



Terms of Reference
Real Time Evaluation
IFRC response to the Syria Crisis 2012-2013

1. Summary

- 1.1. Purpose:** This real time evaluation (RTE) will assess aspects of the IFRC's response to the Syria Crisis, to inform the on-going support to the Syrian Arab Red Crescent (SARC) operations in Syria and the support to the National Societies and their operations in the surrounding countries of Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey and Iraq. As with other RTEs, the evaluation will also inform future global emergency response operations and approaches. Particular emphasis will be placed on looking at the opportunities and challenges in such a complex Movement response over an extended time period and how Movement coordination / cooperation can be best applied to provide flexible and optimal support to the National Societies involved. The RTE will also be asked to scope out future directions and opportunities for the on-going response and contingency planning.
- 1.2. Commissioner:** This RTE has been commissioned by the USG of the Programme Services Division, IFRC, Geneva.
- 1.3. Audience:** This RTE will be used by the IFRC Secretariat in Syria, in the neighbouring countries, in the MENA and Europe Zones and in Geneva to improve delivery in the various Syria Crisis related contexts and to help plan future strategies and interventions. It will also inform all RC/RC actors contributing to the operations, to help improve RCRC Movement coordination and integration around this Crisis. And finally, it will inform future global emergency response operations and the improvement of IFRC approaches and coordination mechanisms in the changing operating environment.
- 1.4. Duration of consultancy:** approximately 30 days (with approx. 15 days in the field)
- 1.5. Estimated dates of consultancy:** May – June 2013.
- 1.6. Location of consultancy:** The consultancy will be carried out in principle in Geneva, Beirut and Amman. Desk reviews will be done for the review RTE in Syria and Turkey with field visits if the context and security allow. Iraq will not be a specific focus for the RTE as the response is still in its early stages.

2. Background

As the ongoing conflict in Syria persists with no imminent end in sight, the regional humanitarian crisis is worsening and becoming increasingly complex. There is a consensus among humanitarian actors and their back donors that there is a need to scale-up response activities, as indicated by the UN's USD\$1.5 billion Syria Humanitarian Assistance Response Plan and the Syria Regional Response Plan, and in light of the IASC Level 3 Emergency activation. The scale up for the moment will focus on funding preparedness materials and human resources to be ready to respond to the increasing needs once a scaled up response in Syria is possible and this will be coordinated out of Amman and Beirut.

The IFRC has been involved in assisting the National Societies with the response to this crisis since May 2011, and although not directly operational in Syria, has provided funding, technical and material assistance to SARC, as well as support as required to the National Societies in the neighbouring countries who are hosting an refugees either in camps or in host families, to enable them to respond to the growing needs in an increasingly tense situation. Official figures show refugee numbers at around 1.1 million as of late March 2013 (324,543 in Jordan, 332,297 in Lebanon, 185,205 in Turkey and 106,697 in Iraq and over 50,000 in



Egypt and North Africa), but unofficial estimates that these numbers are higher and are likely to continue increasing throughout the year.

In the current conflict, the IFRC will not engage operationally in Syria, but instead, will continue to provide assistance and capacity-building support to SARC in accordance with its mandate and the National Society's needs. The IFRC will also continue to provide and where possible scale up assistance to the National Societies of the neighbouring countries and will continue coordinate and communicate closely with all Movement partners to enhance the complementarities of Movement's work. There will be a strong focus on improving coordinated Movement action to improve the efficiency and levels of support for the National Societies concerned.

To date, the IFRC has launched three Emergency Appeals (two managed by the MENA Zone and one by the Europe Zone:–

