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1. Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Real Time Review, Syria Appeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>ELAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector:</td>
<td>Humanitarian (shelter, food,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hygiene, psychosocial, child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>friendly spaces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td>Lebanon and Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level:</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type:</td>
<td>Real Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach:</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience:</td>
<td>Focus: Partner and Tearfund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of</td>
<td>August – September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation/</td>
<td>Evaluator: Internal Catriona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review:</td>
<td>Dejean, Impact and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel Rigby, Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer-Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akram Amin, Country Representative – Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caroline Maxwell, Policy Officer and Advocacy Link for Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor(if</td>
<td>Tearfund Appeal funds and DEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applicable):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose of Evaluation:

Tearfund launched an appeal in February 2013 in response to the escalating situation in Syria. This was followed by a DEC appeal being launched in March 2013. A two year appeal strategy was developed (see Strategy section below) to deliver humanitarian assistance through locally based partners in both Lebanon, Jordan and with some response in Syria. In developing and coordinating its response to date, Tearfund has also coordinated its efforts along with other Integral Alliance members.

In August 2013, a real time review was commissioned and undertaken. The aim of the assignment was to assess the outworking of Tearfund’s strategy of response to the Syria Crisis so far, and to determine whether the strategy remains appropriate to the emergency context in order to inform the next phase of funding.

The key questions for the learning review were:
- Has the response been relevant to the humanitarian needs of the refugees and IDPs?
- Has the evolving nature of the crisis changed the humanitarian needs, or is it predicted to change those needs?
- Does our response need to change to meet the future humanitarian needs?

Key Insights:

The review was an opportune occasion to reflect on the wider strategy, organisational and programmatic practice. A number of interesting insights and lessons have been identified which
cover these areas and are relevant to this response as well as future events. The short term learning loops in this crisis are critical given the changing context, the nature of humanitarian assistance being different in middle income country contexts, and the complex faith dimensions in region. Rapid learning and reflection is critical to enable those working at the different levels, be it the strategy, organisational or programmatic levels to ensure effective and efficient responses. Key insights include learning from other similar protracted crisis; introducing innovation for monitoring and evaluation, addressing longer term as well as short term needs and understanding the risks associated with different operating models.

**Key Recommendations**

- Revision of strategy and consideration of different programmatic options
- Review and consolidation of the current partner portfolio
- Programmatic support for the organisations:
  - Learning opportunities and mechanisms for all partners to be facilitated by Tearfund.
  - Support required by partners from Tearfund in advocacy to help foster the relationships and working with
- Undertaking a power mapping exercise to understanding local actors and decision makers.
- Clearly defining roles and responsibilities of all staff working on the appeal in both the Country Team and HST. This
- New Programme Coordinator should have a good understanding of the regional issues, experience in humanitarian and development approaches where possible.
- Advocacy to be adequately resourced within Tearfund’s response strategy with sufficient capacity to respond
- Tearfund should explore and access institutional donor funding (where partner capacity allows) in collaboration and coordination with other Integral Alliance members for mutual partners.
- Tearfund to consider longer term funding (1 year+) to enable partners, in particular LSESD and Medair to plan for the medium to longer term.
- Strong coordination with Integral Alliance Members should be continued and should include joint funding proposals and coordination of staff secondments/recruitment where appropriate.
- Completion and updating of scoping documents for both Lebanon and Jordan.
- A programme monitoring plan and Gantt chart of all the partner activities
- Final agreed proposals should be completed.

**Review Criteria Rating** (Score 1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Coverage and Stakeholders</th>
<th>Connectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on DAC and Bond criteria
2. Introduction

2.1 Purpose
Tearfund launched an appeal in February 2013 in response to the escalating situation in Syria. This was followed by a DEC appeal being launched in March 2013. A two year appeal strategy was developed (see Strategy section below) to deliver humanitarian assistance through locally based partners in both Lebanon, Jordan and with some response in Syria. In developing and coordinating its response to date, Tearfund has also coordinated its efforts along with other Integral Alliance members.

In August 2013, a real time review was commissioned and undertaken. The aim of the assignment was to assess the outworking of Tearfund’s strategy of response to the Syria Crisis so far, and to determine whether the strategy remains appropriate to the emergency context in order to inform the next phase of funding. The real time review was undertaken 6 months into the appeal. A small internal team from Tearfund visited Lebanon and Jordan between 12-22nd August 2013. The team comprised of 4 people (Catriona Dejean, Impact and Evaluation Advisor; Rachel Rigby, Programme Officer-Syria; Akram Amin, Country Representative – Egypt; and Caroline Maxwell, Policy Officer and Advocacy Link for Syria).

The key questions for the learning review were:
- Has the response been relevant to the humanitarian needs of the refugees and IDPs?
- Has the evolving nature of the crisis changed the humanitarian needs, or is it predicted to change those needs?
- Does our response need to change to meet the future humanitarian needs?

This report sets out the key findings, lessons and recommendations for Tearfund as it revises its strategy for the next 18 months.

The key audience for this report is Tearfund staff working directly on the response and other key stakeholders who have provided support for the response. Relevant findings and feedback were shared with partners whilst in-country, with the opportunity for them to comment and also share with others. This report will also be shared with other Integral Alliance Members, partners and DEC as part of transparency and for additional learning.

3. Context Analysis

3.1 Background to the crisis and humanitarian need
The conflict in Syria has escalated since protests began in March 2011 inspired by the Arab Spring Revolutions in the southern city of Daraa calling for President Bashar al-Assad to resign after four decades of Assad family rule. The uprisings were met with military force; as protests spread across the country the fighting intensified and an estimated 100,000 people have been killed.
Over 2 million Syrians have fled and registered as refugees or applied for registration in neighbouring countries with greatest influx being between March and August 2013. According to the UN, there are now more than 714,000 Syrian refugees in Lebanon, 515,000 in Jordan, 459,207 in Turkey, 163,000 in Iraq, and 110,000 in Egypt. However these figures are only for registered refugees; the numbers could be much higher. For example in Lebanon it is estimated that by the end of 2013 there will 1.5m Syrians making up 25 per cent of the Lebanese population.

Such conditions compelled Tearfund to launch an appeal in February 2013 this was followed by a Disasters Emergency Committee (DEC) appeal in mid March 2013. The situation is very different to other crisis, where many refugees are hidden within the host countries, living with hosts, renting rooms or occupying abandoned buildings and shelters. There are registered camps within Jordan, Turkey and Iraq. (See below).

In Lebanon Tearfund has to date partnered with just one organisation:

- Lebanese Society For Educational and Social Development (LSESD) – working through a network of approximately 17 local Lebanese Baptist churches in Lebanon and the Fellowship of Middle East Evangelical Churches in Syria to deliver food parcels.

In Jordan Tearfund is responding through three partners:

- Jordanian Evangelical Committee for Relief and Development (JECRaD) – working through a national network of churches to deliver food and hygiene parcels
- Medair - an international humanitarian aid agency providing conditional cash-for rent assistance
- VHI (VHI) - a non for profit aid organisation focussing in the Middle East region. They are providing psycho-social trauma support for Syrian refugee children (VHI) and families through the running of a kindergarten.

Further details of the exact nature of the partners’ responses are outlined in Tearfund’s Appeal Strategy

Political unrest and challenges
The nature of this conflict is continually changing. Now in its third year the sectarian and political struggles have far reaching implications across the Middle East region and on how the international community responds. Below is an outline of the different factions involved and a summary of the latest activities both inside Syria and its neighbours.

As a result of the on-going civil war the Syrian National Coalition (SNC) - an alternative government was formed by the opposition umbrella group in March 2012. Representatives of this coalition were invited to take up Syria’s seat at the Arab League on 28 March 2013. The opposition coalition has been recognised as the "sole representative of the Syrian people" by several nations including the United States, United Kingdom and France. It is important to note that there is not one single unified opposition. In addition to the SNC there is the Free Syrian Army and the al-Nusra Front - the leader of the latter, Abu Mohammad al-Golani, recently pledged allegiance to al-Qaeda chief Ayman al-Zawahiri. The SNC and Free Syrian Army have sought to distance themselves from the al-Nusra ideology.

President Assad’s regime has been suspended from the Arab League and the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation. The regime continues to foster good relations with its traditional allies, Iran, China, and Russia, who are among the few countries which have supported the Syrian government in its conflict with the Syrian opposition. Between October 2011 and July 2012

---

2 Taken from UNHCR country dashboards 30th August 2013
Russia and China vetoed three proposed UN Security Council resolutions against the Syrian government. Both sides (regime and opposition) have been accused by the Human Rights Council of committing war crimes.

As the civil war enters its third year, there have been worries that the country could become fragmented and cease to function as a state. The opposition is dominated by Sunni Muslims, whereas the leading government figures are Alawites and of Shia Muslim background. Outside of Syria the political situation is tense with a new Lebanese Prime Minister and ongoing factions with Turkey and Jordan. The conflict is becoming increasingly sectarian and ethno-religious groups are being aligned with either the opposition or the regime.

The EU imposed an arms embargo in May 2011 to restrict supplies of weapons used to crush protests. However, the crackdown intensified and opposition supporters took up arms. As the conflict worsened, foreign powers began to help the new rebel groups. Western countries provided logistical support, while Gulf Arab states sent money for small arms. But the rebels did not gain the upper hand, as government forces had heavier weapons, supplied by Russia and Iran. In March 2013, the UK and France said they would seek to shift the military balance and urged the EU to review the arms embargo. This lead to the EU lifting the arms embargo in May 2013, however as yet no member state has supplied weapons directly to support the opposition.

Since June 2013 various events have taken place within Syria and the wider region, which has worsened the crisis, creating further challenges for the humanitarian response and adds pressure on the international community for a political solution to end the violence, these events include:
- regime gains Al-Quasir with help from Hezebollah;
- attacks in Lebanon, Hezebollah strongholds;
- unrest in Egypt;
- chemical attack inside Syria and impeding military response by western governments; and
- influx of Kurdish Syrian refugees into northern Iraq Kurdish Regional Governate.

The situation in Syria and the wider Middle East is therefore in constant flux, and is becoming increasingly volatile, complicated and complex, requiring constant review and monitoring so as to ensure the appropriate response.

**Poverty Conditions in Lebanon and Jordan**

On top of the increasingly dynamic humanitarian situation, the influx of refugees into both Lebanon and Jordan are changing the existing conditions of the countries. The humanitarian crisis is adding numerous layers of complexity on to already delicate home country situations (politically, socially, economically and environmentally) and starting to exacerbate tension between local host communities and the refugee communities.

Both Lebanon and Jordan are classified as Middle Income Countries with Lebanon at 72 in the HDI rankings and Jordan at 100 (out of 187), but internally they have some severe pockets of poverty and disparity between low and middle/upper income groups. Both countries have their own social, economic and religious problems and the influx of refugees is putting stress on the infrastructure, services and the social fabric of the countries.

---

3 For further details see the current country profiles:
Refugee Numbers
Data as per the UNHCR dashboard\(^4\) on 30\(^{th}\) August 2013\(^5\)

**Lebanon**
- The total number of persons of concern is now 714,069, with 603,850 having registered and 110,219 awaiting registration.
- The number registered equates to approximately 137,454 households.
- The total estimated Syrian population in Lebanon now currently stands at 1m. This government estimate includes Syrian workers and their families and other Syrians of means who have not registered with UNHCR.
- The total population of Lebanon is 4.26m (2011). Since March 2013 there has been a 296% increase in number of registered refugees in Lebanon; registered refugees now make up around 14% of the total population and estimated total Syrian population, 23% of the Lebanese population.

The Lebanese government will not allow formal refugee camps. Refugees in Lebanon are seeking shelter in existing buildings, apartments or informal tent communities, in urban and semi-urban areas, with the greatest concentration being in the Bekaa Valley (East) around Zahle area, and Tripoli (west), followed by Beirut. There is a higher mix of both Christian and Muslim refugees fleeing to Lebanon compared with Jordan. The demographics of the registered refugees are 49% male and 51% female, with the largest percentage falling within the 18-59 age group (20.8% males, and 23.9% female of total registered). Under 18’s make up 47.6% of the total males and 49.1% of total females. The percentage of registered refugees over 60 years is low (1.4% males, and 1.9% females). This largely reflects the population distribution of Syria with the largest percentage of the whole population between ages of 0-59 years (see Figure 1 below).

Figure 1: Syria Population Pyramid for 2010\(^6\)
Age and sex distribution for the year 2010:

![Syria Population Pyramid for 2010](http://www.nationmaster.com/country/sy-syria/Age_distribution)

**Jordan**
- The total number of persons of concern as 515,842, with 481,974 having registered and 33,868 awaiting registration.

---

\(^4\) UNCHR Dashboard as at 30\(^{th}\) August 2013- Lebanon and Jordan
\(^5\) These figures will change as the conflict continues and escalates.
\(^6\) [http://www.nationmaster.com/country/sy-syria/Age_distribution](http://www.nationmaster.com/country/sy-syria/Age_distribution)
The total estimated Syrian population in Jordan, however, now currently stands at
600,000. This government estimate includes Syrian workers and their families and
other Syrians of means who have not registered with UNHCR.

The total population of Jordan is 4.26m (2011).

The registered Syrian refugees now make up around 12% of the total population and
estimated total Syrian population, 14% of the Jordanian population.

The demographics of the registered refugees are 47.8% male and 52.2% female, with the
largest percentage falling within the 18-59 age group (19.2% males and 23.8% female of total
registered). Under 18’s make up 46.4% of the total males and 51.1% of total females. The
percentage of registered refugees over 60 years is low (1.4% males, and 1.1% females).
These demographics are similar to Lebanon. In Jordan, the majority of refugees however are
from Muslim origin and from southern parts of Syria including Daraa. Prior to the arrival of
Syrian refugees Jordan has also hosted those fleeing from violence in neighbouring Iraq,
Palestine and Lebanon. While the numbers of these groups are relatively stable the recent
arrival of Syrian refugees has put a strain on national resources. However the needs of the
protracted Iraqi situation and the new Syria emergency are greater than ever.

Za’atari Camp was the first refugee camp in Jordan, located 10 km east of Mafraq (Northern
Jordan). It is managed by the Jordanian Hashemite Charity Organization (JHCO) and hosts
around 122,496 refugees in Zaatari Camp. It should be noted that on a daily basis refugees
also leave Za’atari, either of their own free will or some are bailed out by local Jordanians. The
nature and conditions of these bail out arrangements is not known.

Approximately 355,763 refugees are dispersed across Jordan and 3,715 in the Zarqa.
The United Arab Emirates (UAE) is also jointly running the Emirates-Jordanian Camp (EJC) for
Syrian refugees, also known as Mreib Al Fhood (MAF), near Zarqa in Jordan. The camp
currently accommodates around 3,000 refugees, with more expected but anecdotal
evidence suggests that this camp favours more affluent refugees. A new camp, Azraq is
due to open September 2013. The refugee camp is being designed to provide refuge to
130,000 people, an estimated half of whom will be children.

The humanitarian context is complex and the needs great across both Lebanon and Jordan;
these are constantly changing as the conflict in Syria continues to escalate and international
pressure is stepped up. The constant influx of refugees is daily and with it the requirement for
the humanitarian community to respond to the new needs.

4. Tearfund’s Appeal Strategy

4.1 Strategic Objectives

In May, Tearfund’s appeal to date had reached £1.8 million and Tearfund’s allocation from
DEC was £362,831. Thirty percent of the DEC funds, £108,849, have to be spent in the first
six months i.e. by 30 September 2013. Tearfund’s aim is to spend 30% of total funds inside
Syria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL (Impact)</th>
<th>To meet humanitarian needs of peoples affected by the conflict in Syria – those internally displaced within Syria plus refugees and host communities in Jordan and Lebanon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSE</td>
<td>To respond to specific needs by working through local and international partner organisations. To support mobilisation and equipping of the local church and build capacity of partners as they respond to the crisis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 UNCHR Dashboard as at 30th August 2013- Jordan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME A</th>
<th>…Immediate needs addressed…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUTS</td>
<td>Humanitarian assistance such as food, NFIs, cash for rent and WASH facilities provided to affected populations. Capacity building and support for new and medium capacity partners to enable them to deliver more effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME B</th>
<th>…Recovery/Resilience supported…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUTS</td>
<td>Churches increased learning on scaling up intervention in communities where they are working. Other partners’ capacity and learning increased. Livelihood programming providing sustainable income for families. Psychosocial support, informal education and child-friendly spaces provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME C</th>
<th>….Advocacy leading to changed policies or practices….</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUTS</td>
<td>Speaking out against violence &amp; need for peaceful political transition. Collaborating with other agencies, signing joint positions and informing media statements or parliamentary briefings. International community continually reminded of humanitarian crisis. Partners supported in local and region based advocacy activities where applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME D</th>
<th>….Reconstruction/Reconciliation….</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUTS</td>
<td>Continued capacity building and mobilisation of local partners and churches. Strengthened sustainable livelihoods of affected populations. Should future context allow: support to affect population as they return home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expectation in the current strategy is that during the period of the appeal it will not be possible to reach the Reconstruction/Reconciliation stage nor to be able to engage in standard Recovery/Resilience activities due to uncertainty over the length of the crisis and inability of refugees to work in both Lebanon and Jordan. The strategy therefore states that there will be an emphasis on meeting the immediate needs (Outcome A), with contribution to Outcomes B and C where possible. Outcome D would only be possible if the situation significantly improves.

An operational response was not initially considered due to lack of funds and access to Syria. It is however not ruled out for the post conflict reconstruction phase or if there is guaranteed humanitarian access to Syria for INGOs.

An associated advocacy response was also drawn up at the same time, with an emphasis being to:

- *speak out for a non violent end to the civil war*; collaborating with other agencies and coalitions e.g. Crisis Action and the Bond Humanitarian Sub Group. This will be carried out within the half-day a week commitment from the Advocacy Link role in addition to keeping a watching brief on political announcements to inform the COG.
- *identify opportunities to support partners in country* with any local and region based advocacy activities. This will require additional capacity to deliver which can either be resourced by the role of a regional policy officer (UK or in-region based) and/or an advocacy visit to the region during the appeal strategy.

It was recognised that without presence inside Syria and with the limited capacity of partners in Lebanon and Jordan, Tearfund’s ability to proactively speak out on issues that are backed up with partner evidence will be minimal compared to other agencies. For a more sophisticated advocacy response Tearfund would require in-region expertise on the changing political dynamics so that it can speak out more proactively and independently with calls to action for the UK government, EU, UN etc. It was recognised at the time of writing (and updating the strategy in May 2013) that a more developed strategy may be required as the crisis develops.
4.2 Partners

There are currently four partners implementing projects funded by the Syria response. These are:

- Lebanese Society for Education and Social Development – LSESD (Lebanon)
- Jordanian Evangelical Committee for Relief and Development - JECRaD (Jordan)
- Medair (Jordan)
- VHI - VHI (Jordan)

Both Medair and LSESD have received DEC funding within the first 6 months of the response as well as Tearfund appeal funding. The other partners have only received Tearfund appeal funding. LSESD has also received funding from Tearfund Ireland. Partners were selected following a visit by Tearfund staff to the region in March 2013. Tearfund was not operational or working with partners in the region before the appeal and there was no additional criteria used for partner selection over and above that of Tearfund’s existing partner criteria. Partners were visited and recommended by others (eg LSESD were introduced by another Integral Alliance member); or previous relationships (eg JECRaD). Medair was approached directly by Tearfund as it was known that they were working in the area. All potential partners were visited, projects discussed and in most cases beneficiaries were visited before inviting proposals.

For Lebanon the decisions and process is outlined in the Lebanon Scoping Visit Report and Response Recommendations Syria Crisis Appeal, 2013. The equivalent Jordan document has not been reviewed during this review as it is pending completion.

There are plans to take on an additional partner in Lebanon, Jordan and Syria: Heart for Lebanon and discussions with Medair (Lebanon); Arab Women Today (Jordan); and CMA (Jordan and Syria). The appeal budget figures would indicate that commitments and decisions have already been made to fund Arab Women Today (£55k in year 2 and 3- total £110k) and Heart for Lebanon (£150k in year 2 and 3 – total £300k). Neither of these partners was visited during the evaluation visit so no assessment can be given of these partners’ potential capacity to deliver in the future.

Integral Alliance

In responding to crisis situations, Tearfund coordinates its efforts through the Integral Alliance of which it is a member. Integral is a global alliance of 18 Christian relief and development agencies, working together to present a more effective response to poverty worldwide. Integral Members work in 85 countries, across 30 sectors, resource more than 1100 projects and have a joint annual turnover of over US$350 million.

