 2025	.5
Inception report (full plan for evaluation) submitted to ShelterBox	10 January 2025	1.5
Finalised inception report (agreed evaluation plan)	17 January 2025	.5
Data collection	20 January - 13 February 2025	10
Final evaluation report (draft)	24 February 2025	5.5
Evaluation report meeting and validation session	28 February 2025	.5
Revision of evaluation report based on meeting	28 February - 6 March 2025	3
Submission of final report	7 March 2025	n/a
Presentation of findings	12 March 2025	.5
Approval of final report	20 March 2025	n/a
Check-in meetings	Fortnightly following finalised inception report (as needed)	.25 x 8 =4
Total Days		26

IX. Deliverables and Payment Schedule

Table 3 - Deliverables

Deliverable	Due	Percentage of Contract Paid Upon ShelterBox Approval of Deliverable
Contract signature	Date of contract	10%
Inception Report, inclusive of full evaluation plan, evaluation tools, and timeline	10 January 2025	20%
Draft final evaluation report	24 February 2025	20%
Presentation of findings	12 March 2025	20%
Final approved evaluation report	20 March 2025	30%



The consultant/firm's main point of contact for this evaluation will be the MEAL Coordinator.

X. Requirements

A consultancy firm/individual legally registered to operate in Syria with formal access to visit and carry out research in the project locations.

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
- Seven (7) years evaluating humanitarian programmes including using OECD/DAC evaluation
- Knowledge of the Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS)
- Experience evaluating shelter, gender, and protection programming in emergencies
- Strong background in monitoring and evaluation, with a demonstrable track record of the use of quantitative and participatory qualitative methods of data collection
- Excellent analytical, communication, writing, and presentation skills in both Arabic and English.
- Ability to analyse complex interventions
- Conversant with the context in Syria

Experience of emergency shelter and/or winterisation projects would be advantageous.

XI. Budget

The total budget for this evaluation is £7,000. Please submit financial proposals in GBP Sterling.

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-224 to tenders@shelterbox.org

The submission should include the following:

1. **A cover letter** of no more than two pages introducing the evaluator/organisation and how the skills and competencies described above are met, with concrete examples. Please also use this cover letter to indicate the consultants' availability for the proposed period.
2. **Technical Proposal:** The technical proposal should include:
 - a) An interpretation of the objectives of the evaluation



- b) Organization/individual capacity statement
 - c) Detailed methodology and work plan
 - d) Examples of relevant past experience
 - e) Approach to safeguarding/Protection Policy
 - f) Data protection/Information Sharing Policy
 - g) CVs of all team members proposed to undertake work on this evaluation, their proposed roles for this assignment, names, addresses, and telephone numbers of 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 to 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.
 5. **Names and identification documents** of members of the boards and individuals who will have contact with the affected population.



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