1. **Syria** - The MENA Zone launched the Emergency Appeal for Syria on 6 July 2012, and revised it on 17 December 2012 to scale-up support for the Syrian Arab Red Crescent (SARC) to assist up to 650,000 beneficiaries for a total of 18 months through to 31 December 2013. The total budget of the Appeal is now CHF 39,197,725 and as of 19 January 2013 is 59% covered (CHF 23,176,298). The main focus of Appeal is on:
 - a. **Relief:** IFRC supports SARC's relief effort in areas not covered by other partners. The objective is to provide 20,000 families with supplementary food (food parcels) and non-food items (hygiene parcels, blankets, kitchen sets etc). Under the Revised Appeal, a special winterization project is underway to provide additional families with items such as thermal blankets, tarpaulins, and mattresses.
 - b. **Health:** IFRC assists SARC to provide health activities across the country, supporting emergency health, primary health care and psychosocial support for the affected population through a well-established network of clinics, health points, mobile health units and ambulance services
 - c. **Capacity building:** IFRC currently works to enhance SARC's operational capacity in management and technical areas, as well as supporting SARC's branches and volunteers continue active engagement in support of the affected population in accordance with RCRC Fundamental principles.
2. **Jordan, Lebanon, and Iraq** – On 9 August 2012, the IFRC launched a Preliminary Emergency Appeal for Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq to address population movement resulting from the Syria Crisis. The Appeal sought CHF 3.7 Million for six months to strengthen the capacities of the Jordanian Red Crescent, the Lebanese Red Cross and the Iraqi Red Crescent to respond to the needs of some 11,000 families (55,000 people) in relief (including cash assistance), hygiene promotion and disaster preparedness. Activities focused on the provision of cash and non-food items to host families in Jordan, on support to the Emergency Medical Services in Lebanon and on capacity building with all three National Societies. On 30 January, this Appeal was revised and now seeks CHF 4,647,103 to scale up assistance to the three National Societies to cope with the evolving needs of the growing number of Syrian refugees crossing into their countries. The revised Appeal now also supports the Palestine Red Crescent Branch in Lebanon to provide health care for the increasing numbers of Palestinian refugees who are fleeing Syria. In Jordan there has also been a deployment of a Head of Emergency Operations (HEOps) and a Field Assessment and Coordination Team (FACT) to support the Jordanian Red Crescent's response and undertake a feasibility study for the establishment of or technical support to a camp for Syrian refugees
3. **Turkey** – On 9 November 2012, the Europe Zone launched the Turkey Population Movement Emergency Appeal seeking CHF 32,311,219 in cash assistance to support the Turkish Red Crescent Society (TRCS) in assisting up to 170,000 people displaced by the crises in Syria. The Appeal is focused on the following areas:
 - a. Urgent **winterisation support** to approximately 100,000 temporary protected people living in camps in Southern Turkey, and essential food and non-food items to approximately 20,000 vulnerable people at the Turkish-Syrian border.
 - b. The provision of **contingency stocks** for an additional 50,000 people for six months.
 - c. Deployment of a reporting delegate to support TRCS's **monitoring and evaluation** efforts.



As the situation faced by the affected population is worsening both inside Syria and in the surrounding countries, and it is likely that needs over the coming months will increase, it is planned that these appeals will be revised to reflect the changing situation and the evolving needs. As the humanitarian challenges are likely to endure for some time to come, it is also likely that the subsequent recovery needs will need to be covered in the longer-term future. The IFRC's current activities and support to the National Societies of the region under these Emergency Appeals provide important continuity of support and help to build longer-term community resilience and National Society capacity to deliver services and maintain a credible response and subsequent recovery capacity.

3. Evaluation Purpose & Scope

The IFRC Secretariat is committed to ensuring quality assurance, standards and a strong culture of lesson learning in its disaster response and, as such, is committed to carrying out RTEs during all major disasters requiring an international response and meeting certain criteria of scale, scope, complexity or risk. These RTEs aim to improve service delivery and accountability to beneficiaries, donors and other stakeholders and to build lessons for the improvement of the International Federation disaster response system. The response to the Syria Crisis, both within Syria and in the neighbouring countries, falls within these criteria.

The humanitarian context in relation to the Syria Crisis is particularly complex and challenging to the humanitarian system and to the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement. The operating environment for both the National Societies and the IFRC Secretariat is changing rapidly and is throwing up many new challenges, pushing us towards exceptions to our operating systems. For this reason, this RTE will extend its focus beyond the specific disaster response operational management and delivery systems issues and will be asked to examine the opportunities and challenges this crisis is putting before the IFRC's systems and support to National Societies. It will evaluate the following three areas:-

- i) the **relevance and effectiveness of delivery** of the International Federation's support to National Society responses to date in each country, with a focus on the overall relevance and effectiveness of the IFRC support provided in Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey, and with consideration of the delivery of the IFRC's mandate. Specific attention would be given to any particular successes or gaps in relation to the requirements, requested support and capacities of the Societies involved.
- ii) how the **Red Cross Red Crescent Movement has managed to coordinate and optimize its response**, including the use of information management tools and humanitarian diplomacy to explain the complexities of the RCRC's roles and to profile the work of the National Societies. The RTE will consider possible opportunities to optimize the support of the various Movement components in future and to look at effective platforms and channels for streamlined Movement coordination in future. It should be noted that the RTE will look at links to the ICRC's activities but will not pronounce on them. To this extent ICRC will be fully briefed on this RTE and will be encouraged to input into its findings.
- iii) the approach to **planning and strategising** for the various operations, including the use of contingency planning and identification of scenarios and opportunities for future response and recovery operations in each country. This would look at opportunities to enhance Federation and Movement wide planning, to improve our added value in each individual country response and in terms of an overall regional response strategy or "master plan" that considers both short-term and longer-term roles for the Secretariat, the wider Federation and the RCRC Movement.