Integral members are committed to maintaining high quality in their work in accordance with internationally recognised standards which respect international law and humanitarian principles. Members are committed to ensuring that their work, and that of their Partners, fully upholds the standards and good practices of the global relief and development community as identified by the UN and sectoral coordinating bodies, as well as quality standards specific to the relief and development community of their own country. This includes upholding the Integral Quality Standards which are drawn from the Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief (RCCC); the HAP Standard in Humanitarian Accountability and Quality Management; and the SPHERE Project – Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response.

World Renew and Food for the Hungry are the other Integral Members who are currently providing support to partners in the region. World Renew is working closely with LSESD in Lebanon and Syria to access institutional funding and provide technical expertise where
required. Food for the Hungry has already provided technical support to Medair and is working with World Renew and Medair on developing institutional funding applications with US donors.

5. Real Time Review (RTR) Methodology

The real time review was carried out in line with the ToR (Annex 1). The following methods were used:

- Semi-structured key informant interviews with partner staff, Integral Alliance Members and Tearfund Staff (Country Representative, Programme officer, and Humanitarian Support Team)
- Visits to project sites
- Semi-structured informal interviews with affected families, other beneficiaries, and project volunteers.
- Review of selected project documentation and other external sources (including UNHCR)
- Feedback to partners (LSESD in Lebanon; and JECRaD, Medair and Vision Hope in Jordan)

The review schedule is attached at Annex 3 along with a list of interviewees at Annex 4. Evaluation questions based on the OECD/DAC perspectives defined in the ToR are set out at Annex 5; and a list of documents reviewed is at Annex 6.

Limitations

It should be noted that this review has focused on the programmatic sides of the response and not on the fundraising, marketing and media aspects as this was beyond the given scope and timeframe of the review. However the findings, lessons and recommendations in this report should inform these groups. It is recommended that a review of the fundraising, marketing and media elements of the strategy is conducted.

The review is a formative review and has taken place alongside implementation. The data in the report was correct at the time of writing, but changes may have subsequently occurred.

At the start of the appeal in February 2013 the original intentions for advocacy were low given that Tearfund had very limited presence in the region and was at the very early stages of working through partners. In April 2013 Caroline Maxwell, in capacity as the advocacy link person for Syria was asked by members of the COG to provide an advocacy proposal (not a strategy), with members of the COG recognising that the conflict was becoming increasingly high profile. The advocacy proposal - with clear asks, messages and activities - was accepted by the COG in May 2013. Feedback on how to ensure advocacy is adequate for the Syria appeal response, based on learning from previous appeals, was also shared during Tearfund’s Strategy Peer Review for Disaster Appeals meeting in May 2013.

However, given the scale and consequences of the conflict, it was recognised that a more developed strategy on advocacy may be required, with plans for a review within 6 months. The original brief for the RTR did not include advocacy, nonetheless the timing of the RTR coincided with the 6 month review of Tearfund’s advocacy response for Syria it was agreed to combine the two processes.

Since the Real Time Review (RTR) visit to Lebanon and Jordan in August 2013, and based on the evidence of the impact of advocacy actions achieved since the launch of the appeal this report provides some clear recommendations for an informed decision to be made on how to resource sufficient capacity to respond and where necessary scale up Tearfund’s advocacy response.
Projects Reviewed
All the partner projects funded by this appeal to date have been reviewed by the RTR team. Below is a short summary and overview of each of the projects reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project dates</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSESD</td>
<td>March 2013-November 2013 (9 months)</td>
<td>£248,000</td>
<td>The project sites in Lebanon are in Beirut and the Be’kaa Valley. Within Syria, LSESD are implementing the project through the Fellowship of Middle East Evangelical Churches (FMEEC). Within Lebanon, the food distributions are co-ordinated by a network of church volunteers.</td>
<td>Emergency Food Assistance</td>
<td>Distribution of food baskets once a month for 9 months. The baskets don’t contain the full SPHERE recommended 2,100 kcal rations, but contribute towards a balanced diet – approximately 50% of the recommended daily intake.</td>
<td>666 households (200 in Lebanon, 466 in Syria). The project works with unregistered refugees in Lebanon and IDPs in Syria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JECRaD</td>
<td>March 2013-August 2013 (6 months with possible 6 month extension)</td>
<td>£44,000 (appeal funds)</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>Emergency Food and NFI Assistance</td>
<td>Distribution of food and hygiene kits for families awaiting registration/re-registration by the UNHCR who are awaiting registration with UNHCR. The distribution is co-ordinated by local churches and works through local church volunteers. One food package which lasts 10 days (family of 5) and a 3 month hygiene kit is provided.</td>
<td>150 families each month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHI</td>
<td>April 2013 -</td>
<td>£38,000 (appeal funds)</td>
<td>Manshia, Mafraq Governate (northern Jordan)</td>
<td>Child friendly space and psychosocial support. Tearfund is providing funding of to VHI for a kindergarten with psycho-social trauma support for Syrian refugee children.</td>
<td>A kindergarten providing psycho-social trauma support for Syrian refugee children and basic education. Trauma counselling for children and parents.</td>
<td>100 children per day ages of 4-7 years; Syrian women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medair</td>
<td>March 2013 – October 2013</td>
<td>£300,000 (appeal funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 Non Food Items
### Location
Irbid, Mafraq, Zarqa, Jerash

### Focus
Cash for rent assistance (conditional)

### Activities
Provision of 3 months rent payments for refugees. Rent payments are made directly to landlords with payments being made in two installments. Legal assistance is available to families requiring it through Jordanian NGO ARDD - Legal Aid

### Beneficiaries
650 vulnerable families, a total of 3,250 people. Beneficiary households are Syrian refugee households and a small number of affected Jordanian host families.

#### 6. Key Findings

The following section sets out the key findings, and assessments for each of the seven perspectives set out in the ToR: Relevance, Effectiveness, Impact, Coverage and Stakeholders, Efficiency and Connectiveness. These have been reported separately but there is overlap and interconnections between the perspectives. In each section a rating (1-5) has been given as to how far the criteria is being achieved. This rating should be used as a guide and it should be recognised that as it is still early in the response that these will change as the context and partner portfolio changes. A score 1 indicates that there is poor contribution to the perspective, with 5 a strong contribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low or no visible contribution to the aspect</td>
<td>Some evidence of contribution to this aspect but significant improvement required</td>
<td>Evidence of satisfactory contribution to this aspect but requirement for continued improvement</td>
<td>Evidence of good contribution to this aspect with some areas for improvement and change</td>
<td>Evidence that the contribution is strong and/or exceeding that which was expected of the project/programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the scores are used as an indication and maker of progress and there is recognition that the perspectives covered are multi-faceted. The scores should be used for further dialogue and as a marker for future progress. Specific Actionable Recommendations are set out in Section 8 below based on the findings and assessments.

#### 6.1 Relevance

There was a degree of commonality in the issues observed in both Lebanon and Jordan in terms of the humanitarian emergency response. These issues have been identified and explained further below, however they are not prioritised in terms of importance. For some refugees paying for the rising rent costs and finding a job are mutual top concerns, while for other refugees finding a decent place to live and having access to health care for long-standing medical conditions or education for children are their key needs.

6.1.1. Shelter and rent

Decent accommodation was a key issue observed. In the case of Lebanon where there are no formal camps, accommodation ranges from refugees living in rented flats, apartments or setting up their own informal makeshift tents and camps. The team saw how this varied in Zahle, Be’kkaa Valley and in Beirut - the former a semi-rural area. Space was another key observation. Both in terms of what is available in the environment and within each home. Lebanon is a small

---

9 There is a government stipulation that all NGO projects should benefit at least 10% of the Jordanian population.

10 Based on DAC and Bond criteria
country so space is limited and some buildings are still in ruins following the civil wars. Most of
the homes visited were one or two roomed apartments, with the average family size of 8
people. This meant that conditions were very overcrowded, families felt isolated and trapped in
urban dwellings with no safe spaces for children to play.

While there are two official camps in Jordan for Syrian refugees more than two-thirds live
outside these camps in urban settings. When some families leave Za’atri they are given a tent,
blankets and a few supplies and end up setting up their own informal camps on land that they
do not own. The team visited one settlement, where the group had a large communal tent, which
they did their best to decorate and make homely. The residents were concerned about
the deteriorating conditions when winter arrives. Most of the other refugees visited lived in flats
and apartments either in the east of Amman, Jerash, Irbid or Mafraq. Again the quality and size
varied typically depending on the socio-economic status of the refugee. Nonetheless the
conditions of overcrowding and limited child friendly spaces were clearly evident.

The sense of hidden and isolated groups was apparent in both Lebanon and Jordan from the
refugees and partners who expressed how they had to seek out refugees to help.

The presence of a TV with or without a satellite dish was also a common feature in the majority
of homes. How the refugees obtained them was unclear; some may have brought them from
Syria but it seems for the majority they saved what little money they had to buy a second hand
TV. They found watching the TV a vital way to stay informed about the crisis in Syria and also
for the cartoons as a means to entertain and distract the children. In some ways the TVs, along
with mobile phones that the refugees had, reflected the changing nature of crisis in the 21st
century and the fact that this particular conflict has affected Syria, a middle income country.

Undoubtedly one of the biggest burdens for the refugees was keeping up with payments for the
rent, and the rising costs as landlords increased their rates. In both Lebanon and Jordan the
concerns were the same. Many refugees had moved from different flats when they could no
longer pay the rent. Without a regular income or salaried work refugees struggled to make ends
meet. It was unclear how some of them were able to contribute to the rent when they were only
receiving food aid. Access to jobs is almost impossible; only casual, sporadic, daily or hourly
rate work can be found. Few agencies including Medair are offering conditional cash for rent
aid. However one could assume that some refugees might be receiving some form of
additional, albeit minimal support through remittances from the diaspora community.

There were differences of opinions amongst the partners met as to whether paying rent was
adversely affecting rental prices, and therefore potentially an unhelpful way to offer assistance
to affected refugees. This is something it would be worth looking at further.

Analysis and evidence from Medair\textsuperscript{11} shows that unaccompanied women face difficulties to find
and retain accommodation. Families are living in overcrowded spaces or moving constantly due
to the need for low rental prices. The average shortfall between income and expenditure is 185
JOD per month (CARE, 2013). The monthly average rent in Irbid (northern Jordan) is 175 JOD,
160 JOD in Mafrak and 130 JOD in Zarqa (CARE, 2013). It should be noted that on top of rent
there may be also other utility bills to be paid, but these exact costs were not obtained. Some
beneficiaries said that these were covered with the rent. Among Medair beneficiaries the
average rent is 158 JOD per month.

Anecdotal evidence from the UNHCR shelter working group in Jordan states that “refugee
household savings are running out and coping mechanisms are decreasing. … this will lead to
an increase in people moving to managed formal camps and informal settlements, or resort to

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Taken from Medair presentation given to review team, August 2013}
negative coping mechanisms, which represent a greater threat to women and children”. Shelter WG Strategy, August, 2013. The group also notes that:

- the housing market is even more flooded and prices continue to fluctuate.
- UNHCR has reported a lack of funding and is unable to provide support to Syrian households already identified as vulnerable.
- INGOs are not allowed to distribute cash assistance until specific project is approved by local authorities.

6.1.2. Food and NFI

Access to food continues to be a key need for the refugees. This was evident from the interviews, observing refugees recommending new arrivals to register with the local church in Lebanon, and the evidence from the both LSESD and JECRaD on the increasing numbers of refugees coming to the churches.

Both LSESD and JECRaD are providing nutritional food aid packages to Syrian refugees (and hygiene kits in the case of JECRaD). These packages partly meet the SPHERE and UN criteria of nutritional value. Both LSESD and JECRaD do the distribution from church buildings within their networks. With JECRaD it was not clear how many distribution points there are; only one church was visited during the visit (Mahata in Amman). Most of the refugees we visited said that this was the only support they received, and with no jobs they could not buy their own food.

LSESD is piloting a food vouchers scheme in Tripoli, this is funded by a German donor. Rupen, LSESD’s Director has recently noticed signs of malnutrition in children and is monitoring the situation to assess what the most appropriate response should be (including change of food package items to improve nutritional content of the packages and prioritisation of most vulnerable families). The packages are currently designed to provide 50% of the kcals required by a family of 5; he recognises that this is not sufficient and families are struggling to supplement their food sources. At several of the refugee homes visited in both Lebanon and Jordan there was other sources of fresh food observed (bread and tomatoes). Families must therefore have money to buy additional food. The LSESD packages are distributed based on the UN vulnerability criteria and also used by the Danish Refugee Council. (See Photograph 1 below). These are distributed in durable plastic bags that have been branded with LSESD’s logo and which can be reused by the refugees. LSESD has done research into the costs of different packaging and labelling and they plan to use the bags in the future opposed to boxes which they started with; they are cheaper and multipurpose.

LSESD through FMEEC is distributing food packages in Syria. The distribution in Syria is remotely monitored by LSESD through the FMEEC office in Beirut and communication with the team in-country. However the true nature of the distribution in Syria is not known as no-one from FMEEC was available for discussion during the review, nor detailed monitoring data reviewed. LSESD’s director has a strong relationship with FMEEC and is keeping up to date with the situation in Syria.

---

12 Taken from Medair presentation given to review team, August 2013
In the case of JECRaD, 10-15 days’ worth of food is provided per household. The understanding is that this is provided only once, although in some case more than one package per household has been distributed. The exact vulnerability criteria for a household and to whom additional packages can be provided is not clear, and therefore should be monitored. The package includes rice, sugar, lentils, beans, crushed wheat, tea, tomato paste, pasta, cooking oil, sardines, tuna, luncheon meat, and corned beef. In addition to receiving the food, those refugees that have sign-up with JECRaD receive a hygiene pack which should last them 3 months. The kit includes shampoo, soap and detergent. (See Photographs 2 and 3 below).
VHI provides a fruit snack to the children attending the kindergarten. This is the only nutritional support they provide through the project and they have considered if there are options to provide more. Interestingly LSES D has also considered setting up ‘school’ feeding initiatives. These could be run along with the children's clubs/camps that some of the churches have started running to provide child friendly spaces for children, but not a formal educational provision. Both of these initiatives would be worth exploring further.

**Winterisation kits**

One area of concern raised by the partners and a selection of refugees is that of the pending winter and their lack of winterisation products. LSES D is exploring provision of winterisation kits (stoves, blankets, heaters etc) with another donor. JECRaD has undertaken some clothes distribution from the church which have been donated by church members, and with voluntary support to distribute them. Medair are also considering winterisation kits with other donors. VHI recognises this as a concern, but are not able to provide such equipment. One potential activity they are considering to run alongside the kindergarten is to replicate a knitting project which is being run in the area. This could provide a social group for women, allowing informal counselling and support mechanism for women whilst their children are in the classes, whilst at the same time allowing them to produce jumpers and blankets for their families and others for the winter. (See Impact section below).

**6.1.3. Access to health and educational services**

It was clear that the arrival of refugees is creating a strain on host government resources and services like health and education. In Lebanon healthcare costs are effectively subsidised by international agencies, but many refugees are still unable to cover the costs. Others are unaware of the available support, whilst such support is not available to unregistered UNHCR refugees. Several refugees families visited had family members with complicated health issues (tumours, diabetes, heart and visual problems). Several families had young men who had been injured in the conflict.

In terms of education many Lebanese schools are now overcrowded and space is limited for refugees. Anecdotal evidence from the trip was that the average class size was 40 pupils. Syrian refugee children face the language barrier as subjects in Lebanese schools are taught in English or French, rather than Arabic. For the refugees that do attend the local schools some have experienced bullying as tensions between refugees and host communities become strained. Similar experiences were shared in Jordan.

In Jordan, registered refugees are entitled to use the public health and educational services. However, the sheer volume of refugees has quickly led to strains on these resources. Despite this it was encouraging to meet some refugees who had benefitted from the healthcare available.

Refugees in Jordan reported lack of educational opportunities as a key need, and children had experienced clear discrimination in the school system. Classes are overcrowded and it is hard to find a place for a refugee child. There was anecdotal evidence of children being bullied by local children and teachers. Many families interviewed in both Lebanon and Jordan expressed their concerns and fears for their children’s future without access to education and developmental opportunities. Some families noted that there children had not been at school for an extended period (up to 3 years) since the on-set of the conflict in Syria.

**6.1.4. Employment and livelihoods**

One of the underlying factors that emerged when discussing the other key issues above was that of jobs and income generation. In both Lebanon and Jordan refugees do not have the right to work (ie regular income salaried jobs), in fact the refugees are perceived officially as ‘visitors’. There are some exceptions and instances where refugees can be employed for
casual or part-time work and legal aid agencies are best placed to advise refugees on their legal rights. There were some cases of informal employment. For example the owner of a factory in Amman, Jordan is providing some work opportunities for refugees who have set up makeshift camps on the factory owners land. However, there is risk that refugees can be sent back to Syria if found working and also the potential for the factories to be shut down if owners found employing refugees. There are also protection issues for refugees who do work and the potential for exploitation and abuse.

In Manshya, (Mafraq governate) the founder of the local Jordanian organisation that VHI is registered with has liaised with local authorities and has been permitted to employ Syrian refugee women as day labourer teachers in the pre-school offering psychosocial trauma care for children. The review team were informed that it is legal for them to be employed as casual day labourers and they do have a contract with each teacher. In Lebanon on visiting one community supported by Faith Baptist Church one woman had recently set up a small kiosk selling light refreshments to local workers in the area. The legality of this shop is not known. It seems in this case the community saved the little money they had to buy the drinks, biscuits etc from a wholesaler and then using the little space they had in their settlement to sell the goods. These examples appeared to be exceptions and there was not a clear and official process of gaining employment in order for refugee families to sustain themselves, yet there was a strong desire to be productive and generate income. The refugees visited were generally skilled and educated (teachers, machine workers, administrators). One young man had a t-shirt printing business in Syria but lost everything but still had a desire to work and had examples of his work with him and was proud to show them.

6.1.5. Tensions between hosts/national communities and the refugees
This observation underlined the other key issues identified above. Lebanon and Jordan continue to experience economic and political pressures and the arrival of hundreds of thousands of Syrian refugees, not to mention existing refugees from other neighbouring countries, has understandably caused tensions between the Syrian refugees and the Jordanians or Lebanese. Within this is the concern of the conditions for poor host communities. While the review trip did not extend to interviewing a significant number of hosts there were stories of tensions, and worries that poor local people’s needs were being neglected given the already fragile conditions of the host countries. In such a context the application of ‘do no harm’ principles are critical and need to be considered when planning.

Nonetheless it was clear that the church was working to try to bridge this gap. There were stories of local Jordanian and Lebanese churches being mobilised to get involved with relief work to help the refugees. It was encouraging to see how in some cases the community facilitators were foreigners themselves and indirectly acting as a mediator and bridge between communities. On the few visits and interviews with some local people involved with Tearfund partner projects their generosity and willingness to help was evident.

Within Jordan, INGOs are expected to deliver 10% of support to local Jordanians. This is built into the Medair proposal. This is not the case for JECRaD and VHI as their projects are either registered through the local church or a local organisation.

6.1.6. Assessment
As detailed above, the key priorities which beneficiaries themselves highlighted in both Lebanon and Jordan were: shelter; food; income generation; education and support for their children; winter products; and health. Tearfund’s response to date is to support food (LSESD, JECRaD), NFI (JECRaD), education and psychosocial support (VHI), and shelter assistance (Medair). No WASH activities, as per the strategy document, have been undertaken. WASH activities are difficult to implement except in the camp locations; the majority of people supported through Tearfund partners are not in camps but in private accommodation in urban spaces. Jordan does suffer from water shortages as a nation and the additional refugee burden
is exacerbating this situation. World Renew also commented on the challenges of getting funding from institutional donors for WASH activities.

In the Tearfund strategy document (updated May 2013) the key needs identified were food, shelter (including rent support), health, WASH, NFIs, education, and psychosocial support. LSESD, JECRaD and VHI are providing for those refugees that fall within the gaps of the UN systems and along with Medair, they are all supporting refugees within non-campus situations. This is an area of great concern and needing attention, as refugees are isolated and ‘hidden’. The UN stated in the Real Time Review (July 2013) that this was an area that needed to be addressed, along with facing into longer term issues and ensuring the immediate involvement of development actors so as to mitigate the impact of the refugee influx on host states and communities.13

The review visit confirms that the needs identified within the strategy document are still the same given the constant flow of refugees into the neighbouring countries with food and shelter predominating for new arrivals and those who have been in-country longer. The lack of and deterioration of own resources and coping mechanisms means it is difficult for refugees to sustain themselves and are dependent on external support where they can find it. The UN agencies and other NGOs and CBOs are struggling to respond to the increasing and deepening needs despite the numbers of agencies on the ground responding and the resource committed to date. The current resources however are not sufficient for the need; only 40% of the UN resources have been fully committed. The UN is struggling to provide for the initial six months of support and has cut this back to 3 months support. Consequently there are many refugees falling within the gaps and only receiving limited or no support.

A score of 4 is given for this aspect. Given the nature of the crisis, the partners are responding to the immediate needs and overall adapting their practice based on learning and analysis of the current situation. There is however room for improvement in particular in terms of medium term strategies and to enable focus on the most vulnerable (see sections 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4 below).

### 6.2 Effectiveness

#### 6.2.1 Tearfund’s Appeal Strategy

In the *Implementation timeframe & exit strategy* section of the Appeal Strategy, it states:

*If the conflict continues for the period of the appeal (2 years) the focus will remain on immediate needs. If the conflict is resolved within that period, recovery and reconstruction will then be considered.*

*If the conflict continues beyond the period of the appeal there are a number of options which can be considered e.g. closing and exiting; launching a second appeal; seeking institutional funding; transitioning to a HIAF, but these will need further discussion and approval, some at IG level.* (p7)

The Strategy also states that it would be unlikely that the response would move beyond Outcome A. It is true that the immediate humanitarian needs are great and that there needs to be a greater focus on these. However in light of the protracted nature of the crisis and the potential for negative consequences and repercussions as a result of trauma, lack of positive coping mechanisms and increasing tension with the host communities, it would be pertinent to
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start considering activities that move into Outcomes B-C. Legal advice around livelihoods and the possibility of microenterprise work could be sought. This observed evidence is also endorsed by the evidence and analysis of the UN in their real time evaluation\(^\text{14}\).

Figure 2 below sets out suggestions for focusing the strategy in the coming months for Tearfund and its partners. This was drawn up during the review visit, based on interviews, discussions, observations and the analysis from the UN real time review. It is recognised that resources are limited and that not all the areas can be covered, nor do partners have all the appropriate skills. Collaboration and referrals to other organisation is one option, thus a good understanding of who is operating, where and doing what would need to be mapped out. The need for exploring options with other Integral Members and coordinating future proposals is another option to allow for greater integration.

---

\(^{14}\) UNHCR Real time review July 2013
influencers. This is really important for local level advocacy work. World Vision’s Making Sense of Turbulent Context\(^{15}\) approach could be considered. Rupen at LSESD has experience of using this and is linked in with World Vision who is using the tool in the region.

![Well-being: multidimensional Model](http://www.wellbeingpathways.org/what-we-do/our-model-of-wellbeing)

**Figure 3: Applying well-being thinking to future phases of the appeal**

### 6.2.2 Appeal Spending

Tearfund is on track to spend 30% off the DEC funding within the first six months of the response. This has not been without challenges. Due to problems with Medair receiving local registration in Jordan, this resulted in implementation stopping and DEC funding was instead partially reallocated to cover some of the work of LSESD, with agreement from the DEC.

To date there has been a total of £3,140,785 raised for the two years of the appeal (2013-15). £2,665,353 from the Tearfund appeal and £475,432 from the DEC, 67% of the funding is to be spent on grants (£2,238,314). 19% of funding is planned to be spent on operations, direct staff costs, and other direct expenses.

As stated in the introduction the review was not able within the time period to undertake a review of the marketing and fundraising approaches. It would be advisable to consider undertaking a review of this in light of this review and to assess the effectiveness to raise funding for the appeal.

In the strategy the aim was to spend 30% of the total funds within Syria. An up to date financial report shared on 13\(^{th}\) September would indicate that to date the current total allocations over the period of the appeal (to 2015) would be 17% of the total spend being in Syria.\(^{16}\) The ability to spend in Syria is significantly hampered due to only one partner currently working there (LSESD through FMEEC); there are plans to fund CMA in Syria within year 2. CMA was not reviewed during the RTR as the agreement had not been confirmed. Access to respond in Syria is a common issue for all agencies working in the region and the true picture within Syria is not known given limited access and lack of hard evidence from inside the country. The ability to effectively operate is seriously hampered and the exact needs not known, along with


\(^{16}\) Financial update report shared 13\(^{th}\) September 2013 by Guy Calvert-Lee
challenges for monitoring and reporting. This will need to be considered as the strategy develops with the reality of being able to scale up operations in Syria through the existing partners carefully managed.

The main activities in Syria are being managed by LSESD with implementation through FMEEC in Syria. A detailed analysis of the work there was not possible as it was not possible to interview the team. LSESD is working with FMEEC to ensure there are suitable monitoring processes in place to track progress and ensure accountability. FMEEC does have office representation in Beirut and LSESD meets on a regular basis. LSESD’s Director did request a similar in-depth learning review be conducted with the Syrian team, as the time during the RTR did not allow for this, nor time to speak to or meet with the team from FMEEC.

As and when the situation in Syria allows more access, the spending in Syria may need to be reassessed in light of the humanitarian needs and capacity of FMEEC to respond and/or to consider an operational presence. However, the needs in Lebanon and Jordan will still remain high where responding is currently safer and feasible.

In the current Tearfund strategy it states “Institutional Donors – not pursuing currently but will keep all options open”. The conflict has moved on considerably and if Tearfund and its partners wish to effectively and efficiently respond to the needs consideration should be given to apply for institutional funding. This needs to be done however in a coordinated manner given the limited number of partners with current capacity to manage such grants. It would be good to consider how the coordination can be improved with discussions on integrated funding applications being made with World Renew and Food for the Hungry who are also working closely with both LSESD and Medair. For example Food for the Hungry and World Renew are pursuing USAID Food for Peace funding for both these partners. This would seek to reduce the burden on the partners and also leverage the comparative advantages of each organisation. It would also be good for Tearfund and the Integral Alliance Members to discuss resourcing staff and capacity to ensure such grants can be delivered effectively as well as supporting the partners in their own development and implementation.

During the visit, several beneficiaries talked about receiving support from family members in other countries, including Sweden and Kuwait. It is not clear as to how many Syrians live outside of Syria and how many are based in the UK. One area for Tearfund to explore is how to reach out to the Syrian Christian diaspora for support (financial and non-financial) and media stories.

### 6.2.3 Assessment

The Strategy’s key focus for Outcome A was on Immediate needs addressed with the key outputs being Humanitarian assistance such as food, NFIs, cash for rent and WASH facilities provided to affected populations; and Capacity building and support for new and medium capacity partners to enable them to deliver more effectively.

Outcome B was to focus on …Recovery/Resilience supported… with the key outputs being Churches increased learning on scaling up intervention in communities where they are working. Other partners’ capacity and learning increased. Livelihood programming providing sustainable income for families. Psychosocial support, informal education and child-friendly spaces provided.

There is evidence of the local church stepping up and responding (in particularly LSESD and JECRaD’s models) although the level of capacity and skills varies across their networks as new churches come on board and there is the requirement for on-going capacity building and support required for the churches.

---

17 Anecdotal evidence and sharing from the DEC Evaluators meeting (September 13th 2013)
Given the response is only within the first year of implementation it is not surprising that there has been less movement into the longer term recovery and resilience. The immediate focus has been on meeting the immediate needs and the strategy has been correct to focus on the humanitarian imperative. The ability to understand how effectively this has been achieved (and the impact to date, see below) is however significantly hampered by the sheer scale and complexity of the crisis.

While many refugees in Lebanon and Jordan expressed their hope and desire to return home in the near future, there seems little prospect of this for the majority. The DEC Real Time Review (September 2013) states:

*In Syria itself, particularly in the contested areas from which many have fled or are trapped, the situation remains highly volatile. This is due both to the conduct of hostilities between government and rebels (with the support of their respective external backers), and to the high levels of criminal activity that have erupted in the wake of the conflict. Given low levels of access and coverage by humanitarian agencies, the day-to-day humanitarian picture remains uncertain. Most agencies are able to report (if at all) only on their own immediate project areas; and it is hard to get a joined up picture of the humanitarian situation.*

There is a sense of the overwhelming situation and complexity which hampers a true picture of the achievement and effectiveness of the strategy to date. The current budget allocations are also small in comparison to the need. The current percentage allocations for grants and other direct costs (67% and 17% respectively) and indirect costs (programme and admin recoveries at 14%) would seem appropriate and should be maintained.

Challenges around partners being able to give more than 3-6 months support to affected families does reduce the overall effectiveness, as some of the basic needs have been supported, but even after this initial intervention, without the ability to build their own resilience and support, families remain vulnerable, whilst at the same time new families continue to leave Syria. Attention should be given to focusing on the humanitarian needs, but it is also an opportune time to reflect on the options for longer term support, balancing these with the immediate needs and move towards contributing to Outcome B (see Conclusion below). In light of the context and resource constraints a score of 3 has been given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of satisfactory contribution to this aspect but requirement for continued improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Impact

6.3.1 Partner Impact

Impact is a difficult perspective to assess this early into the response. As it is a protracted crisis, longer term changes are not evident. From a partner perspective, there is evidence that the majority of them are learning from previous experience and/or their current interventions to improve and adapt them to have the greatest impact.

LSESD is exploring and analysing whether food vouchers which they are delivering through a different donor, are more effective than food packages and allow people to buy more suitable and varied food products. There is early evidence of LSESD developing the interfaith dialogue and providing additional ‘value’ beyond just the food distribution (a listening point for refugees and the church being a sense of sanctuary and safe place to visit).
Medair is researching and assessing evidence from other agencies about the impact of unconditional cash distribution versus conditional cash (e.g., rent assistance) to assess whether this allows affected people to make their own decisions about how to use the cash and build their resilience. They are working with local churches including JECRaD to gain access to hidden groups and respond more holistically.

As stated above in the Relevance section, VHI is looking at how they could incorporate other activities alongside the kindergarten. One is to replicate a project that they have links with which trains women in knitting. This could provide a social group for women, allowing informal counselling and support mechanism for women when their children are in the classes, whilst at the same time allowing them to produce jumpers and blankets for their families and others for the winter. This could be a fairly low cost project, although issues around the running costs and possibility for generation of funds from the sale of products at low prices to other refugee families should be explored. This would be a project that would support women beyond the immediate physical needs and speak into the other domains as per the well-being star outlined above at Figure 3. This could also be an interesting and tangible project to present to a Key Investor.

The work that VHI is doing is very inspirational and is dynamic with clear evidence of them learning as they develop the model. They should be encouraged to capture the learning and critical success factors and consider developing a toolkit for other organisations interested in setting up a similar child-friendly space and psychosocial project. Documenting the ‘softer’ aspects such as skills, key actors and contextual factors are important as the model is dependent on interpersonal and personnel skills, motivation and connections. They are doing significant work to address the more holistic needs of refugees through developing interfaith dialogue with local Jordanians and refugees themselves. The kindergarten has been a place in which spiritual issues have been discussed in a non-threatening or coercive way to enable refugees to seek meaning and express themselves and deal with trauma. The VHI team has strong relationships with local Muslims including the leader of the local Jordanian organisation with whom they are partnering.

JECRaD are reaching out to groups that fall ‘within the gaps’ (see section 6.4 below) and like LSESD are providing additional ‘value’ beyond just the food and hygiene kit distributions. JECRaD have considered educational and child-friendly spaces for refugee children and developed a proposal. Discussions with them and experience from a similar initiative they ran during the Iraqi crisis, would however raise some concerns about the faith element of the school and the risks of this being misperceived and understood by people outside of the church. This is a potential risk to ensuring impartiality in the response and would have to be carefully considered and discussed before funding.

6.3.2 Assessment
The response is still in the early stages and the ability to assess impact is too soon. True impact is the collective contribution of many actors and is not often evident in the early stages of an intervention.

Progress has been made to date and the holistic approach and nature of the partners’ work contributes to the early signs of change. As one partner commented, they are ‘sowing seeds’ despite it being difficult for them to see the whole picture within the current context. The sheer tenacity and passion of the partners to make a difference is evident, along with the risks that they are going to distribute and support the immediate needs as well as longer term personal psychosocial support and hope. The context is difficult and the lack of hard evidence from partners and other agencies in the region make it difficult to get a true picture of any impact at this stage. However there are small seeds being sown to provide for longer term impact through the holistic nature and approaches of the partners.
A score of 3 has been given for this aspect but this is not a negative reflection on the partners work, but the challenges of the context and timing of this review.

| 3 | Evidence of satisfactory contribution to this aspect but requirement for continued improvement |

6.4 Coverage and Stakeholders

6.4.1 Beneficiary Reach
Tearfund's appeal in the first six to nine months was set to reach around 1,500-1,600 households (total of 8,000 beneficiaries18). The future numbers have not been set given it is a dynamic situation and existing partners will scale up operations and/or new partners will come on board as the situation and strategy is implemented.

Data shared by the Tearfund team indicates that to date approximately 1,050 individual beneficiaries in Lebanon, around 2,450 in Syria and 5,650 in Jordan have been reached.19 On the basis of 5 people per households this would work out to be 1,738 households. (Total beneficiaries = 8,690)

FMEEC in Syria would show that they are on track and have exceeded the beneficiary numbers agreed in the proposal (466 households). Actual numbers reached are 2,450 beneficiaries (approx 490 households).

LSESD in Lebanon are on track and have exceeded slightly the proposed amount of beneficiary households (200). They have actually reached a total of 1,050 (equal to 210 households).

Medair indicated that in Jordan in August they had reached the following beneficiaries20:
• 108 households (760 individuals) have benefited from rental assistance.
• 244 new households have been confirmed (identified as vulnerable, cross-checked with other agencies and full documentation has been collected 159 checks are ready for delivery).
• 107 new Households have been identified (pending cross-checked with other agencies – and in some cases follow up to confirm vulnerability). More cases are being collected.
• 459 households, identified, confirmed or served, total min. 504 (ensuring 146 vulnerable Jordanians are also served).

The total number planned and agreed for Medair is 3,900. However due to their registration difficulties this number has not been fully realised at time of writing.

JECRaD planned to reach 150 families each month (this would total be a total of 900 families 4,500 people). The actual number reached has been 900.

VHI planned to reach around 100 children per day over the course of the project. The actual figure is 500.

Achievement
The figures above show that LSESD in both Lebanon and Syria have exceeded the planned numbers of beneficiaries.

18 5 people per household
19 Data taken from IBIS and shared by Guy Calvert-Lee 13th September 2013
20 Presentation given on 20th August, Amman, Jordan by Medair team
For Jordan however there has been a slight shortfall in the numbers being reached as planned. The planned total was 8,900 for all partners in Jordan (JECRaD, Medair and VHI). The actual figure of 5,650 is significantly behind what was planned. This was predominantly in part to the note above about regarding Medair’s registration which hampered their implementation.

One observation is that there is a mixture of beneficiary numbers and household numbers used in the reports and in Tearfund’s data collection methods. Consistency as well as ensuring the household size is consistent is important. Of the refugees in Jordan it is not know if there is any double counting of beneficiaries between partners. However without a rigorous system such as the one Medair has in place to cross checking all their data with other agencies working within the same areas of intervention, it is not possible to ascertain if there is any double counting. Given the partners are largely operating in fairly different areas and providing different support the potential for double counting is lower.

6.4.2 Cost per beneficiary
If a crude analysis of cost per beneficiary is undertaken based on the proposed beneficiary reach for the project value the following is evident for each organisation. It should be noted that caution is taken with these figures as other factors do need to be considered when assessing the figures (context, delivery model, difference in direct and indirect costs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Total Budget21 (committed to date)</th>
<th>Cost per beneficiary to date (based on total budget- direct and indirect costs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSESD</td>
<td>£156,465</td>
<td>£149 (based on 1,050 beneficiaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMEEC</td>
<td>£143,534</td>
<td>£58.59 (based on 2,450 beneficiaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JECRaD</td>
<td>£41,186</td>
<td>£45.76 (based on 900 beneficiaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHI</td>
<td>£38,032</td>
<td>£76.06 (based on 500 beneficiaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medair</td>
<td>£495,702</td>
<td>£127.10 (based on 3,900 beneficiaries)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These crude figures do show the differences in the projects and it is important to consider what is provided for these services and included in the costs. In the case of Medair this includes costs for a highly skilled expat and local staff team, alongside the rent assistance and legal support being provided. LSESD is also covering some staff costs, and the food packages being provided are for 50% of the recommended nutritional requirements. They have been looking into ways to reduce costs through the use of different packaging for distribution. JECRaD runs a low cost model with a mixture of paid and volunteer staff. Their operational model is also lower cost with the food and hygiene kits being purchased through a local supplier and requiring minimal transportation and packaging. VHI also runs a low cost model, with donations being received and employing volunteers and paid staff. Fruit purchased for the children is through a local supplier. FMEEC works through local church networks and has a mixture of paid and volunteer staff. The exact nature of the model is not known as this was not explored during the visit.

A cost per beneficiary calculation should however not be taken as the only deciding factor for assessing partners as there are other added values which are need to be taken into consideration.

6.4.3 Conditionality and Beneficiary targeting
It is not entirely clear that aid given by LSESD and JECRaD is unconditional; in this context it is with regard to Christian messaging and sharing and how closely these are intertwined with distributions. There needs to be a tightening of systems and continuous monitoring and dialogue.

21 Taken from August 2013 data shared by Guy Calvert Lee
In terms of beneficiary targeting LSESD as an organisation it is clear that external standards are understood and sought to be applied across its network. (Danish Refugee Council, UNHCR). However observations from the visit raised concerns about whether criteria are being consistently applied across the church network. Given there are 17 churches within the network, the consistency in application of the criteria is not clear and this is an area that should be monitored. For example the Church of Christ in Beirut shared a needs assessment form they used which has their own subjective assessment for assessing need. Need is categorised on 3 levels with the highest level being those given priority. There was however some concern that on this form, it asks the refugees if they would like to hear about the Gospel during distribution.

With JECRaD it is not clear whether there is an understanding of standards such as the Red Cross Code of Conduct, and the lines between aid and evangelism activities at times appears to be blurred. JECRaD are providing support to families which are awaiting registration (new arrivals with a yellow card) or re-registering (6 months plus). Within that it is understood that there are no further criteria for prioritisation of refugees. There is also potential concern over the cost of transportation required to go and collect food parcels from the JECRaD distribution. From the visit it was understood that distribution is only taking place from one place in Amman, but the proposal and intention is to work through its network. Greater clarity and on-going monitoring of the situation is required.

Medair are working with other agencies in the UN Coordination system to apply agreed vulnerability criteria and are part of the Shelter sector working group who are working on the development of these.

The criteria used by VHI is not clear, but is based on an open access basis for families in the area as far as capacity of the kindergarten allows. It would be good for this to be clearly articulated. They have experienced an increasing demand for the services and would like to be able to expand this where possible.

6.4.4 Protection of vulnerable groups

Across all the refugee households that were visited it is interesting to note that the team met 5 children/young people within the families with Down’s Syndrome. Given the limited sample of people we visited, this seemed fairly significant and it would be interesting to know if Syria has a higher than average rate of Down’s Syndrome. Anecdotal evidence from a peer evaluator working with Handicap International would indicate that they have seen data showing potentially higher rates of genetical disorders in the Syrian population (this evidence has not been verified). It is interesting to note this from the perspective of consideration and protection of vulnerable groups in future interventions. In all cases, the children/young people sat in on the interviews and it appeared that they were not being ignored by their families. One family in particular were concerned about their son who has some other serious health complications. People with physical disabilities were not noted during the visits, but this is not to say they were not present in the places of habitation.

Three households visited in Jordan had elderly family members who had serious health issues and required medical treatment. One of these elderly members had received health care during her time in Jordan.

6.4.5 Protection of children and young people

An area of concern coming out of the beneficiary visits, the UN report and discussions with partners is the potential exploitation and abuse of children and young people. The team heard general feedback directly from the beneficiaries and the partners about the horrific situations that many children have been exposed to in Syria, and the trauma that is manifesting as a result (the details of stories were not shared nor did the team delve where issues were sensitive). Several families in Jordan shared about the treatment of their children by local

---

22 Anecdotal evidence and sharing from the DEC Evaluators meeting (September 13th 2013)
children – they had been stoned in the streets; where children had been able to go to school they had been bullied by both children and teachers and therefore had not returned.

During the discussions with VHI it was evident that there is no child protection policy in place for the kindergarten and they were encouraged by the team to develop one and ensure all staff and visitors are aware of it to ensure protection for children first and foremost (and staff, volunteers and visitors). Records are kept of all children’s names and there are tight regulations and conditions on photographing of children and staff. VHI does however have a child protection policy at the international organisational level. A local level policy adapted from this for the kindergarten should however be developed.

As families start to become desperate and current coping mechanisms are stretched, there is the potential for children and young girls to be abused or exploited. The team did not witness any signs of physical abuse, although this would have been difficult in the limited time spent with families. (This was also not the remit of the team and they are not experts in this field so were sensitive to asking questions which would have required follow-up). One family visited in Beirut did present their 16 year old daughter who had recently got married to another refugee man in the same area; they stated she would be well protected and looked after. The girl herself was very sad and withdrawn and did not answer any of the team’s questions about her hopes for the future, unlike her siblings who said they wanted to return to school. This was the only case the team observed.