The RTE team will meet with and interview key Red Cross Red Crescent stakeholders in both the National Societies and the relevant IFRC Secretariat and ICRC offices. The team will also consult with other partners and organizations such as governments, the UN, INGOs / NGOs as appropriate to the evaluation's objectives. The focus will not be specifically on discussions with beneficiaries however, where opportunities present the RTE team should take advantage of this in appropriate contexts.



Geographically, the scope of the evaluation will include the affected countries, with a focus on support to the National Society responses in Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey (although for Syria and Turkey it may be through desk reviews and phone / web based interviews depending on security and access issues to both countries). As the Iraq response operation is still very much in its genesis, assessments are ongoing and access is problematic, the RTE will exclude specific evaluation of the Iraq operation and will not visit Iraq. However, general observations, findings and recommendations for the operations in Syria and other neighbouring countries may be considered as relevant to the future Iraq operational context.

The RTE team will be briefed in Geneva and Beirut before starting and will also debrief in both locations. As well as being briefed by the Secretariat in both locations, they will also meet with ICRC for briefings.

The evaluation will cover the period from the outset of the Crisis (early 2011) until the time the evaluators collect the data.

4. Evaluation Objectives and Key Questions

The specific objectives and possible key questions to be addressed in this RTE are listed below, under the three areas outlined above. In addressing these issues, particular emphasis should be placed on considering the performance and delivery of the IFRC Secretariat support to the National Societies in the four countries, in relation to the specific environment and context and in relation to the wider RCRC Movement engagement and considering possible future scenarios, options and directions.

Please note that these are guiding questions and the RTE team are not limited to those below.

1. To what extent has the IFRC Secretariat support to the National Society response in each context been relevant and effective in its overall performance and delivery in this complex operating environment?

- a. How effectively have the IFRC's emergency appeals / plans responded to the needs in each country and to the requirements of the four National Societies. What flexibility has been needed in each context and how have these tools been able to respond to these demands? Were they used in a timely and appropriate manner?
- b. What successes and gaps can be identified in the response and are there ways these gaps could have been addressed or could be addressed in future? What steps have been taken to ensure the quality of the response and the support to the National Societies in each case?
- c. What synergies have been made between the country plans / appeals and a regional approach and how have the MENA and Europe Zones worked together so far in relation to this Crisis? How might an improved regional approach work in future and what steps might the National Societies and the two Zones take to build regional coordination?
- d. How relevant was the use of IFRC's surge tools in this context and how well have they contributed to the operations? Have there been any gaps or concerns regarding their use? And are there any recommendations for future deployments?
- e. What challenges were faced by the IFRC's resource mobilization, finance, HR and logistics systems in working in the different contexts, including where there was no IFRC Secretariat presence? Has resourcing been adequate and what could be done differently to improve visibility and resource mobilization in this politically sensitive environment?
- f. What systems have been used for monitoring, reporting, informational management and evaluation in these different National Society contexts and what can both the National Societies and the IFRC do to address issues or improve these systems. How has this worked where the IFRC has had no presence or is working on NS led response / appeal?



- 2. How effectively and efficiently has the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement managed to coordinate and optimize its response to this Crisis and how could Movement coordination channels and platforms be improved for the future response and recovery operations?**
 - a. Has there been clarity around “the lead agency” in each country and the division of roles and responsibilities between the National Societies, the IFRC and the ICRC?
 - b. How well has Movement coordination and cooperation functioned in each country and at a zonal or global level? What challenges have arisen or gaps identified and how could these be addressed to improve future coordination / cooperation?
 - c. How did partners perceive Movement coordination in each context and what key messages from them need to be considered by the various Movement partners? What recommendations would the RTE make to the IFRC to adapt its coordination approaches and functions?
 - d. In what ways did the IFRC Secretariat adapt its approach, role and tools to the Movement coordination challenges in each operating environment? How successful was this and where does the IFRC need to make further changes to its approach?
 - e. How has information management and sharing worked in the various contexts and at an overarching zonal level? What challenges and issues presented themselves and how could the IFRC Secretariat address these challenges and improve communication with partners?
 - f. What role has humanitarian diplomacy taken in this Crisis and what key messages have been identified / advocated? How could this role be strengthened in future and what should the IFRC look to as its HD priorities for the coming months?