The UN’s real time review points to concerns and evidence of early marriage and child exploitation. An IRIN report23 also confirms this and says that some Syrian refugees arriving in Jordan are opting to marry off their daughters at a young age believing that marital status offers a form of protection and insurance. The legal age of marriage in Jordan for example is 18; informal marriages therefore will illegally performed by religious leaders and this means the girls have no rights in the event of disputes or problems. Another critical issues it poses are child birth and health issues for the young girls: "Early marriage can have severe risks for girls including health risks. Early pregnancy is more likely to lead to birth complications and sometimes even prevent girls from having children later in life," said Samir Badran of UNICEF.

The current situation and status of early marriage does need to be balanced with the fact that early marriage was a socially and legally accepted practice in Syria prior to the conflict with girls often being married as early as 13 years old. According to a UN Women assessment focusing on early marriages among Syrian refugees in Jordan and which was According to a UN Women assessment focusing on early marriages among Syrian refugees in Jordan and which was published in July 2013, social customs and family “honour” still appear to be the main motivation behind Syrians marrying off their daughters when still children – factors which appear to be more significant than their current economic deprivation and poverty.24 The concerns that have been expressed in various on-line news articles however is the exploitation by local men and a potential acceleration of the practice as families seek to protect their daughters against exploitation25. One family the team visited in Jordan did give some anecdotal evidence that there had been an attempt by a local man to take one of their young daughters from the family whilst she was outside playing. This has increased the family’s fear of going out. This fear of going out or too far from their shelter, especially amongst women was expressed by all the affected households visited.

Young men are also vulnerable and at risk of exploitation and/or exploiting others. A father visited in Beirut expressed concerns and fears about his 18 year old son being found and taken

25 https://www.google.co.uk/?gws_rd=cr&ei=zSE8UvKKB0Wi0wWTroDoDQ#q=early+marriage+in+syria
back to fight in the war. He was concerned for his son’s future as he was not able to work or do anything meaningful and was living in fear. Another young student in Jordan expressed his concerns over having to leave his university studies and is fearful of his future as he has no opportunity to continue his studies in Jordan and pursue his career and dreams.

There is a clear sense that there could be a ‘lost generation’ as educational and child development opportunities have been removed, and children and young people are affected by traumatic experiences affecting their normal functioning and emotional and physical well-being.

The observed, anecdotal and secondary evidence points to an area that should be monitored and consideration given to whether there is a role for churches/partners to play in identify and referring cases. The provision of training and support to partners on what and how to deal with such cases should be considered. The preferred option would be for this to be delivered by local trainers with relevant technical expertise, Arabic language and local knowledge. The counsellors working with VHI could be well placed to provide advice on how to address such issues and recommend people in their network who could provide training and support. VHI were keen to consider how to support refugees themselves to contact the national referral system that has been set up in Jordan for cases of abuse.

There were also concerns over the protection of refugees who were able to access some form of employment – typically informal, casual day labourer work. Anecdotal evidence was shared of factory owners recruiting desperate refugees only to make them work long, unsociable hours with very little or guarantee of payment. Often children are chosen to work as they are considered cheap labour but often at risk to abuse and neglect (this was also picked up by Aneeta’s visit to Jordan).

6.4.6 Beneficiary Feedback
The consistency of the beneficiary feedback mechanism with LSESD is not clear, especially given they operate through 17 churches. The church visited in Zahle did talk about providing a time for beneficiaries to come and talk with the volunteers so that they can ask questions and the church can understand the needs. It is not clear how this is or if it is undertaken in the other churches in Lebanon and Syria.

There was no evidence that JECRaD have a formalised beneficiary accountability or complaints mechanism in place. There is a strong oral culture in both Lebanon and Jordan meaning that evidence and feedback is often verbal. An example from JECRaD is that they believe the content of the box to be what Syrians eat and want, but another comment indicated refugees sell the contents. There is no other evidence collected to verify either statement.

Medair has a telephone feedback and complaints mechanism in place. VHI do not have a mechanism in place but were interested to learn from Medair’s systems.

6.4.7 Assessment
Despite the complexity of the situation the strategy has reached the target number and provided basic support for refugees. The response is quite disparate across the 3 countries, with 4 partners (currently) working in multiple locations within each country. The question of coverage and focus should be asked for the next stage of the strategy.

A score of 3 has been given for this aspect as overall there is evidence of contribution to this aspect.
contribution to this aspect but requirement for continued improvement

6.5 Efficiency

6.5.1 Partners
In addition to observing the humanitarian response 'on the ground' the review team also observed the opportunities and challenges that its four partners face in Lebanon and Jordan:

- Sustainability of the response - working in a protracted crisis combining relief with longer term development interventions, current numbers and scale of refugee situation, and future expansion plans (see sections 6.1 and 6.2 above)
- Partner capacity - surge capacity requirements, additional support to establish robust M&E systems, the possibility of easing administrative burdens by using mobile applications and real-time data collection methods (see below)
- Advocacy potential - using advocacy as a ‘force multiplier’ in the response, direct communication with partners on the ground, working in coalitions, power-analysis mapping to identify targets, allies and messaging at different levels ie local, national, regional and international.

Monitoring and measurement
Monitoring in Syria is an area of challenge and potential that was expressed by LSESD. (World Renew also made reference to this). LSESD does have strong links with the FMEEC team in Syria and in Beirut. There is also a potential risk that if the church and its members were to leave Syria, then this would have implications for the delivery of the assistance. It would therefore be good for them to consider a risk management and mitigation plan to protect against this.

LSESD is also intentional about data collection, but their data is also currently collected manually and they have a lot of data awaiting input and analysis. They have employed an Information Officer to input and analyse the data. Rupen also expressed an interest in a real-time solution to collect data and this could also be of benefit for monitoring in Syria. With respect to LSESD’s appeal funding it would be helpful for Tearfund to get a clear picture of where the appeal funding is allocated exactly. During the visit the team were told that it was not possible to identify exactly which churches were funded by the appeal. There is an accountability system which can track numbers of churches funded per donor, but this does not track which church.

Medair has an M&E plan in place which it is actively implementing. This includes data collection, monitoring, cross-checking and verification with UNHCR and other agencies in place. Data collection and input is currently undertaken manually and they have 2 dedicated staff members in Amman with these responsibilities. Medair is completing a livelihoods assessment to understand the current context. The potential to develop digital applications for data collection in the field through mobiles/tablets was one which the team would be interested to explore. They see the value of this for their project and improving efficiency. Medair have developed a good household visit report which should be shared across our partners to help them begin to monitor in the same way.

VHI are starting to implement educational needs assessments and are keen to measure the change and outcomes of their project as per their original proposal. They have strong intentions to develop this area of work and could benefit from support from Tearfund to do so.

JECRaD do keep beneficiary registration lists, although data on age and sex are not collected, despite this being requested on the form. This data is collected at point of distribution and is stored as paper copies. There was no evidence of this data being analysed nor of any
monitoring and evaluation system in place to monitor the effectiveness of the work. This ties in with a lack of a beneficiary feedback mechanism (see section 6.4.6 above) to enable feedback and complaints to be collected and analysed.

**Financial monitoring**
All the partners would appear to have financial management systems in place and appropriate audit trails, appropriate to the size of their organisations. An in depth analysis of their financial systems were not undertaken, but records and electronic systems were observed for assurance.

All the partners have processes and records in place with their relevant suppliers in-country. However given the oral culture of both Jordan and Lebanon for LSESD, and JECRaD there was a stronger emphasis on verbal contracts and the team were not able to see any written agreements with suppliers. The system is based on relationship and trust and both organisations expressed a good relationships. They did not seem concerned at the lack of a written contract. From an audit perspective it would be good to encourage a written statement, but it was not clear from discussions if this would be counter cultural and would undermine the relationships they currently have. It would be worth exploring this issue further with all partners for audit and accountability purposes.

**Dependency on one partner in Lebanon**
A critical issue that Tearfund needs to consider is dependence on just one partner in Lebanon, LSESD, which is also being funded and supported by World Renew. There is concern about the ability of LSESD to handle additional institutional funding on its current organisational model. Staffing should be written into any new proposals. LSESD has the desire to scale up and apply for DFID and other EU funds. They are also planning other institutional funding with World Renew and Food for the Hungry. However, Tearfund needs to be mindful of the current capacity and not to overburden the organisation. Staffing should be written into future proposal or surge capacity provided by Tearfund and/or other Integral Alliance Members. Rupen, did acknowledge that there is a large amount of work but was confident of being able to manage it and recruiting staff to help. The staffing options however appeared to be of a temporary, voluntary nature, potentially from missions backgrounds to work with the churches. Longer term options should be explored to ensure the organisation is as efficient as it can be to manage and implement projects.

6.5.2 **Tearfund**

**Coordination and staffing**
There was feedback from an Integral Alliance member and also from a partner about confusion over the key contact point within Tearfund and the overall coordination. JECRaD also expressed some frustration over the many questions asked and often sometimes more than once by different people. In the early months of the response Integral Alliance members expressed some frustration and challenges about knowing who to contact in Tearfund and how to contact them. Different Tearfund staff members were also engaged in different calls and it was often felt that the same ground was covered in each meeting. The urgency of responding to requests for calls has also been low and a challenge, and the Integral Alliance member said this was very different compared with their relationship to another member where they could contact the senior leader within 48 hours to follow-up and there was a clear line of communication and decision making. There was a sense that the bureaucratic nature and structure of Tearfund inhibited the response in the early months. Improvements to the communication and coordination have however been noted following a face-to-face meeting with Dave Bainbridge and Oenone Chadburn at Tearfund. A partner representative also mentioned the challenges of communication with Tearfund, and expressed their confusion over multiple Tearfund people contacting them. The partner did accept there had been a lot of change within his own organisation which was an inhibitor to the relationship; Tearfund has
shared the current changes in staff and agreed to communicate any future changes with partners.

Concerns over coordination and roles and responsibilities between the Country Team and HST, were also expressed by Tearfund staff members, in particular concerns over a lack of urgency in response and follow-up, and lack of clarity over roles and responsibilities. It was recognised that the restructure in the International Group may have led to confusion or lack of clarity on roles as well as staff members getting up to speed with humanitarian response approaches and requirements; this was the first time the organisation has had to respond to a humanitarian crisis under this new structure and in an area where there is no existing HIAF/Country Strategy. Key staff involved has also had different perceptions of what was required and varying levels of humanitarian experience. Other staff commented on the fact that they felt the CRICOMs should be more frequent with greater clarity on their purpose, who should attend, the intended outcomes of the meeting and to ensure the changing context was being monitored and key issues communicated and acted upon, where relevant, by COG/CRICOM members.

In the next phases of the appeal, it is therefore critical that the key roles and responsibilities are clearly articulated and shared internally and with other Integral Alliance Members and partners. The recruitment of a new Programme Coordinator in region is a critical step and they will also have to ensure that they are leading on the coordination both in the region with partners, and beyond that with the Integral Alliance members, donors, UN and others in Tearfund in the UK. Up-skilling of key staff on humanitarian processes and approaches is also critical as well as how to integrate and balance the longer term recovery.

**Capacity and technical support**

In the March strategy document, Tearfund proposed a short term IPO secondment and possible Emergency Risk Register and/or LIAS advisor and/or other to be deployed to support partners in the early phases of the appeal. From discussions with World Renew and Food for the Hungry they have also offered and/or to date provided technical support to partners that Tearfund is working with (LSESD and Medair – Food for the Hungry has seconded a livelihoods specialist to help with a recent three week livelihoods assessment). From the review visit and meetings with partners, there are identified needs and gaps that seconded personnel could provide to the partners. If Tearfund does pursue this then it is recommended that they do so in close discussion with the other Integral Alliance members so that there is no duplication of resources and capacity support can be best provided to partners. Any seconded personnel would also have to work with and report into the new Tearfund Programme Coordinator.

**Project Management**

During this review it has been difficult to assess quickly the progress of the appeal without reviewing each individual project proposal and budget and reports. In some cases a final proposal (without comments) has not been completed, but instead changes to scope or others elements of the project are in email trails. For audit purposes it will be important for emails agreeing changes are included in the T drive with the other project documentation.

**6.5.3 Assessment**

As the strategy is still in the early phases of implementation with many new partners who Tearfund has not previously partnered with, an overall score of 3 for this aspect is reasonable as there is evidence of some change but with some clear areas for future improvements.

A score of 3 has been given for this aspect as overall there is evidence of contribution to this aspect.
6.6 Connectiveness

6.6.1 Partners

All the partners are connected to local, national and international networks. Some of these are formal (e.g., UNHCR mechanisms, church networks) or other informal networks (e.g., local stakeholders, suppliers and other faith leaders).

**LSES**
- Good local relationships and efforts to build and leverage these. A mixture of one-to-one relationships and some interagency working.
- Their network of 17 churches provides them with a good reach and local capacity to understand local context and needs. This includes reach and access to Syria through FMEEC.

**JECEFA**
- Links with the national network of churches
- Attending UN sector coordination meetings

**Medair**
- Attending UN sector coordination meeting
- Sharing of databases with other agencies
- A good understanding of context and ongoing monitoring for changes

**VHI**
- Establishing good local connections and relationships with local municipality and key actors
- Identifying and working with relevant educational and counselling experts in Amman to develop the curriculum and their model

6.6.2 Tearfund

To date Tearfund has not had any representation at the UN coordination groups in the region. Of all the partners visited only Medair and JECEFA said that they were actively participating in the relevant UN working groups with Jordan. Within Lebanon, LSES said that the UN cluster system was not working in Lebanon. This should be revisited as the UN refers to sector groups and it would be good for there to be representation on these.26 There is a capacity issue as with a small team it is difficult to attend regular meetings. The new Tearfund Programme Coordinator should provide this capacity to attend meetings and ensure that partners are meeting the standards and criteria that are being agreed across the coordination groups. An issue raised by the UN in their review was that of agencies not within the UN system operating to their own standards and outside those of the coordination groups which had led to conflict and difficulties. Anecdotal evidence was shared by the partners in Jordan of the negative impact of a Korean church group in the camps.

It will be important for Tearfund to consider how the Programme Coordinator will also feed into the UK staff who will have to take the lead on coordination and networking with the key UK actors and donors (DEC, DFID and others where appropriate). This role needs to be clearly defined and the on-ground and regional intelligence needs to be fed into and informing the
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26 It was not possible to meet with UN representatives during the visit.
advocacy messaging. A dedicated advocacy staff member would enable consistency and for them to be involved with advocacy networks engaged on Syria, including Open Doors and Middle East Concern.

6.6.3 Assessment
The level of engagement and interaction at the local levels in Lebanon and Jordan should be encouraged. These networks should be encouraged and continued on the projects as they move forward. Coordination and connection with others actors however should be strengthened by Tearfund at the international levels and local levels where capacity allows.

**LSESD** should be encouraged to build on their interfaith dialogue experience and start advocating to those in positions of influence to bring about change at the local and national levels e.g. through local Sheikhs, other church denominations and other faith leaders. It would also be good for them to encourage pastors learning from each other through regional/local/national hubs/learning opportunities. LSESD is keen to develop the church to church capacity building and mentoring and does have plans for bringing church leaders together.

**JECRaD** should continue to attend UNHCR coordination meetings and to adapt their responses according to the criteria and standard approaches that are being developed.

**Medair** should also continue to attend UNHCR coordination meetings and to adapt their response according to new and agreed criteria and standard approaches. Exploring and leveraging connections with actors outside of the UNHCR network to gain access to new areas e.g. the local church networks and learning from VHI on interfaith dialogue.

**VHI** should be encouraged to explore the UN referral system to be able to directly refer beneficiaries for support related to protection.

**Tearfund**
In the future phases of the appeal, Tearfund should continue to explore and strengthen its efforts for coordinated response action with other Integral Alliances. Tearfund brings its own comparative advantages in terms of its expertise in disaster management, resilience and advocacy that can contribute to those of the other members (World Renew and Food for the Hungry in particular).

There is evidence of some good coordination on the ground by partners but with room for improvement between Tearfund and also by Tearfund itself with other networks. An overall rating of 3 has therefore been given.

| 3 |
| Evidence of satisfactory contribution to this aspect but requirement for continued improvement |

7. Conclusions

Overall, it can be concluded that Tearfund’s partners are performing essential roles in Lebanon, Jordan and Syria to provide immediate humanitarian relief and meet the basic needs of the affected people. LSES, FMEEC, JECRaD and VHI are in particular working within the gaps of the UN system and are able to mobilise local faith communities to respond. They are also demonstrating signs of providing beyond the immediate basic needs to consider the holistic needs of the affected people (trauma support, providing meaning and sense within the context, extending compassion and love, and demonstrating their own faith within the situation). Medair is working through the established UN system and is engaging to ensure that aid is delivered to
the best quality in the given context. Given their organisational structure and regional resource they do have the capacity to scale up quicker and expand and adapt their existing interventions.

The ratings for each of the perspectives in this report are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Coverage and Stakeholders</th>
<th>Connectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These scores should be viewed in light of the dynamic context and that it is still early into the appeal. These scores represent overall a satisfactory response in light of the internal and external challenges faced. Anecdotal evidence from other agencies would indicate the frustrations and challenges of responding in the current context, with lack or poor hard evidence about the situation in Syria and surrounding countries, as well as the lack of an enabling environment to assist in dealing with longer term issues and providing better support (eg work opportunities, education and health).

There is however some key issues which have been identified and will need to be considered in the next stages of the appeal:

- the urgency of response. There was a time delay in length of time taken to scale up the projects and internally their could have been greater urgency to respond;
- a lack of preparedness and standing capacity of partners to deal with the scale and enormity of such a crisis which in turn has contributed to point a (this has been common across all the DEC members);
- the limited coverage and understanding of the real situation in Syria and the potential risk that the ‘church’ itself and those within the FMEEC network may leave due to insecurity;

It is well worth Tearfund developing and assessing different options for the next stages of the strategy in order to contribute to the complexity of needs. The following options are posed for further discussion and debate by the wider Tearfund team in the planning of the next phases of the strategy; there may be other options which the team wish to consider.

Programmatic Options

**Option A**: focus to be given to responding to the humanitarian needs with attention being given to continue support for shelter, food, winterisation and limited trauma support. This could continue with the existing and proposed partner portfolio, across Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria.

**Option B**: focus to be given to responding to the humanitarian needs with attention being given to continue support for shelter, food, winterisation and limited education and trauma support over a longer period of time. This could continue with a reduced number of higher capacity partners and focusing attention on geographically targeted areas where there is currently limited other agency support. This could be supported with advocacy activities (see below).

**Option C**: Focus on providing integrated support through a smaller number of partners to collaborate and/or develop a holistic model for delivery where access to shelter, food, education, trauma and some livelihoods (where feasible) support can be provided to the most vulnerable families in clearly targeted areas. This could be supported with advocacy activities (see below).

---

27 Anecdotal evidence and feedback from ALNAP/DEC evaluators learning day 13th September 2013.
28 DEC Real Time Review Draft Report September 2013
Option A is more or less 'business as usual' with some additional winterisation activities. Business as usual is reaching people, but it is considered that there could be greater efficiency and effectiveness through the choice of partner portfolio and the coverage of interventions.

Option B would allow for some scaling up of other activities including winterisation, education and trauma support but through a selected number of higher capacity partners within a focused area. This would enable reaching more beneficiaries at a greater scale and with more sustained support to be given.

Option C presents a more radical approach with attention and resource being required for longer term interventions as well as the short term response. This approach would seek to address issues of impact and may prepare people for the long haul and future return.

The conflict is within its third year. Anecdotal evidence and the current statistics and outlook for Syria would indicate that this crisis will last for the next 7-10 years. Whilst it would be good to explore livelihood options to support refugees over the longer term and seek to give them social protection, the ability and likelihood to do this is currently limited. Such work is unlikely to be possible without changes at the national levels and acceptance and legal right of Syrian refugees to work in the host countries. However options should be explored where legally valid to seek ways to support refugees to generate income and also provide them with some purpose and meaningful activity which would in turn support the mental and emotional well-being of refugees.

There may be other potential options, but the ones suggested above are for further discussion and dialogue by the team. The decision on the options to be taken needs to be carefully taken in light of partner capacity, desire to work in different ways, available resource and the potential to work in new ways. As the UN confirms in their real time review, emergency response in middle income countries is expensive and complex. Difficult decisions need to be undertaken and prioritization is paramount. Community based approaches that favour a large amount of people need to be prioritized over individual responses in many sectors (p21).