- 3. What possible scenarios and contingency planning options should the National Societies and the IFRC be examining to prepare for the evolving Crisis and what future opportunities and directions should the IFRC pursue to deal with the evolving situation in each country and to provide a coherent regional approach?**
 - a. What contingency planning has taken place to date at country and regional level? How could this be strengthened?
 - b. Has contingency and scenario planning taken place with other Movement and non-Movement actors? And what recommendations would the RTE make regarding this?
 - c. Given an assessment of the evolving situation on the ground, the rapidly changing and increasing needs and the engagement of other actors, what key directions would the RTE recommend the IFRC Secretariat and the National Societies to consider for the immediate and longer-term future strategies?
 - d. Given the increasing regional approach of the UN and wider humanitarian system, what recommendations would the RTE make to improve NS to NS and IFRC coordination around a regional strategy for this Crisis? What opportunities are there for wider engagement with other humanitarian actors or other partners to strengthen our future approach at both country and regional levels?
 - e. What recovery actions have or are being considered (as contingency measures) and how could planning for these be strengthened in engagement with IFRC partners and their expertise?
 - f. What would be the humanitarian diplomacy messages and priorities to support the recommended future directions?

5. Evaluation Methodology & Process



The methodology will adhere to the draft [IFRC Framework for Evaluations](#)¹, with particular attention to the processes upholding the standards of how evaluations should be planned, managed, conducted, and utilized.

An **IFRC evaluation management team** will oversee the evaluation and, with the evaluators, ensure that it upholds the IFRC Management Policy for Evaluation. The evaluation management team will consist of three people not directly involved with the MENA operation; one of which is from the Secretariat Planning and Evaluation Department, the other two who have direct experience in emergency operations and assessments – one from the Zone and one from Programme Services Division.

The **evaluation team** will consist of three to four people: one an external evaluator and team leader, two representatives from PNS, and with the potential for an IFRC Secretariat support person if needed, who will also provide the interface with the Secretariat offices in each country and will help to clarify internal processes and approaches for the team. Ideally the team leader or one or two of the PNS representatives should have regional knowledge / experience and ideally all candidates should have some experience of the IFRC disaster response systems and operations. Although for functional reasons, ICRC will not be represented directly on the team, the RTE team members will coordinate closely with ICRC representatives in the complex response and will ensure their views are well reflected, particularly in regard to the Movement coordination and future scoping issues.

The external evaluator will provide an independent, objective perspective as well as technical experience on evaluations, and will be the primary author of the evaluation report. S/he should not have been involved or have a vested interest in the IFRC operation being evaluated, and will be hired through a transparent recruitment process, based on professional experience, competence, ethics and integrity for this evaluation.

The PNS / Secretariat evaluators will assist the external evaluator in the evaluation process, and will be able to provide perspectives on the RCRC actors and interactions in the operation. It is expected that this five person team will be able to conduct a reliable and informed evaluation of the emergency operation that has legitimacy and credibility with stakeholders.

The specific evaluation methodology will be detailed in close consultation between the RTE team and IFRC, but will draw upon the following primary methods:

1. **Desktop review** of operation background documents, relevant organizational background and history, including prior IFRC RTE evaluation reports, and any relevant sources of secondary data, such exist surveys from IFRC participants in the operation.
2. **Field visits/observations** to selected sites and to the Country / Regional offices.
3. **Key informant interviews** (institutional and beneficiaries as appropriate).
4. **Focus group discussions**, (institutional and beneficiaries as appropriate) as time and capacity allow.

The RTE team will look at the IFRC support to the National Society response operations in Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey. The team will therefore be briefed in Geneva and Beirut and will together visit the Zone office in Beirut, the Lebanese Red Cross and the Jordanian Red Crescent and Secretariat office in Amman. The team may then split with one group follow up on the desk engagement and phone / web interviews with SARC and the Secretariat Representation in Damascus and the other group following up with the Europe Zone office and with Turkish Red Crescent (with a field visit to Turkey agreement permitting). They will also meet with ICRC offices and representatives linked to each of the contexts being reviewed.