In the UN’s summary (p2) key points which should resonate with Tearfund are:
The growing number and needs of the refugees, however, as well as the serious pressures they are placing on host communities, now require UNHCR and its partners to complement their emergency response activities with comprehensive and proactive strategies that focus on: (a) more extensive and effective outreach to out-of-camp refugees; (d) ensuring the immediate involvement of development actors so as to mitigate the impact of the refugee influx on host states.

New ways of approaching the crisis are required as this is not like any previous crisis. Point 33 of the UN Report states: There is a growing recognition that traditional humanitarian responses will not be sufficient to address this crisis. While the Refugee Response Plan 5 (RRP5) began to incorporate support to host communities and local authorities in the refugee response, a far more substantial and coherent strategy is needed. In this respect, the involvement of development actors, financial institutions, donor states and the private sector will be crucial.(p6)

Advocacy Considerations
The power and role of advocacy should be carefully considered as advocacy activities in collaboration with other agencies will have the potential to bring change to create enabling environments to protect Syrian refugees displaced in Lebanon and Jordan. A detailed rationale

29 Anecdotal evidence and feedback from ALNAP/DEC evaluators learning day 13th September 2013.
30 UNHCR Real Time Review - Crisp, et. al., 2013, p.21
It is interesting in this regard to note the final conclusion of the DEC Real Time Review:

In the conflict over the Former Yugoslavia in the 1990s, agencies tended to mis-characterise the humanitarian picture as being essentially about access for aid delivery. While relief assistance is essential, it can be no substitute for effective measures to allow families to find safety, including the option of seeking asylum. It is too late for the more than 100,000 already thought to have been killed in Syria, but the lives of many more are at risk. Only a minority of those at risk can flee Syria or would want to – the most critical issues of protection and assistance therefore remain inside Syria itself. But unless conditions in neighbouring countries are such as to allow those fleeing conflict to find a viable place of refuge, many of those currently at risk will have their best chance of safety closed to them. This will require a major effort of international solidarity and donor support to the hosting countries, the burden on which is immense and unsustainable. Concerted advocacy by DEC members, based on their field-level experience, could make a significant contribution to making this happen.

Six months into the Syria appeal it has become clear that the advocacy response within the strategy needs to be updated and better reflect changing nature of the crisis, specifically because:

- Conditions inside Syria are worsening, safety and protection for aid workers becoming even greater concern.
- UK Government approach very anti-regime but lacks a viable alternative to resolve the fighting.
- International community including NGOs struggling to cope with current levels of need as rate and scale of crisis intensifies
- Ultimately political resolution is required otherwise humanitarian response is undermined
- Syria will remain a ‘hot topic’ – Tearfund’s advocacy response needs to adapt, be better prepared for when Syria peaks in the political and news agendas, with sufficient capacity to respond and scale up resources for advocacy
- Tearfund’s current advocacy link capacity is now overstretched, in order to build on the progress made thus far a decision is required on how to resource a role for advocacy

**What can Tearfund do to develop its advocacy approach? What specific role can Tearfund play in advocacy?**

- Policy analysis of the humanitarian challenges\(^3\) - highlight these to UK government (Jordanian and Lebanese govts when applicable), use the analysis to develop stronger policy lines, messages and advocacy asks based on partner and beneficiary needs
- Power/stakeholder mapping of key decision makers in UK/international, opportunities to influence eg Cabinet Office Syria Implementation Unit; regional/in country local faith leaders, Jordan Ministry of Planning and International Coordination (MOPIC), Lebanese government, church and interfaith networks
- Speak into the complexity of the crisis, voicing concern over potential power vacuum if change in Syrian regime, the need for a peaceful, democratic and representative governing body. Also highlight conditions on the ground in Lebanon and Jordan, children without education, limited access to health care, families struggling to make ends meet
- Highlight to decision makers role of local churches in responding to the crisis, interfaith dialogues in restoring peace, alleviating tensions between hosts and refugees

---

\(^3\) This was also a recommendation in the DEC’s evaluation report of all members response to the crisis citing ‘a lack of concerted policy analysis and advocacy, particularly on protection issues’ of agencies
Support inter agency advocacy calls for action ie Crisis Action, but contributing Tearfund’s own developed messages and communicate value of faith communities in the humanitarian response

**Why should Tearfund invest in advocacy?**

- Without speaking into and influencing the political space Tearfund’s response to the humanitarian crisis will not be as impactful as it could be. The evidence of how previous advocacy actions have helped to strengthen the response thus far reinforces the fact that Tearfund has a significant role to play in advocacy
- Speak out for justice using Tearfund’s position as a faith-based humanitarian organisation to advocate for change in difficult situations on behalf of partners and beneficiaries, and bring this distinctiveness to joint agency advocacy initiatives
- Influence to strengthen humanitarian response and ultimately speak out for a peaceful and political resolution. Although there are other active agencies it is clear that there is strength in numbers for joint advocacy as each organisation has an area of expertise that adds value in advocacy initiatives. For Tearfund it is highlighting role of faith communities/local churches within the humanitarian response and opportunities for interfaith networks in alleviating suffering for refugees and IDPs
- Accountability with partners, beneficiaries, supporters and allies eg World Evangelical Alliance to actively engage in political dialogue bringing its Christian distinctiveness in calling for change

**Overview of the main advocacy issues that the partners have helped to identify during RTR visit**

- Strengthen the immediate humanitarian response - active Tearfund presence in UN coordination or other humanitarian agency cluster meetings and feeding issues/reinforcing messages to other decision makers/advocacy forums. Key issues such as NGO project approval challenges, gaps in humanitarian response, livelihood needs of refugees, funding and capacity opportunities
- Inter-faith dialogues - although the church has limited presence in Lebanon and Jordan it still has power to influence particularly through inter-faith initiatives while still maintaining Christian distinctiveness
- Peaceful end to crisis - strong concerns that the West lacks understanding of the region, culture and implications of the conflict. Partners recognise the role of advocacy, and Tearfund specifically, to speak into these debates, advise caution on military responses and keep attention on the humanitarian crisis. Beneficiaries hope to return to Syria/family links remain in Syria (opportunity to strengthen advocacy for humanitarian access)
- Livelihoods - clear awareness of the protracted nature of the crisis and longer term needs of refugees such as education, health, employment to pay for rent and support families. Even if partner projects are unable to meet these needs it does not mean Tearfund should de-prioritise or stop reminding the international community of these needs and offer recommendations

**Overview of what will be needed in terms of time / budget / people to make this happen**

The current advocacy link support has worked above and beyond allocated capacity and the evidence of the impacts from advocacy actions to date speaks volumes of what can be delivered. Nonetheless 6 months into the appeal this level of support cannot be sustained particularly as crisis becomes more complex. Options to consider for resourcing the advocacy response include:

---

32 Depending on which option is decided for further review a more detailed action plan/job description can be developed
A. Regional advocacy officer - fixed term full time contract UK or region based. The lead person directly undertaking activities to develop and implement Tearfund Syria Advocacy Strategy including research, lobby national networks, government and other key decision makers and linking and coordinating with existing NGO and faith networks, coordinate the involvement of partners to inform and where applicable implement the strategy, provides support to partners when necessary, work closely with Programme Coordinator and Comms Officer to ensure joined approach to Tearfund’s response. Liaises at all levels within and outside the organisation in relation to advocacy initiatives relating to Syrian refugees (particularly with the Lebanese and Jordanian government, local faith networks, donors and other NGOs) in relation to Tearfund Syria Advocacy Strategy.

B. Seconded advocacy officer - scale up of advocacy link capacity to a (part time) advocacy officer role of 3 days a week, UK based with travel to region when needed. Lead person on policy analysis, research and messaging with strong liaison with staff members located in the region ie Programme Coordinator and Comms Officer so that advocacy messaging is informed by partners. Focus on international and UK advocacy targets, work with other agencies and networks to engage in joint activities, representing Tearfund in advocacy meetings and using evidence-based policy lines to influence decision makers. The role will not be able to lead on or support partners in-country/region advocacy initiatives.

C. Humanitarian policy officer - not limited to Syria response but providing surge capacity when required for developing policy messages and attending advocacy meetings when required. Further discussions required with Head of HST.

D. Advocacy link - half a day a week maximum of capacity to allow support for joint-agency advocacy initiatives only, and informing the CRICOM of topline political developments. The role will not have capacity for in depth policy analysis or developing Tearfund’s own policy positions.

Within the Tearfund Syria appeal budget there is £15k allocated for Year 2 (April 2013 - March 2014) and then another £15k for Year 3 (April 2014 - March 2015).

It is recommended that given the timely need for an increase in advocacy for the Syria response, option A or B is most advisable in order for Tearfund’s approach to be in a better position to adapt to the changing nature of the crisis and scale up capacity when required. Although the advocacy link person can advise and make suggestions, the decision on resourcing must be made, agreed and owned by the Syria response team and respected by all CRICOM members - recognising the limitations of the role for whatever option is decided.

Discussions would be necessary with Head/Deputy of ELAC and Director of AMG/Head of Policy on the budget and how to effectively resource advocacy for the response based on the desired option. If Option C is decided then Head of HST should also be consulted.

Section 9 below sets out the specific recommended actions based on all the findings and conclusions set out above.

8. Key lessons

---

33 This is an option beyond the scope of advocacy for the Syria response and is being considered as part of the AMG strategic work stream on advocacy support for the IG.
• Complex context requiring hybrid relief and longer term approaches. A very different context and crisis in which it is not possible to just replicate the responses common to Africa and Asia. Middle income countries and urban/semi-urban areas that are receiving and hosting refugees.
• Interfaith dialogue and working. United front in helping those in need.
• The church as a local civil society organisation does have a critical role to play in providing space, speaking out, connecting other actors and providing a bank of volunteers to support and provide expertise.
• To learn from other protracted crises (eg Sudan, Bosnia and Kosovo) about how to do effective advocacy at the local, national and international levels and humanitarian programmatic response over a longer period of time.
• Volunteers are resources for the projects that have supported the success of implementation to date. However, there is no such thing as pure volunteering. There will also still be power dynamics within the local church which need to be carefully monitored. Consideration of formalising the volunteer positions. However the church as a local civil society organisation does have a critical role to play.
• Observations and feedback from beneficiaries is critical, but this needs to be assessed carefully. Eg do we have a true picture of the resources that refugees have? How many are receiving remittances from outside Jordan?
• Organisational capacity building is an on-going process throughout implementation where there are identified areas of need (eg project management and monitoring and evaluation).
• At what point will the current coping mechanisms be so stretched that there will be an increased manifestation of negative outcomes? The need for psychosocial support is evident. Are we at a critical point in the response where there is a need for a more holistic approach and provision of services such as trauma and psychosocial care which can support the refugees in the longer term and for a potential move back to Syria?
• Risk of putting all support into one organisation and key individuals.
• Given the protracted nature of the crisis Tearfund needs to continually monitor and have open discussion with partners to ensure that key partner staff is not burning out and can access suitable support.
• LSESD are starting voucher systems for food in the Tripoli and Beirut areas – evidence and learning from the analysis will be important prior to shifting any focus from direct food to vouchers.
• Medair are looking at unconditional cash – evidence and learning from their analysis should inform Tearfund’s decision on what to fund.
• Potential for use of mobile applications for monitoring and data collection such as POIMAPPER was enthusiastically received in particular by LSESD and Medair and could significantly reduce the administrative burden of inputting data and free up time to analyse that data instead and visit beneficiaries.
• With both LSESD and JECRaD it would be good to introduce basic household surveys eg how do we know that the beneficiaries have the equipment required to cook the food provided?
• In both Jordan and Lebanon where refugees from the same Syrian communities had been reconnected and were living together (either in temporary camps or accommodation) it made a huge positive difference to their sense of wellbeing.
• Protection issues came to light a lot on the visits - how should Tearfund equip their partners to spot issues and refer refugees to other organisations who are working in such areas/able to refer them to the national systems?
• Advocacy is a huge need - both at the local level and the national and international levels.
• Medair have developed a good household visit report which should be shared across our partners to help them begin to monitor in the same way.
• VHI have a lot of learning on inter-faith working and empowering women that should be shared with the other partners.
9. Specific Actionable Recommendations

The following specific actionable recommendations set out those required to be undertaken by Tearfund. The recommendations are to be discussed with the team, comments made and appropriate actions and timelines discussed.

Recommendations were made to partners and shared with them directly during the visit. This evidence has been used to set out the following recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Tearfund</th>
<th>Tearfund Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible (who)</th>
<th>By when</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Revision of strategy and consideration of programmatic options including:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option A:</strong> focus to be given to responding to the humanitarian needs with attention being given to continue support for shelter, food, winterisation and limited trauma support. This could continue with the existing and proposed partner portfolio, across Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option B:</strong> focus to be given to responding to the humanitarian needs with attention being given to continue support for shelter, food, winterisation and limited education and trauma support over a longer period of time. This could continue with a <strong>reduced number of higher capacity partners</strong> and focusing attention on geographically targeted areas where there is</td>
<td>In addition to immediate humanitarian needs, such as those listed, which will remain the primary focus of the strategy, we would like to give consideration to supporting some medium and longer term needs. These are essential for recovery and resilience, such as the provision of child friendly spaces and education. The VHI kindergarten project is an example of such work already being supported.</td>
<td>The strategy will be revised to reflect Option D.</td>
<td>Deputy Geo-Head ELAC / DRM</td>
<td>30 Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Tearfund</th>
<th>Tearfund Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible (who)</th>
<th>By when</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>currently limited other agency support.</strong> This could be supported with advocacy activities (see below)</td>
<td>shape of our response.</td>
<td>We will send copies of the revised strategy to IA and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>Deputy Geo-Head ELAC / DRM</td>
<td>30 Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option C:</strong> Focus on providing integrated support through a smaller number of partners to collaborate and/or develop a holistic model for delivery where access to shelter, food, education, trauma and some livelihoods (where feasible) support can be provided to the most vulnerable families in clearly targeted areas. This could be supported with advocacy activities (see below).</td>
<td>We do see merit in assessing whether we could work more collaboratively in specific geographical target areas, and will explore this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other options can be put forward and discussed.</td>
<td>We don’t agree that we should reduce the number of partners. We feel that there is more merit in increasing our partner portfolio by two or three partners. This would help to reduce our reliance on an individual partner (such as LSES D in Lebanon), and could increase the number of beneficiaries they can reach, as well as broadening the sectors and type of programming that they are working in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The revised strategy needs to be communicated and shared with other key internal stakeholders (Media and Communications and supporter facing teams), Integral Alliance Members and partners where appropriate. A communication momentum needs to be regained stating how Tearfund is responding to the escalation of the conflict and adjusting its response accordingly.</td>
<td>Therefore we propose an <strong>Option D</strong> : to expand our partner base, continue our focus on addressing immediate needs, but consider some medium and long term programming, and explore the opportunities for collaborative projects in particular geographical areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Tearfund</td>
<td>Tearfund Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible (who)</td>
<td>By when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Creative Communications Teams will work together to continue to raise awareness of the crisis and our response. This will include the recruitment of a Communications Officer to be based in the region.</td>
<td>Partners and projects will be assessed on the basis of their ability to outwork our strategy to an acceptable standard in accordance with IPMS. Proposals are pending or expected from LSESD, FMEEC, H4L, AWT, JECRaD and VHI. New partnerships will be assessed for the value they add to the current portfolio. AWT’s partnership application will be finalised and a decision made.</td>
<td>DH ELAC and DRM.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Review and consolidation of the current partner portfolio. To ensure effectiveness and efficiency, consideration should be given to scaling-up partners with the technical capacity and systems in place, who have a strong understanding of humanitarian response and where they can contribute to a longer term strategy: <strong>Jordan:</strong> Medair and VHI <strong>Lebanon:</strong> LSESD and to consider developing a new partnership with Medair.</td>
<td>We will continue to review and monitor the opportunities provided by various partners and their capacities to respond to the crisis. We have conducted a recent scoping exercise of potential partners to see if we missed any obvious opportunities for partnership with high capacity local partners, but we have concluded that there are not any really good opportunities that we were unaware of. IPMS requires us to assess projects on a number of technical and strategic issues, including quality standards and the extent to which projects contribute towards transformation and integrate with the local church. We will seek to develop a portfolio that adequately meets those requirements. We have recently entered into partnership with Heart For Lebanon which helps to diversify our options in Lebanon, and are actively exploring partnership with Arab Women Today in Jordan. AWT has Bob Hansford is planning two workshops in November to review Tearfund’s Quality</td>
<td>DH ELAC</td>
<td><strong>31 Oct 2013</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRM</td>
<td><strong>30 Nov 2013</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Tearfund</td>
<td>Tearfund Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible (who)</td>
<td>By when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependent on option chosen (point 1)</td>
<td>expertise in working with women and so can potentially build our capacity in the area of protection. We believe these partnerships will help to broaden our coverage and to address some medium and longer term needs.</td>
<td>Standards.</td>
<td>PEA</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We will review JECRaD’s pending request and ensure that the risks are commensurate with the relatively small grant being requested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The challenge of ensuring impartiality whilst at the same time empowering churches to engage in integral mission is not straightforward. We would like to develop Tearfund’s learning around this issue, and to that end we are considering recruiting a consultant to explore how best to promote integral mission in a humanitarian context, especially in countries where Christianity is a minority religion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We do recognise that our partners would benefit from additional technical support, especially regarding targeting and accountability and we are actively exploring opportunities to recruit regional-based staff to oversee our programme and build the capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Programmatic support for the organisations: LSESD, VHI and JECRaD</td>
<td>We do recognise that our partners would benefit from additional technical support, especially regarding targeting and accountability and we are actively exploring opportunities to recruit regional-based staff to oversee our programme and build the capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure organisation have clearly defined criteria and Tearfund should monitor the application of beneficiary targeting criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Tearfund</td>
<td>Tearfund Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible (who)</td>
<td>By when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Medair and LSESD**  
To investigate option to fund mobile data collection and monitoring systems and work with them to set this up. Development of a proposal for the Partnership Team to fund. |  
One of the roles we plan to recruit is a Programme Effectiveness Adviser who will work with our partners to identify areas, especially those relevant to Tearfund’s Quality Standards, where we can help to improve their technical quality.  
We can investigate the opportunities for mobile and digital data collection to see if it would represent an improvement over paper-based methods. |  
HR and DRM to arrange for the recruitment of the PEA to go live.  
DRM to shortlist and interview.  
PEA to discuss options for digital and mobile data collection with partners. | Recruitment Team and DH ELAC  
DRM  
PEA | 7 Oct 2013  
15 Nov 2013  
31 Mar 2013 |
| **VHI**  
Project Management skills building  
Strengthening monitoring, measurement and beneficiary accountability mechanisms.  
Quality Standards training  
Understanding UN referral systems |  
All Partners  
On-going Quality Standards training and support for all partners.  
Assistance to partners to find local experts and trainers on protection issues.  
Partner agreements and capacity building plans setting out what specific support Tearfund will provide for supporting the organisational development and capacity to effectively deliver the support.  
We have already supported one workshop in Lebanon on Quality Standards, which was led by Bob Hansford, and we are planning a second one in Lebanon for Syrian churches, and one in Jordan.  
The Programme Effectiveness Adviser can develop capacity building plans for individual partners. |  
Two Programme Effectiveness workshops to be planned and provided in Lebanon and Jordan in Nov 2013.  
Individual partner technical needs to be identified and a response planned. | DH / DRM  
PEA | 30 Nov 2013  
31 Mar 2014 |
| **All Partners** |  
Learning opportunities and mechanisms for all partners to be facilitated by Tearfund. |  
The running of additional training workshops will be a valuable opportunity to bring partners | PEA | 31 Mar 2014 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Tearfund</th>
<th>Tearfund Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible (who)</th>
<th>By when</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>learning and reflection sessions or through virtual connection. In a fast and dynamic context supporting the partners and providing a strategic view of the context and learning from others both in the region and from the UK would be helpful.</td>
<td>together for shared learning. The PEA can also facilitate shared learning through joint meetings, exchange visits and lesson sharing.</td>
<td>partner capacity building plans, including options for having a periodic partner forum, or arranging exchange visits or joint workshops.</td>
<td>Caroline Maxwell / Advocacy representative</td>
<td>31 Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Support required by partners from Tearfund in advocacy to help foster the relationships and working with others at the grassroots level. Tearfund needs to communicate more with partners to ensure that international advocacy activity is aligned with what is happening at the grassroots level. Exploring the use of mass communications for advocacy (as per UN recommendations34) Options A and B under recommendation number 10 could be a way to meet this.</td>
<td>It is important that Tearfund's advocacy is aligned with the advocacy needs identified by our partners. We will encourage the Advocacy representative to maintain open dialogue with our partners to develop specific campaigns and ‘asks’.</td>
<td>This will be reviewed during the development of the advocacy strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Undertaking a power mapping exercise to understanding local actors and decision makers. Application of a tool such as World Vision’s MSTC and building on context analysis work undertaken. This should be undertaken on a 6 monthly basis to assess changes. Options A and B under</td>
<td>Unfortunately, there is limited capacity within the team to undertake such work, but we can certainly ask our partners to consider the power dynamics in the areas in which they are working as they design and implement their projects. We will work with them to comply with the Conflict quality standard, so that they take account</td>
<td>Project proposals will be reviewed to consider the extent to which they comply with the Conflict QS. If and when Tearfund recruits a Conflict Advisor or gives someone specific responsibility for conflict-related advice we will ask them to work with the</td>
<td>DRM</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 UNHCR Real time review July 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation for Tearfund</th>
<th>Tearfund Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible (who)</th>
<th>By when</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>recommendation number 10 could be a way to meet this.</td>
<td>of the complex political, military, religious and social dynamics of the region.</td>
<td>PEA and our partners to ensure that power dynamics are being properly accounted for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tearfund structure and staffing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>Clearly defining roles and responsibilities of all staff working on the appeal in both the Country Team and HST. This should be communicated internally and with Integral Alliance members and partners, and updated accordingly.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This should include who has ultimate decision making power, key point person(s) for specific activities, preferred methods of communication for urgent responses, process for escalating issues to the Deputy Head, followed by Geographical Head and IG director (where and if required), and desired response times on key decisions and communications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This should include a review of the COG/CRICOM processes: purpose, who should participate, who will make key decisions, and the frequency of meetings. The frequency should be increased to allow for the changing context to be reviewed, and quick decisions and changes to the response be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility for both the development of the strategy and its implementation lies with the ELAC Geographical Team. HST provides advice, support and assistance, but does not have decision-making responsibility. There might, on occasions, have been a blurring of lines because HST staff have been seconded for limited periods to ELAC. But this doesn’t change the division of responsibilities in principle. We can ensure that this division is more expressly communicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Deputy Head of ELAC is line managing the programme staff. From Feb till the end of Sep 2013 the programme was the responsibility of the Country Rep, with support from the Programme Officer and HST. From Oct 2013 till Dec 2013 it will be the responsibility of the temporary Disaster Response Manager, based in the UK. From Jan 2014 we hope that the DRM role will be based in-region. The DRM will line-manage the Programme Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The responsibilities will be communicated to internal stakeholders through the CRICOMs. An e-mail has already been sent to partners and to the IA to confirm our recruitment plans and to clarify the line management responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>New Programme Coordinator should have a good understanding of the regional issues, experience in humanitarian and development approaches where possible.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Programme Coordinator should have an active coordination role and engage with the other Integral Alliance Members, partners and other Tearfund Staff including HST, and attend appropriate external coordination meetings where partners are not able to. It would be good for this role to also facilitate regular learning opportunities to bring together all the partners to</strong></td>
<td><strong>The planned role of Programme Coordinator has been succeeded by the new role of Disaster Response Manager. The job description and person specifications of the Disaster Response Manager, do cover most of these issues.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To ensure continuity the Deputy Head of ELAC will be the primary contact for the IA. Discussions have already been started with IA members about opportunities for closer co-operation, including the sharing of staff, and including the possibility of a shared in-region IA representative. We are also in</strong></td>
<td><strong>Selection of the DRM to include consideration of their experience and skills in line with the job description and person specifications.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Deputy HoR to attend IA conference in Antwerp in oct.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Tearfund</td>
<td>Tearfund Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assess progress and share learning. A strategic thinker but with sound technical humanitarian knowledge.</td>
<td>discussion with BWAA (now Transform Aid) about the possibility of being a conduit for their assistance if they launch an appeal next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Advocacy to be adequately resourced within Tearfund’s response strategy with sufficient capacity to respond to the crisis. Tearfund has the following 4 options to consider based on the evidence of previous advocacy actions, the potential for future impact and the findings from the RTR visit: These options are: A. Regional advocacy officer - fixed term full time contract UK or region based. The lead person directly undertaking activities to develop and implement Tearfund Syria Advocacy Strategy including research, lobby national networks, government and other key decision makers and linking and coordinating with existing NGO and faith networks, coordinate the involvement of partners to inform and where applicable implement the strategy, provides support to partners when necessary, work</td>
<td>Annex 5 of the report contains some helpful reflections by the Policy Officer on the advocacy work that has been done to date, though it would perhaps have been more helpful if the main body of the report could have contained an independent analysis of the relevance, effectiveness, impact and efficiency of the advocacy component of the appeal strategy. We would recommend that future evaluations should try to include an assessment of our advocacy work alongside the assessment of the programmatic work. Nevertheless the key ‘asks’ do seem generally relevant, as do the suggested activities. These will form a good basis for developing a revised advocacy strategy. Till now the limited appeal budget has prevented significant expenditure on advocacy, other than the £15,000 per year currently allocated for trips and other expenses. In order to make funding available for a policy officer to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Tearfund</td>
<td>Tearfund Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closely with Programme Coordinator and Comms Officer to ensure joined approach to Tearfund’s response. Liaises at all levels within and outside the organisation in relation to advocacy initiatives relating to Syrian refugees (particularly with the Lebanese and Jordanian government, local faith networks, donors and other NGOs) in relation to Tearfund Syria Advocacy Strategy.</td>
<td>recruited we could put some or all of the £30,000 towards salary costs for 6-12 months; and then seek further funding for the contract to be extended till the end of the appeal. Funding sources would include Partnership Funding, Institutional Funding, and cost-sharing with other IA members. In addition if appeal income exceeds current expectations that could also free up further funding for advocacy. We do not have strong views on the advantages of either Option A or Option B. We see the benefits in having a regionally based policy officer, but are aware that there would still need to be capacity in the UK to support and link in with them. We would like to know whether the current Policy Officer could provide that support. Another option would be to include some policy work in the JD for the Communications Officer and use this person to help inform a UK-based policy officer. We suggest that ELAC and AMG explore the best options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Tearfund</td>
<td>Tearfund Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>networks to engage in joint activities, representing Tearfund in advocacy meetings and using evidence-based policy lines to influence decision makers. The role will not be able to lead on or support partners in-country/region advocacy initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Humanitarian policy officer(^{35}) - not limited to Syria response but providing surge capacity when required for developing policy messages and attending advocacy meetings when required. Further discussions required with Head of HST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Advocacy link - half a day a week maximum of capacity to allow support for joint-agency advocacy initiatives only, and informing the CRICOM of topline political developments. The role will not have capacity for in-depth policy analysis or developing Tearfund’s own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{35}\) This is an option beyond the scope of advocacy for the Syria response and is being considered as part of the AMG strategic work stream on advocacy support for the IG
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Tearfund</th>
<th>Tearfund Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible (who)</th>
<th>By when</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>policy positions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Tearfund should explore and access institutional donor funding (where partner capacity allows) in collaboration and coordination with other Integral Alliance members for mutual partners. A critical issue for Tearfund and World Renew is dependence on just one partner in Lebanon, LSESD. There is concern about the ability of LSESD to handle additional institutional funding on its current organisational model. Staffing should be written into any new proposals. LSESD has the desire to scale up and apply for DFID and other EU funds. They are also planning other institutional funding with World Renew and Food for the Hungry. However, Tearfund needs to be mindful of the current capacity and not to overburden the organisation, or provide surge capacity where required. Institutional funding should be managed and</td>
<td>We are exploring institutional funding opportunities and have been in discussion with other IA members, including World Renew, FHI, Tearfund NZ and Tearfund Belgium, about the best route for our partners to access such funding. We see Tearfund’s comparative advantage over other IA members being in our ability to access funding from DFID, Scottish Govt, Jersey, and ECHO. Funding from other sources can more easily be accessed by other IA members. LSESD has already accessed funding from NZ Aid and CFGB and this diminishes its capacity to absorb further institutional funding. The PFT has provided a brief summary of funding opportunities from some of these donors, and we can build on this research to identify specific funding opportunities. We will try to ensure that our partner portfolio includes some interest and capacity to expand with institutional funding and we will work with our partners</td>
<td>The DRM and the PFT will review the partner needs and the donor opportunities, to try to identify suitable funding options.</td>
<td>DRM and Victoria Cole</td>
<td>31 Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Tearfund</td>
<td>Tearfund Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible (who)</td>
<td>By when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implemented by the larger and stronger partners, Medair and LSESD, with a clear understanding of risks and potential areas for capacity development.</td>
<td>to develop their capacity where necessary. We agree that applications should make adequate provision for support staff. At the same time we need to be sensitive to the capacity of our partners and we need to ensure that the pursuit of institutional funding does not detract from their or our strategic priorities or Christian distinctiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong> Tearfund to consider longer term funding (1year+) to enable partners, in particular LSESD and Medair to plan for the medium to longer term and not be pressurised by short term reporting and planning. This could enable consideration to be given to longer term interventions and support. In the case of Medair this would also prevent any future challenges related to registration and awaiting government (MOPIC) approval for new projects.</td>
<td>Yes, we are open to providing funding for 12 month projects. We would probably not want to consider projects of longer duration because the crisis is dynamic and we would want to retain some flexibility to direct funds to emerging needs assistance.</td>
<td>DRM will discuss with partners their preferred length of project and will consider suggesting that proposals be submitted for 12 months periods.</td>
<td>DRM</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong> Strong coordination with Integral Alliance Members should be continued and should include joint funding proposals and coordination of staff secondments/recruitment where appropriate.</td>
<td>We will continue to coordinate our work with other IA members. The Deputy Head of ELAC will be the primary contact point for future IA meetings and conference calls to ensure consistency while we transition through different short term personnel. He is also planning to attend the IA meeting in Antwerp.</td>
<td>Participate in IA conference calls. Participate in IA annual conference in Belgium in Oct.</td>
<td>DH ELAC / DRM DH ELAC</td>
<td>On-going 31 Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Tearfund</td>
<td>Tearfund Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible (who)</td>
<td>By when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Tearfund should explore if there are options to reach out to the Syrian/Middle Eastern diaspora in the UK for support both financial and non-financial (including advocacy and prayer support)</td>
<td>The programme staff have met Rev Nadim Nasser who has quite a high profile as the Cof E’s only Syrian priest, and who has become an advocate for the protection of the Syrian Christian community. He might be able to help us to link in with the Syrian diaspora and to develop opportunities for raising financial and prayer support.</td>
<td>Discuss options for networking within the Syrian Diaspora with Rev Nadim Nasser</td>
<td>DRM</td>
<td>31 Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Completion and updating of scoping documents for both Lebanon and Jordan. These should also be updated in light of the changing dynamics in the region and on-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Tearfund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussions to partner with new organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scoping documents should be living documents and there should regular monitoring of external insights and intelligence (including UNHCR dashboards and updates from other agencies) to enable changes to be made to the response where appropriate. A situational report and implications for Tearfund’s strategy should continue to be provided to the CRICOM to allow for informed and rapid decisions. Preparing these should be the role of the Programme Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong> A programme monitoring plan and Gantt chart of all the partner activities to allow easy tracking of progress against agreed deliverables and tracking of beneficiary numbers for reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong> Final agreed proposals should be completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Tearfund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed proposals and/or supporting emails with agreed changes should be saved in the T drive. They should accurately reflect any changes made through discussions and email trails to ensure that an evaluator / and other staff can easily assess and understand what was agreed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Annexes

Annex 1: Strategy Real Time Review - Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference for Strategy Review for Syria Crisis August 2013

Approval Title: Strategy Review for Syria Crisis 2013
Summary: The purpose of this trip is to undertake a review of the work of Tearfund’s partners across Lebanon, Syria and Jordan to determine the appropriateness of our strategy and to inform the second phase of funding.
Location and Region: Lebanon & Jordan
Partners: LSESD, JECRaD, Medair, Vision Hope, possibly CMA
Correspondent: Rachel Rigby
Country Representative: Morag Gillies
Team: Catrina Dejean, Akram Amin, Rachel Rigby

Does this assignment require the consultant to have either one-to-one contact, regular or frequent contact with children or young people under the age of 18? No

Please note: A CRB /police check is required when a consultant has either one-to-one contact, regular or frequent contact with children and/or young people in the course of their assignment.

BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description (costs per person)</th>
<th>£ GBP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flights – London – Amman – Beirut – London</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation in Amman &amp; Beirut</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel in country</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and meals (additional to that provided by partners)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical (malaria tablets, vaccinations)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous/Contingency</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total per person</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1550</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for team of 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>£4650</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACKGROUND

On 6th February 2013 Tearfund launched a public appeal to respond to the ongoing conflict within Syria which had led to millions of displaced people and a huge humanitarian crisis. The DEC then launched an appeal on 20th March 2013.

Tearfund’s strategy thus far has been through grants to local and international partners. Some are former Tearfund partners and others are either linked to or are part of existing Christian networks including Integral Alliance and EU-CORD. It is expected that support and capacity building – particularly training in project design and quality standards – will enable partner to scale up and respond well. Quality Standards training was carried out in Lebanon in May 2013, and training is planned for Jordan in the autumn of 2013.

Tearfund staff secondment to key partners will be considered if needs are identified.
An operational response is not being considered currently due to lack of funds and access to Syria. 

Current partners are:

- LSESD – Lebanon & Syria, food aid
- JECRaD – Jordan, food aid
- Medair – Jordan, cash for rent
- VHI – Jordan, psycho-social support for preschool Syrian refugees.

The appeal is currently due to finish 31st March 2015.

PURPOSE

This real time review is being undertaken 6 months into the appeal. The aim of this assignment is to assess the outworking of Tearfund’s strategy of response to the Syria Crisis so far, and to determine whether the strategy remains appropriate to the emergency context in order to inform the next phase of funding.

The key questions for the learning review are:

- Has the response been relevant to the humanitarian needs of the refugees and IDPs?
- Has the evolving nature of the crisis changed the humanitarian needs, or is it predicted to change those needs?
- Does our response need to change to meet the future humanitarian needs?

Within the above questions it would be useful to consider the usual perspectives of an evaluation ToR. A shortened version of the relevant sections of this are below:

1. RELEVANCE PERSPECTIVES

- How relevant is the response to the priorities and policies of the partners and Tearfund?
- How relevant is the response to the changing contextual needs in the region?

2. EFFECTIVENESS PERSPECTIVES

- Has the response to the crisis so far been effective in achieving the intended objectives
- Have the interventions been appropriately phased?
- Have the interventions adequately supported the affected population and was there timely provision of support, goods and services?

3. IMPACT PERSPECTIVES

- What evidence is there of the impact that the appeal response has had to date on beneficiaries and other key stakeholders?
- What change is evident and is attributable to the response and the interventions of partners?
- Are there any unintended changes, positive or negative, because of the response?

4. COVERAGE AND STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES

- Is the response with partners reaching the key groups who are at greatest risk? Is the coverage appropriate for the needs and scale of the scale and within the resources available?
- What do the beneficiaries think of the response? Its relevance, appropriateness and outcomes?
- What do other primary and secondary stakeholders (e.g. staff, community leadership, local government officials, UN) Are the most vulnerable being reached? Is the targeting appropriate for the context and needs?
5. EFFICIENCY PERSPECTIVES

- Has the response been efficient in achieving the intended objectives and outputs?
- Should other alternative approaches be considered in the few months of the response?
- Was the budget and available financial resources realistic for the achievement of the intended objectives and outputs?
- Has there been enough time allowed for the achievement of the intended objectives and outputs?
- Is there enough staff, of appropriate competency, for the achievement of the intended objective and outputs?
- How effectively have Tearfund’s quality standards been communicated to the beneficiaries and partners?
- Are there appropriate systems of downwards accountability (participation, information sharing and feedback) that beneficiaries are using? Is feedback (from beneficiaries and partners) received shaping the implementation of the appeal response?
- Is there an appropriate system of management and communication in place to support staff?
- Are there appropriate financial systems in place?
- Are there appropriate logistics system and other support systems (eg HR) in place?
- Is new learning being captured and acted upon during implementation? If yes, how and what? If no, why not?

5. CONNECTIVENESS PERSPECTIVES

- How has the response to date supported connectedness between partners, Tearfund and other key actors responding to the crisis?
- How is local capacity being supported and developed through the response to contribute to sustainability? What additional support is required?
- What do the partners consider to be the critical issues for future support and moving from immediate response to recovery?
- How are other actors responding and relating to Tearfund and its partner’s response?

CONCLUSIONS

- What are the key lessons learned? What are the implications of the lessons for the appeal strategy?
- What should be repeated and developed for the next phase of the appeal strategy? What should not be repeated in the next phases?

METHODOLOGY

This strategy review will be carried out using the following methods:

- Interviews with partners
- Visits to selected partner projects
- Interviews with beneficiaries
- Sharing of initial findings and learning with partners in Lebanon and Jordan

SCHEDULING

- Travel dates – 12th August 2013 to 22nd August 2013.
- Submission of final report on return from the region, by the end of September 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon 12th Aug</td>
<td>Travel to Beirut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MANAGEMENT OF VISIT

- This assignment will be managed by Rachel Rigby, with logistical assistance from partners, particularly JECRaD in Jordan and LSESD in Lebanon.

### EXPECTED OUTPUT

The expected output of this assignment is a report with the following sections:

- Executive Summary Introduction / Background
- Methodology
- For each perspective
  - Findings
  - Conclusions
  - Recommendations for future planning
- Specific Actionable and Prioritised Recommendations

### INTENDED USE OF THE REVIEW

This review will be used primarily by the Geographical Team to inform future planning and priorities for the next year. It is suggested that it is also available to partners as appropriate.

It will also be useful for future learning in emergency response situations in the future. If the learning is considered to be of wider IG interest then the learning could be shared in an IG Session, and the report made available to those interested.

### OTHER INFORMATION

**T:Drive**

Date of entry (with approval details):

---

**Terms of Reference for Strategy Review for Syria Crisis August 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Title:</th>
<th>Strategy Review for Syria Crisis 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>The purpose of this trip is to undertake a review of the work of Tearfund’s partners across Lebanon, Syria and Jordan to determine the appropriateness of our strategy and to inform the second phase of funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location and Region:</strong></td>
<td>Lebanon &amp; Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners:</strong></td>
<td>LSESD, JECRaD, Medair, Vision Hope, possibly CMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correspondent:</strong></td>
<td>Rachel Rigby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Representative:</strong></td>
<td>Morag Gillies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team:</strong></td>
<td>Catriona Dejean, Akram Amin, Rachel Rigby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does this assignment require the consultant to have either one-to-one contact, regular or frequent contact with children or young people under the age of 18? No

Please note: A CRB /police check is required when a consultant has either one-to-one contact, regular or frequent contact with children and/or young people in the course of their assignment.

BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description (costs per person)</th>
<th>£ GBP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flights – London – Amman – Beirut – London</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation in Amman &amp; Beirut</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel in country</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and meals (additional to that provided by partners)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical (malaria tablets, vaccinations)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous/Contingency</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total per person</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1550</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for team of 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>£4650</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACKGROUND

On 6th February 2013 Tearfund launched a public appeal to respond to the ongoing conflict within Syria which had led to millions of displaced people and a huge humanitarian crisis. The DEC then launched an appeal on 20th March 2013.

Tearfund’s strategy thus far has been through grants to local and international partners. Some are former Tearfund partners and others are either linked to or are part of existing Christian networks including Integral Alliance and EU-CORD. It is expected that support and capacity building – particularly training in project design and quality standards – will enable partner to scale up and respond well. Quality Standards training was carried out in Lebanon in May 2013, and training is planned for Jordan in the autumn of 2013.

Tearfund staff secondment to key partners will be considered if needs are identified.

An operational response is not being considered currently due to lack of funds and access to Syria.

Current partners are:

- LSESD – Lebanon & Syria, food aid
- JECRaD – Jordan, food aid
- Medair – Jordan, cash for rent
- VHI – Jordan, psycho-social support for preschool Syrian refugees.

The appeal is currently due to finish 31st March 2015.

PURPOSE

This real time review is being undertaken 6 months into the appeal. The aim of this assignment is to assess the outworking of Tearfund’s strategy of response to the Syria Crisis so far, and to determine whether the strategy remains appropriate to the emergency context in order to inform the next phase of funding.
The key questions for the learning review are:

- Has the response been relevant to the humanitarian needs of the refugees and IDPs?
- Has the evolving nature of the crisis changed the humanitarian needs, or is it predicted to change those needs?
- Does our response need to change to meet the future humanitarian needs?

Within the above questions it would be useful to consider the usual perspectives of an evaluation ToR. A shortened version of the relevant sections of this are below:

**1. RELEVANCE PERSPECTIVES**

- How relevant is the response to the priorities and policies of the partners and Tearfund?
- How relevant is the response to the changing contextual needs in the region?