An initial draft report will be prepared for **review**. This review process should occur within 6 weeks of submitting the draft report to the evaluation management team, and will involve the following stakeholders in the following order:

- **Week 2-3 post review:** the evaluation management team to check content is in line with this TOR and IFRC evaluation standards. Stakeholders who participated in the evaluation to provide feedback

¹ <http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Publications/monitoring/IFRC-Framework-for-Evaluation.pdf>



on any inaccuracies or clarifications (differences of opinion should not be put forward here but outlined in the management response). Following this, a final draft is prepared

- **Week 4-6 post review:** an evaluation management response team (to be determined, but consisting of key relevant stakeholders from within the IFRC) will review the report and compile a management response to be included as an appendix to the final published RTE report.

The draft IFRC Real-time Evaluation Management Guide will be piloted for this RTE and that the report review process and development of management response will be undertaken as described in the draft guide, to be made available to the evaluation team.

6. Evaluation Deliverables

Inception Report – The inception report will be a scoping exercise for the RTE and will include the 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.

Debriefings / feedback to management at all levels – The team will report its preliminary findings to the IFRC in Beirut (Zone Office) and the team or team leader will debrief in Geneva, in a timely manner and will adhere to the above mentioned review process.

Draft report – A draft report, identifying key findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons for the current and future operation, will be submitted by the team leader within two weeks of the evaluation team's return from the field.

Final report – The final report will contain a short executive summary (no more than 1,000 words) and a main body of the report (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, 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, a list of those interviewed and any other relevant materials. The final RTE report will be submitted one week after receipt of the consolidated feedback from IFRC.

All products arising from this evaluation will be owned by the IFRC. The evaluators will not be allowed, without prior authorization in writing, to present any of the analytical results as his / her own work or to make use of the evaluation results for private publication purposes.

7. Evaluation Quality & Ethical Standards

The evaluators 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, is conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organizational learning and accountability. Therefore, the evaluation team should adhere to the evaluation standards and applicable practices outlined in the IFRC Management Policy for Evaluation.

The IFRC evaluation standards are:

1. **Utility:** Evaluations must be useful and used.
2. **Feasibility:** Evaluations must be realistic, diplomatic, and managed in a sensible, cost effective manner.
3. **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.



4. **Impartiality & Independence;** Evaluations should be impartial, providing a comprehensive and unbiased assessment that takes into account the views of all stakeholders.
5. **Transparency:** Evaluation activities should reflect an attitude of openness and transparency.
6. **Accuracy:** Evaluations should be technical accurate, providing sufficient information about the data collection, analysis, and interpretation methods so that its worth or merit can be determined.
7. **Participation:** Stakeholders should be consulted and meaningfully involved in the evaluation process when feasible and appropriate.
8. **Collaboration:** Collaboration between key operating partners in the evaluation process improves the legitimacy and utility of the evaluation.

It is also expected that the evaluation will respect the seven Fundamental Principles of the Red Cross and Red Crescent: 1) humanity, 2) impartiality, 3) neutrality, 4) independence, 5) voluntary service, 6) unity, and 7) universality. Further information can be obtained about these Principles at: www.ifrc.org/what/values/principles/index.asp

8. Qualifications

Selection of the external evaluation consultant will be based on the qualifications outlined below. The IFRC would also look for the two or three PNS team members to have a level of evaluation and disaster response experience, with at least one having ICRC experience:

1. Demonstrable experience in leading evaluations of humanitarian programs responding to major disasters, with specific experience in RTEs preferred;
2. Knowledge of strategic and operational management of humanitarian operations and proven ability to provide strategic recommendations to key stakeholders;
3. Strong analytical skills and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions, make recommendations and to prepare well-written reports in a timely manner;
4. Experience in qualitative data collection and data analysis techniques, especially in emergency operations;
5. Knowledge and experience working with the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement and knowledge of the IFRC's disaster management systems;
6. Demonstrated capacity to work both independently and as part of a team;
7. Excellent English writing and presentation skills in English, with relevant writing samples of similar evaluation reports.
8. Knowledge of the MENA region would be an advantage.
9. Minimum qualification of a master's degree or equivalent combination of education and relevant work experience.
10. Immediate availability for the period indicated.

9. Application Procedures

Interested candidates should submit their application material by 30 April 2013 to the following email: misgana.ghebreberhan@ifrc.org. Application material is non-returnable, and we thank you in advance for understanding that only short-listed candidates will be contacted for the next step in the application process.

Application materials should include:

1. **Curriculum Vitae (CV)**
2. **Cover letter** clearly summarizing your experience as it pertains to this RTE, your daily rate, and three professional references.



3. At least one example of an evaluation report most similar to that described in this TOR.