**3. EFFECTIVENESS PERSPECTIVES**

- Has the response to the crisis so far been effective in achieving the intended objectives?
- Have the interventions been appropriately phased?
- Have the interventions adequately supported the affected population and was there timely provision of support, goods and services?

**3. IMPACT PERSPECTIVES**

- What evidence is there of the impact that the appeal response has had to date on beneficiaries and other key stakeholders?
- What change is evident and is attributable to the response and the interventions of partners?
- Are there any unintended changes, positive or negative, because of the response?

**4. COVERAGE AND STAKEHOLDER PERSPEDECTIVES**

- Is the response with partners reaching the key groups who are at greatest risk? Is the coverage appropriate for the needs and scale of the scale and within the resources available?
- What do the beneficiaries think of the response? Its relevance, appropriateness and outcomes?
- What do other primary and secondary stakeholders (e.g. staff, community leadership, local government officials, UN) Are the most vulnerable being reached? Is the targeting appropriate for the context and needs?

**5. EFFICIENCY PERSPECTIVES**

- Has the response been efficient in achieving the intended objectives and outputs?
- Should other alternative approaches be considered in the few months of the response?
- Was the budget and available financial resources realistic for the achievement of the intended objectives and outputs?
- Has there been enough time allowed for the achievement of the intended objectives and outputs?
- Is there enough staff, of appropriate competency, for the achievement of the intended objective and outputs?
- How effectively have Tearfund’s quality standards been communicated to the beneficiaries and partners?
- Are there appropriate systems of downwards accountability (participation, information sharing and feedback) that beneficiaries are using? Is feedback (from beneficiaries and partners) received shaping the implementation of the appeal response?
- Is there an appropriate system of management and communication in place to support staff?
- Are there appropriate financial systems in place?
- Are there appropriate logistics system and other support systems (eg HR) in place?
Is new learning being captured and acted upon during implementation? If yes, how and what? If no, why not?

5. CONNECTIVENESS PERSPECTIVES

- How has the response to date supported connectedness between partners, Tearfund and other key actors responding to the crisis?
- How is local capacity being supported and developed through the response to contribute to sustainability? What additional support is required?
- What do the partners consider to be the critical issues for future support and moving from immediate response to recovery?
- How are other actors responding and relating to Tearfund and its partner’s response?

CONCLUSIONS

- What are the key lessons learned? What are the implications of the lessons for the appeal strategy?
- What should be repeated and developed for the next phase of the appeal strategy? What should not be repeated in the next phases?

METHODOLOGY

This strategy review will be carried out using the following methods:

- Interviews with partners
- Visits to selected partner projects
- Interviews with beneficiaries
- Sharing of initial findings and learning with partners in Lebanon and Jordan

SCHEDULING

- Travel dates – 12th August 2013 to 22nd August 2013.
- Submission of final report on return from the region, by the end of September 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon 12th Aug</td>
<td>Travel to Beirut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 12th Aug - Fri 16th Aug</td>
<td>Partner visits in Lebanon, and partner feedback session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 17th Aug</td>
<td>Travel to Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 18th Aug – Thurs 22nd Aug</td>
<td>Partner visits in Jordan, and partner feedback session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 22nd Aug</td>
<td>Travel to London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MANAGEMENT OF VISIT

- This assignment will be managed by Rachel Rigby, with logistical assistance from partners, particularly JECRaD in Jordan and LSESD in Lebanon.

EXPECTED OUTPUT

The expected output of this assignment is a report with the following sections:

- Executive Summary Introduction / Background
- Methodology
• For each perspective
  o Findings
  o Conclusions
  o Recommendations for future planning
• Specific Actionable and Prioritised Recommendations

INTENDED USE OF THE REVIEW

This review will be used primarily by the Geographical Team to inform future planning and priorities for the next year. It is suggested that it is also available to partners as appropriate.

It will also be useful for future learning in emergency response situations in the future. If the learning is considered to be of wider IG interest then the learning could be shared in an IG Session, and the report made available to those interested.

OTHER INFORMATION

| T:Drive | Date of entry (with approval details): |
Annex 2 – Methodology and Work Plan

Syria Appeal Real Time Review
12th-22nd August 2013

Introduction

A small internal team from Tearfund will be visiting Lebanon and Jordan between 12-22nd August 2013. The team is comprised of 4 people (Catriona Dejean, Impact and Evaluation Advisor; Rachel Rigby, Programme Officer-Syria; Akram Amin, Country Representative – Egypt; and Caroline Maxwell, Policy Officer).

The intention of the visit is to learn and reflect on progress made to date under the current response strategy and to assess what is going well and areas for improvement. This real time review is being undertaken 6 months into the appeal. The aim of this assignment is to assess the outworking of Tearfund’s strategy of response to the Syria Crisis so far, and to determine whether the strategy remains appropriate to the emergency context in order to inform the next phase of funding.

The key questions for the learning review are:
- Has the response been relevant to the humanitarian needs of the refugees and IDPs?
- Has the evolving nature of the crisis changed the humanitarian needs, or is it predicted to change those needs?
- Does our response need to change to meet the future humanitarian needs?

Itinerary

The following table sets out the approximate timings for the visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>13/8/13</td>
<td>Beirut/Be’kaa Valley</td>
<td>Review team briefing Visits with LSESD Team debrief</td>
<td>Early morning prior to partner visit Day Early evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>14/8/13</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Team briefing Visits with LSESD Team debrief</td>
<td>Over breakfast Day Early evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur</td>
<td>15/8/13</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Team briefing Visits with UN – To be confirmed Feedback to LSESD – Informal discussion to present back key lessons and findings. Opportunity for response and discussion Identifying key areas to be continued, areas to be discontinued/improved upon, recommendations for the future phases of the response. Team debrief – time to document findings and key learning prior to leaving</td>
<td>Over breakfast Day Day Early evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>16/8/13</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Freetime – possibly see Heart for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>17/8/13</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>Travel to Jordan</td>
<td>Morning/evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>18/8/13</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>Team briefing&lt;br&gt;Visits with JECRaD&lt;br&gt;Team debrief</td>
<td>Over breakfast/Early evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>19/8/13</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>Team briefing&lt;br&gt;Visits with JECRaD&lt;br&gt;Visits with Medair&lt;br&gt;Team debrief</td>
<td>Over breakfast/Early evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>20/8/13</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>Team briefing&lt;br&gt;Visits with Medair&lt;br&gt;Team debrief</td>
<td>Over breakfast/Early evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>21/8/13</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>Team briefing&lt;br&gt;Visits with VHI&lt;br&gt;Team debrief and preparation for the Jordanian feedback</td>
<td>Over breakfast/Early evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur</td>
<td>22/8/13</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>Feedback to Jordanian Partners&lt;br&gt;Informal feedback session – presenting back of key lessons and findings. Opportunity for response and discussion Identifying key areas to be continued, areas to be discontinued/improved upon, recommendations for the future phases of the response.</td>
<td>Morning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methodology**

We propose to undertake the review through mixed methods:

1) **Desk reviews of current project documents and external documents**
   - Project proposals/budgets and any project revisions
   - DEC reports
   - M&E plans and reporting
   - Partner activities
   - Background and context (UN OCHA reports)
   - Donors and UN/NGO coordination overview

2) **Key stakeholder interviews**
   We would like to conduct semi-structured interviews with the following people
   - Tearfund project staff (in the UK) and Partner Staff (in region) to garner insights and feedback on the implementation to date.
   - We would like to meet with partner staff who are directly involved in the management and implementation of the projects. We would like to conduct semi informal interviews with them. These can be conducted as a group and will take around 2 hours. In addition we will have opportunity to further discuss and expand on these interviews during travel time and field visits (see below)
- Through the interviews we may ask to see additional evidence or require follow-up discussions if appropriate. We would like to state that this is not an audit but a process of reflection, learning and identification of what is going well, and areas for improvement so any additional evidence will be to allow us to be assured that processes are in place.

3) Field and analytical activities

We would like to visit project activities in the field where security allows:
- Project visits – this will enable us to observe the activities that are being undertaken as per the proposals, well as meet with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

- Beneficiary interviews: where possible we would like to interview a sample of the beneficiaries who partners are working with. We will take the lead from partners as to how best to interview beneficiaries depending on the context and nature of the activities
  o It may be best for us to engage with beneficiaries on a one to one basis when visiting project areas.
  o Where possible focus group discussions would be invaluable with men, women, and young people separately. We would recommend a group of maximum of 10 people per group. These discussions would last up to 1 hour.

- For LSESD we would be keen to interview a sample of the Community Facilitators to garner their feedback and perceptions of their involvement in the projects and their interactions with refugees.
- For other partners if there is the opportunity to meet with non-beneficiaries with whom they interact with we would appreciate this (eg local authority officials, others). This will enable us to understand the context and any of the issues faced between the beneficiaries and host communities.

The purpose of the above activities will be to assess:
- Efficiencies of input deliveries
  o Type and style of action
  o Are funds being used as stated
  o Timing of actions
  o Costs and effectiveness and value for money
  o Management and staff control – support and effective communication

- Evidence of building on or drawing on local capacity and any issues of the interaction of refugees with the host communities.
- Degree to which support is being delivered to protect and respond to the needs of the refugees.
- The level of contribution and impact of the projects to the wider relief efforts
- The extent to which humanitarian and Tearfund Quality Standards have been respected

4) Analysis and writing

Feedback will be provided during the trip to enable immediate input and discussion. This will take the form of two informal meetings (one in Lebanon and one in Jordan) at the end of the team’s visits in both countries. This will be the opportunity for the team to share the initial findings and discuss further with the partners what these mean and future implications.

The findings along with the discussions from the feedback sessions will be taken into consideration and presented in a draft report to the Tearfund project staff and partners. Following discussion and clarification a final report will be submitted. This report will inform the future strategy and management response. The final report will completed by end of September 2013.
### Annex 3 – Interviewees/ Key informants

#### Tearfund Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morag Gillies</td>
<td>Country Representative (Lebanon and Jordan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oenone Chadburn</td>
<td>Head of HST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Wood</td>
<td>Humanitarian Support Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Rigby</td>
<td>Programme Officer (Syria appeal) (discussions during the visit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Maxwell</td>
<td>Advocacy Link person (Syria) (discussions during the visit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Newnham</td>
<td>Geographic Head (ELAC) (informal discussions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Integral Alliance Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Renew</td>
<td>Wayne de Jong</td>
<td>Director, Humanitarian Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food for the Hungry</td>
<td>Peter Howard</td>
<td>Director, Emergency Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Partner Staff (see detailed lists below of interviews/discussions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSESD</td>
<td>Rupen Das</td>
<td>Director, Emergency Response Project lead for church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pastor of True Vine Church (Zahle)</td>
<td>Project lead and coordinator for the church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 local volunteers</td>
<td>Project lead for the church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pastor of Church of Christ and member of congregation (Beirut)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Volunteer from Faith Baptist Church (Beirut)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JECRaD</td>
<td>Vera</td>
<td>Director, Project Coordinator, Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nabil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fadi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pastor of Mahata church (Amman)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medair</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Country Director, Jordan Programme Manager, Project management, data collection and input responsibilities, financial management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 local staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHI</td>
<td>Daniel and Kim Harrison</td>
<td>Programme Managers Providing voluntary support to the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 local counsellors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 expat educational expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname and Name</td>
<td>Partner and function</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupen Das</td>
<td>Director, LSESD</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazir and Lara</td>
<td>True Vine church part time relief workers</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zainab</td>
<td>Beneficiary of LSESD food aid</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehad</td>
<td>Senior Pastor of True Vine Church</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor plus a volunteer who was an Iraqi refugee so could empathise with Syrian's on community outreach visits</td>
<td>Senior Pastor of Church of Christ in Beirut</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All female family, eldest daughter is an accountant but struggles to find work in Lebanon</td>
<td>Beneficiary of LSESD food aid</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname and Name</td>
<td>Partner and function</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father and 19 year old son, fled Syria due to high security risks of son being forced to join the army</td>
<td>Beneficiary of LSESD food aid</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie</td>
<td>Local church volunteer and soon to be a part-time member of LSESD helping with data collation</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various beneficiaries - see focus groups tab for info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupen Das</td>
<td>Director, LSESD</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JORDAN: JECRaD churches, beneficiaries etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera Haddad</td>
<td>Founder, JECRaD partner</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fadi</td>
<td>PwC Consultant and part time accounts/auditor for JECRaD. He is also Youth Pastor at the AoF church</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname and Name</td>
<td>Partner and function</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabeel</td>
<td>Former businessman, AoG elder and co-founder of JECRaD</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JORDAN: Medair; conditional case for rent and beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Miriam, Reham and another Medair worker -</td>
<td>Medair (partner) Jordan team</td>
<td>Male x2 and female x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JORDAN: VHI; pre-sch trauma care and beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mustafa</td>
<td>Head of local NGO which VHI is registered with</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celia</td>
<td>Lead Pre-school Shift coordinator, a Syrian refugee but works for the pre-sch</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad Afrat</td>
<td>Jordanian landlord of the pre-school and garden</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary family a mother with 2 children</td>
<td>Beneficiary of Vision Hope Intl pre-sch trauma</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname and Name</td>
<td>Partner and function</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that attend the pre-school. Her husband died in Syria and is seen as a martyr</td>
<td>care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre school morning shift teachers plus shift co-ordinator</td>
<td>Office next to the pre sch in Manshiya</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Beneficiary Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendees (type including beneficiaries, host community, gov, volunteers, staff etc)</th>
<th>No of women</th>
<th>No of men</th>
<th>No of children</th>
<th>Group Dynamics (level of participation, presence of a dominant participant, level of interest)</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Topics covered</th>
<th>Note Taker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2013</td>
<td>Zahle, Bekka Valley, Lebanon</td>
<td>Partner LSESD, True Vine Church (Catriona, Rachel, Caroline and Lara [church worker])</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Tearfund staff all asked questions, active participation and input from others. Discussions were held in True Vine church building. We also saw their food aid boxes, what was in them and a tour of the building.</td>
<td>30mins - 1 hour</td>
<td>How the church became involved with relief work, he needs of the Syrian refugees, advocacy activities that Jehad has been involved with etc</td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram - translator when needed. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Attendees (type including beneficiaries, host community, gov, volunteers, staff etc)</td>
<td>No of women</td>
<td>No of men</td>
<td>No of children</td>
<td>Group Dynamics (level of participation, presence of a dominant participant, level of interest)</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Topics covered</td>
<td>Note Taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2013</td>
<td>Zahle, Bekka Valley, Lebanon</td>
<td>Beneficiary family received LSESD food aid via True Vine Church</td>
<td>One mother called Zainab</td>
<td>Father arrived towards end of the discussion as he was out trying to find work</td>
<td>4 children 2 boys and 2 girls both were the mothers</td>
<td>Beneficiary home was a rented room. Mother was very open to share her story as was her husband when he arrived. This was a Christian family. They live in a small flat we only saw one communal room.</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>Their life in Syria and their struggles in Lebanon - unable to pay for rent or find a job. Do receive any other support apart from local church</td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram - translator. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2013</td>
<td>Zahle, Bekka Valley, Lebanon</td>
<td>Beneficiary family receives LSESD food aid via True Vine Church</td>
<td>One mother called Hamida. One daughter called Zeelan</td>
<td>Father called Mohammed. Two sons called Ahmed and Afktar</td>
<td>3 children; one girl and 2 boys. One of the boys is very gifted academically but cannot go to school and the other son used to print t-shirts but no opportunity to work</td>
<td>Beneficiary home was a rented room. Father was very open to share their story. Some of the family are refugees in Turkey and they hope to join them. They live in a block of flats, many other families live there but they have a one bed room for everything. It looked like kitchen, living room and place to sleep.</td>
<td>20 mins</td>
<td>Their life in Syria and their struggles in Lebanon - unable to pay for rent or find a job. Do receive any other support apart from local church</td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram - translator. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14/2013</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Beneficiary family receives LSESD food aid via Church of Christ. All women in the family (brothers)</td>
<td>4 in total; one mother, her two sisters/aunts and one older daughter who is an accountant</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>One young girl with Downs Syndrome</td>
<td>The family were open but did not want photos taken. The older daughter participated most to share her experiences in Lebanon.</td>
<td>20 mins</td>
<td>Challenges in finding a job, discrimination as refugees are not allowed to work. Health needs for support.</td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram - translator. Catriona - lead interviewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Attendees (type including beneficairies, host community, gov, volunteers, staff etc)</td>
<td>No of women</td>
<td>No of men</td>
<td>No of children</td>
<td>Group Dynamics (level of participation, presence of a dominant participant, level of interest)</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Topics covered</td>
<td>Note Taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14/2013</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>and sons either remain in Syria or one is married in Sweden. There was a young girl with Downs Syndrome</td>
<td>but struggles to find a job in Lebanon</td>
<td>The family were very hospitable and offered coffee. Likely to be a Christian family. This flat had more rooms and they were categorised as a lower-middle class family</td>
<td>20 mins the community facilitator was also present from Church of Christ. He is an Iraqi refugee himself so could empathise with the family</td>
<td>Fears and concerns for his son's safety. How the church is helping them out, their only source of support. His son hopes to learn English, lessons provided by the church and also volunteer.</td>
<td>Everyone participated by asking questions too</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beneficiary family receives LSESD food aid via Church of Christ.</td>
<td>Mother (but she did not join the discussion)</td>
<td>Father aged 55 and his 19 year old son</td>
<td>None under the age of 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram - translator. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14/2013</td>
<td>A few miles outside of Beirut a refugee community in sheltered accommoda</td>
<td>One wife/mother set up her own food stall /kiosk. Another wife/mother with her 3</td>
<td>One child who looked malnourished/growth defects. This</td>
<td>The husband/father led the discussions. The women did not speak much/at all. He was very open and has been helping new refugees when they arrive eg a</td>
<td>20-30mins</td>
<td>The father's struggle to find work. His eldest daughter at 16 years old was married to a friend of her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram - translator. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Attendees (type including beneficiaries, host community, gov, volunteers, staff etc)</td>
<td>No of women</td>
<td>No of men</td>
<td>No of children</td>
<td>Group Dynamics (level of participation, presence of a dominant participant, level of interest)</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Topics covered</td>
<td>Note Taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18/2013</td>
<td>East of Amman</td>
<td>Beneficiary family receives food and hygiene kits from JECRaD.</td>
<td>3 women incl a very elderly woman who is disabled but had to be carried in a wheelbarrow by her son in order to cross the border into Lebanon</td>
<td>One man - the breadwinner of the family. His brothers have either died in the conflict or remain in Syria</td>
<td>Approx 5 children all under the age of 15</td>
<td>Very somber mood. They used to live in Homs, were IDPs in Syria then fled to Jordan. The man led in answering the questions but the elderly woman also shared her thoughts. Many of the other women began to cry when the stories about their husbands dying in conflict were shared. This is a Muslim family</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>The loss of loved ones, struggle to pay the rent, fears of having to move and not being able to find a job</td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram and Vera - translators. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Attendees (type including beneficiaries, host community, gov, volunteers, staff etc)</td>
<td>No of women</td>
<td>No of men</td>
<td>No of children</td>
<td>Group Dynamics (level of participation, presence of a dominant participant, level of interest)</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Topics covered</td>
<td>Note Taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18/2013</td>
<td>East of Amman</td>
<td>Beneficiary family receives food and hygiene kits from JECRaD.</td>
<td>2 women</td>
<td>3 men</td>
<td>Approx 4 children</td>
<td>One of the men injured his hand during the conflict. He may have been part of the opposition. The men led the discussions. This was a more political family with father openly against the regime. A Muslim family in a very small flat, children inside all day long</td>
<td>20 mins</td>
<td>Struggles to pay rent, hostility from local Jordanians - some Jordanian kids would throw stones at the flat</td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram and Vera - translators. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18/2013</td>
<td>Informal camp tent shelter. 25 people across the site</td>
<td>Beneficiary family receives food and hygiene kits from JECRaD. They pay a 5 Jordanian Dollar bus fare to collect the aid from the church. Most have been UNHCR registered when they first arrived apart from one man</td>
<td>Approx 6</td>
<td>Approx 6</td>
<td>Approx 12 incl one boy with Downs Syndrome and one 10 month old baby</td>
<td>Much more positive atmosphere in the tent. There was a tight community/clan spirit in the tent. The children were very engaged, similing etc. One of the men was a teacher in Syria and hopes to teach the children but said he needed a tent/room. Another man said the main needs are food and shelter, education is not a priority.</td>
<td>30mins</td>
<td>Fears of winter conditions in the tent, dreams of renting a flat, hope of education and work</td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram - translator. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/19/2013 Morning</td>
<td>JECRaD office based Partner JECRaD meeting with Vera</td>
<td>4 (Catriona, Rachel, Caroline) 2 (Akram and Nabeel)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Tearfund staff all asked questions, active</td>
<td>1 hr 30 mins (incl an)</td>
<td>All took notes and asked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Attendees (type including beneficiaries, host community, gov, volunteers, staff etc)</td>
<td>No of women</td>
<td>No of men</td>
<td>No of children</td>
<td>Group Dynamics (level of participation, presence of a dominant participant, level of interest)</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Topics covered</td>
<td>Note Taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/19/2013</td>
<td>Medair office in Amman</td>
<td>Partner Medair meeting with Martin, Director; Miriam, Programme Manager, Rehman, Project Officer and another local Jordanian man as Project Officer</td>
<td>4 (Catriona, Rachel, Caroline, Miriam and Rehman)</td>
<td>3 (Akram, Martin and another Medair worker)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Medair presented their Jordan programme of conditional cash for rent to Syrian refugees for 3 months. Questions were allowed answered throughout the presentation and afterwards</td>
<td>1 hr 30mins</td>
<td>Medair's response in Jordan, how they select beneficiaries based on needs assessment and the agency's struggles to obtain registration status with Jordan's Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC)</td>
<td>All took notes and asked questions. No need for translator as conducted in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/2013</td>
<td>Jerash, Medair cash for</td>
<td>Two - one</td>
<td>None, the</td>
<td>6 incl the</td>
<td>The Jordanian landlady</td>
<td>Limited support</td>
<td>Rachel and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Attendees (type including beneficiaries, host community, gov, volunteers, staff etc)</td>
<td>No of women</td>
<td>No of men</td>
<td>No of children</td>
<td>Group Dynamics (level of participation, presence of a dominant participant, level of interest)</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Topics covered</td>
<td>Note Taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/2013</td>
<td>Jerash, capital and largest city of Jerash Governorate, which is situated in the north of Jordan, 48 kilometres north of the capital</td>
<td>Medair cash for rent beneficiary family of approx 14 incl a very old grandma</td>
<td>Approx 6</td>
<td>Approx 10</td>
<td>Approx 10</td>
<td>Despite pain they have suffered in Syria, and at Za'atri camp they family were very open. The elderly woman answered most questions along with the man present (her son). The flat looked larger than others visited and seemed to have more sunlight. However the man also wished to</td>
<td>20 mins</td>
<td>Rising rent prices, bad conditions in Za'atri camp, no stable job or income</td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram and Reham from Medair - translators. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too incl Miriam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Attendees (type including beneficairies, host community, gov, volunteers, staff etc)</td>
<td>No of women</td>
<td>No of men</td>
<td>No of children</td>
<td>Group Dynamics (level of participation, presence of a dominant participant, level of interest)</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Topics covered</td>
<td>Note Taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/2013</td>
<td>Irbid, the capital and largest city of the Irbid Governorate, 70km north of Amman</td>
<td>Medair cash for rent beneficiary family incl a 16 year old son who wants to continue studying Physics but cannot get a place in Jordanian sch</td>
<td>4 women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>move elsewhere for cheaper rent</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
<td>Rising rent, conflict and loss inside Syria, lack of work and education opportunities in Jordan</td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram and Reham from Medair - translators. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too incl Miriam from Medair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/2013</td>
<td>Irbid, the capital and largest city of the Irbid Governorate, 70km north of Amman</td>
<td>Medair cash for rent beneficiary visit incl a grandad who is blind and has a brain tumor plus a young girl suffering from glaucoma</td>
<td>Approx 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open discussion, the elderly mother led most of the discussion along with the 16 year old boy. Some of the other women became very emotional when sharing the loss of loved ones in Syria</td>
<td>20 mins</td>
<td>Rising rent costs, safety and security fears especially for the children, health needs</td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram and Reham from Medair - translators. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too incl Miriam from Medair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Attendees (type including beneficairies, host community, gov, volunteers, staff etc)</td>
<td>No of women</td>
<td>No of men</td>
<td>No of children</td>
<td>Group Dynamics (level of participation, presence of a dominant participant, level of interest)</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Topics covered</td>
<td>Note Taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/2013</td>
<td>Manshiya, Mafraq Governate, In the office next to the pre-school</td>
<td>Mr Mustafa who owns the local NGO for which VHI are registered with 4 (Catriona, Rachel, Caroline and Kim [Daniel's wife])</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Mr Mustafa was very welcoming and apologised for the little time he had for the discussion. However he answered all question. 10 minutes. Mr Mustafa had another appointment so a very short meeting</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>What support provides, history of the local NGO, how he works with Daniel, his hopes for the future and how he has been advocated with the local government officials</td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram - translator. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/2013</td>
<td>Manshiya, Mafraq Governate, In the office next to the pre-school</td>
<td>Ahmad Afrat, Jordanian landlord of the pre-school and garden 4 (Catriona, Rachel, Caroline and Kim [Daniel's wife])</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Ahmad was open and honest, shared how his has been generous and giving his time and space for the pre-school. 15 minutes</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>How he has supported Daniel and VHI to use the land with the local NGO. Ahmad also shared his hopes for the future and that some Jordanians are willing to help</td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram - translator. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/2013</td>
<td>Manshiya, Celia, lead pre-</td>
<td>5 (Celia, 2 (Akram and</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Open and participatory</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>Her history in</td>
<td>Rachel and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Attendees (type including beneficiaries, host community, gov, volunteers, staff etc)</td>
<td>No of women</td>
<td>No of men</td>
<td>No of children</td>
<td>Group Dynamics (level of participation, presence of a dominant participant, level of interest)</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Topics covered</td>
<td>Note Taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/2013</td>
<td>Manshiya, Mafraq Governate. Rented room of the beneficiary mother</td>
<td>school shift co-ordinator and Syrian refugee - former teacher in Syria</td>
<td>Catriona, Rachel, Caroline and Kim (Daniel's wife)</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>6 children (two were the mother's own children and they both attend the pre-school, one was her baby and the others were cousins of the children)</td>
<td>Although the mother was tired and emotional she was open in sharing her story. She lives with her brother-in-law (not present in the discussion) on the ground floor. No furniture but mattresses and a TV (very common in all homes visited in both Lebanon and Jordan)</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Her life in Syria, the loss of her husband and the change she has seen in her kids. She also shared struggle to pay for rent and no access to work</td>
<td>Caroline, Rachel, Caroline - note takers. Akram - translator. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/2013</td>
<td>Pre school in Manshiya, Mafraq</td>
<td>Pre-school teachers</td>
<td>10 (7 teachers incl shift co-ordinator as well as Catriona, Caroline and Rachel)</td>
<td>Akram, Daniel and drivers X2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Open discussion all of the women contributed but 3 or 4 were most confident incl one who spoke very little English. First discussion with women that were confident and willing to speak freely.</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>What they have discovered about helping children deal with trauma, stories of transformation, their hopes for the future. Also</td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline, Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram - translator. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Attendees (type including beneficairies, host community, gov, volunteers, staff etc)</td>
<td>No of women</td>
<td>No of men</td>
<td>No of children</td>
<td>Group Dynamics (level of participation, presence of a dominant participant, level of interest)</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Topics covered</td>
<td>Note Taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/2013</td>
<td>Home of Daniel and Kim from Vision Hope International in Mafraq governate</td>
<td>Partner meeting</td>
<td>5 (Catriona, Rachel, Kim and Caroline)</td>
<td>2 (Akram and Daniel)</td>
<td>One (Daniel and Kim’s 3 year old daughter)</td>
<td>Open discussion over lunch at the home of Daniel and Kim. Relaxed but still professional atmosphere.</td>
<td>1 hour 30 mins</td>
<td>The systems they have in place, future/expansion plans incl possible knitting project for mothers while children are in safe space.</td>
<td>All took notes and asked questions. No need for translator as conducted in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/2013</td>
<td>Amman, the home of a friend of Daniel and Kim who has helped them with the curriculum for the pre-sch</td>
<td>Partner and contacts incl Daniel &amp; Kim from Vision Hope Intl, Simon &amp; Cath from UK and Faroosh &amp; Gus from Assemblies of God Church/JECRaD contact and have been helping at the pre-sch</td>
<td>6 (Catriona, Rachel, Caroline, Kim, Cath and Faroosh)</td>
<td>4 (Akram, Daniel, Simon and Gus)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Vey open and collaborative discuscion. Ideas were being shared and bounced off each other. Good networking and supporting each other. All couples have been influential in setting up and running the pre school in various degrees.</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>Ideas to improve the pre-school, child protection policies needed, care and support for Gus and Faroosh as they are the lead counsellors. Ideas of replicating preschool model, documenting what's needed and possible franchise model.</td>
<td>Rachel and Caroline - note takers. Akram - translator. Catriona - lead interviewer. Everyone participated by asking questions too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Attendees (type including beneficiaries, host community, gov, volunteers, staff etc)</td>
<td>No of women</td>
<td>No of men</td>
<td>No of children</td>
<td>Group Dynamics (level of participation, presence of a dominant participant, level of interest)</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Topics covered</td>
<td>Note Taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/22/2013</td>
<td>Amman, JECRaD hosted the meeting in their office in the Assemblies of God building</td>
<td>All of Tearfund's partners based in Jordan had a meeting together; JECRaD, Medair and Vision Hope. Note Akram had to leave for an earlier flight</td>
<td>5 (Catriona, Rachel, Carline, Kim and Vera)</td>
<td>1 (Martin from Medair)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Catriona presented initial findings from Jordan evaluation; what's working well and areas for development with partners. Opened up to a discussion. Partners welcomed the feedback, were grateful for the support from Tearfund and found the visits valuable</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>What has worked well, areas of improvement, relief to longer term challenges in support, value of advocacy, staff changes in Tearfund, interfaith opportunities and cross-cultural dynamics</td>
<td>All took notes and asked questions. No need for translator as conducted in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4 – Evaluation Questions

The following sets out the questions that were used to guide the key informant and beneficiary interviews. Semi-structured interviews or discussions were facilitated rather than a strict interview process. This allowed for greater trust and flexibility in the questioning and a more open dialogue to be created. In the case of the beneficiaries we often started by asking them to tell us their story and from this many of the questions were answered and we used it as an opportunity to actively listen and provide them with the space to share their (traumatic and difficult) stories.

Interview Guide: Partners

Opening Introductions
Introduce the team, the purpose of the review and the intention of the interview

My name is………………. I am the ……………..at Tearfund and I am here with my colleagues…………………………….to undertake a review of the Syrian response which Tearfund is supporting and funding, along with funding from the Disasters Emergency Committee. This review is intended to allow for reflection and learning by Tearfund and its partners; to review current progress; assess any emerging issues and concerns; and to understand where changes could be made to the response for the next stages of the strategy. We would therefore like to explore with you during our discussion what is currently going well, areas of concern and areas we need to press into in the future. The learning and recommendations will shape the response strategy. In addition to this learning review, the DEC has also been conducting its own learning review of the wider collective response. We aim to feed in our learning and findings to DEC.

Interview protocol
This should be shared with interviewees at the start of the evaluation:

- You have the right not to be interviewed or to terminate the interview at any time
- You can choose not to answer some questions if you do not want to.. If you don’t understand the question please tell us and we can re-phrase it.
- Nothing you say will be attributed to you directly or indirectly without your explicit permission
- We will be taking notes during our interview so that we can capture what you say accurately. The notes on this interview will not be shared outside the evaluation team
- We will send you a draft of the findings for your comments and if you’re happy with what you said.

Ask the interviewee to explain their role in the partner organisation and their involvement with the response to date.

Logistics
Notes will be taken during the interview. One of the team will be designated to take notes during the interview. Consideration can be given to recording the interview, but permission will need to be sought at the start and cultural sensitivities to be considered.
It is proposed that the questions are asked by 2 interview leads. This will enable the interviewing to be shared out. We will rotate who will lead on the question during the review.
At the end of each day it is proposed that the evaluation team spends 1-2 hours debriefing on the day’s discussions and documenting key lessons and implications as they go (see evaluation https://drive.google.com/a/tearfund.org/?tab=mo#folders/0ByB-CT7Y2NpTYm9TWdtsTVJ1eDQ)
Semi-Structured Interview Questions
The questions in the section below should be used as prompts to guide semi-structured interviews with partners.

1. RELEVANCE PERSPECTIVES
   - How relevant are the response activities to the priorities and policies of your organisation?
   - How relevant is the response to the changing contextual needs in the region? Do you think that the current activities you are engaged with are meeting the changing needs of the refugees/IDPs/host communities? If not why not?
   - Are there areas that have not been met during the response to date? Why were these areas not responded to? If yes what would you recommend should happen in the next phase of the response?
   - What other contextual or organisational drivers should Tearfund be aware of in the review of the appeal strategy?
   - What are partners’ perceptions of advocacy, and its relevance to the response?
   - What do you feel the role of the church is in the response to support and speak out on behalf of those affected? What is the church’s experience of this? What lessons were learnt from this experience?

2. EFFECTIVENESS PERSPECTIVES
   - How effective do you consider yourselves to have been in achieving the intended objectives set out in the agreed plans?
   - Have the interventions been appropriately phased?
   - Have the interventions adequately supported the affected population and was there timely provision of support, goods and services? (support to men, women and children –over and under 12)
   - Are you aware of Tearfund’s advocacy response in the UK and at the UN? How effective do you consider Tearfund’s advocacy response at the international level eg targeting the UK and UN?
   - How have partners engaged in local level advocacy? What support do partners need to be effective at local level advocacy? Who are the key stakeholders to engage with to support partners in advocacy efforts?

3. IMPACT PERSPECTIVES
   - What do you consider to be the most significant changes since the projects started?
   - What positive changes have you observed?
   - What positive changes have been recorded? How far is/are the project(s) in achieving their planned results?
   - Are there any other unintended as a result of the project either positive or negative that you have observed/recorded?
   - What changes are directly attributable to the project interventions?
   - What have been some of the key challenges faced by the teams in implementing the projects?
   - What has been positive about the relationship between Tearfund and the partner?
   - What could be improved in the way in which Tearfund and the partner work together?

36 Recognising that advocacy does not have to be biased or favouring a particular political group
• Have there been any attempts/discussions to access new and additional funds from others to support your organisation’s interventions?

4. COVERAGE AND STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES

• What do the beneficiaries think of the project? Its relevance and appropriateness? How do you know what beneficiaries think? Were they involved in the planning, design or implementation and do you collect feedback from them?
• What do other primary and secondary stakeholders (e.g. staff, community leadership, local government officials, non beneficiaries, etc.) think of the project?
• How did you select beneficiaries to receive support? How have you ensured the most vulnerable have been supported? Do you think your targeting has been appropriate?
• Is your organisation working with both refugees and host communities? If yes, how and what change have you seen (eg. relationships in the home, in the community etc) and what challenges have you faced? If no, why not?
• Have you noticed/experienced any increased tensions between host communities and refugee communities? If so, what would consider to be appropriate measures to mitigate this situation? Who do you think should be involved in doing this?
• Do you consider you current and proposed activities are appropriate for the needs of the beneficiaries you are reaching and within the resources available? If no, why not?
• What should be the role of the church in working with host and refugee communities? What should be/is the role of the church in the current crisis? Are there any positive stories of the church working with host and refugee communities?

5. EFFICIENCY PERSPECTIVES

• Has the response been efficient in achieving the intended objectives and outputs?
• Has the project been successful in achieving the results to date? Is it on track? Or is it behind the plans? What are the reasons for this? What needs to be identified and addressed in the next phase of the projects?
• What are the key successes that need to be continued in the final phases of the project?
• What are the key weaknesses that need to be addressed in the final phases of the project?
• Should other alternative approaches be considered in the next few months of the response? How should be done to support the different needs of the refugees better (ie. men, women, girls, boys)?
• Was the budget and available financial resources realistic for the achievement of the intended objectives and outputs?
• Has there been enough time allowed for the achievement of the intended objectives and outputs?
• Is there enough staff, of appropriate competency, for the achievement of the intended objective and outputs? What are your skills and knowledge gaps? What support do you think you would like to support you in this?
• How effectively have Tearfund’s quality standards been communicated to your organisation?
• Do you have appropriate systems of downwards accountability in place (participation, information sharing and feedback) that beneficiaries are using? Is feedback (from beneficiaries and partners) received shaping the implementation of the appeal response?
- Is there an appropriate system of management and communication in place to support staff?
- Do you consider your organisation to have appropriate financial systems in place?
- Do you consider your organisation to have appropriate logistics system and other support systems (eg HR) in place?
- How do you capture and act upon new learning during implementation? Can you give examples?

6. CONNECTIVENESS PERSPECTIVES
- How has the response to date supported connectedness between your organisation and other partners, and key actors responding to the crisis? How can you as a local NGO be supported to plug into current referral pathways designed by the National Family Unit, UN agencies and INGOs? What support would you require?
- Do you think that through the response local capacity is being supported and developed? Do you think additional support is required?
- What does your organisation consider to be the critical issues for future support and moving from immediate response to recovery?
- How are other actors responding and relating to you and your organisation in the wider response?
- What challenges do you consider Tearfund and its partners face in the coming phases of the strategy with regard to working with and supporting both refugees, IDPs and host communities? What could be done to mitigate or address these challenges?
- How should Tearfund and its partners continue to connect with other key actors to ensure they are effectively responding to the changing humanitarian needs?

Closing Questions and Lessons learned
- When you look back on the response, what is the biggest lesson that you have learned, or had reinforced, by this experience?
- What have you personally learned from this experience?
- What was the thing that most surprised you in this your organisation’s response?
- If you were back at the start of the project/programme with the knowledge you have now, what would you do differently?
- Is there any question that you were expecting which we have not asked
- What are the key lessons learned for Tearfund and its response moving forward? What do you consider to be the implications of the lessons for the appeal strategy?
- What in your opinion do you think should be repeated and developed for the next phase of the appeal strategy? What should not be repeated in the next phases?
**Interview Guide: Beneficiaries/Affected Groups**

**Opening Introductions**
Introduce the team, the purpose of the review and the intention of the interview

*My name is……………… I am the ………….at Tearfund and I am here with my colleagues……………………………… to undertake a review of the response which Tearfund is supporting along with PARTNER X. We would like to take some time to ask you what support you have received and your experiences of interacting with Partner X as they provide support to you and your families. The reason for our questions is that we want to ensure our response is correct and supporting the needs of your and families in the best and most appropriate way we can. We also value the feedback of those we work with so that we can shape our future work.*

**Interview protocol**
This should be shared with interviewees at the start of the evaluation:

- You have the right not to be interviewed or to terminate the interview at any time
- You can choose not to answer some questions if you do not want to. If you don’t understand the question please tell us and we can re-phrase it.
- Nothing you say will be attributed to you directly or indirectly without your explicit permission except if you disclose abuse or exploitation of yourself or someone you know then I am bound by Tearfund’s policies to disclose.
- We will be taking notes during the interview so that we remember what you’ve said. The notes on this interview will not be shared outside the evaluation team (with the exception above)
- We will send you a draft of the report for your comments

If appropriate, ask the group members/individuals to share where they have come from and how many family members they are with.

**Logistics**
Notes will be taken during the interview. One of the team will be designated to take notes during the interview. Consideration can be given to recording the interview, but permission will need to be sought at the start and cultural sensitivities to be considered.

It is proposed that the questions are asked by 2 interview leads. This will enable the interviewing to be shared out. We will rotate who will lead on the question during the review. It is likely that the interview will need to be conducted through interpreters, so attention needs to be given to the phrasing of questions. Where a question is difficult to understand a question may need to be reformulated or examples given.

In addition to the notes taken of the content, the note takers should also be encouraged to document any observations during the interview and record these. Eg nature of the interactions, attitudes, and ways of responding.

At the end of each day it is proposed that the evaluation team spends 1-2 hours debriefing on the day’s discussions and documenting key lessons and implications as they go (see evaluation [https://drive.google.com/a/tearfund.org/?tab=mo#folders/0ByB-CT7Y2NpTYm9TWWdsTVJ1eDQ](https://drive.google.com/a/tearfund.org/?tab=mo#folders/0ByB-CT7Y2NpTYm9TWWdsTVJ1eDQ))
Semi-Structured Interview Questions
The questions in the section below should be used as prompts to guide semi-structured interviews with beneficiaries/affected groups

1. RELEVANCE PERSPECTIVES
   - What are your key needs at this time?
   - What do you see being keep challenges and difficulties for you in the next 2-3 months?
   - Do you think the response of Partner X is relevant to your needs? Are Partner X providing the support you need?
   - Are there other organisations/people/groups you have engaged with since you came here? If yes who and what support have they given you? How would you compare their support with Partner X?

2. EFFECTIVENESS PERSPECTIVES and 5. EFFICIENCY PERSPECTIVES
   - Tell us how Partner X came to help you and/or your family? What sort of process was in place?
   - How quick were you to receive support from Partner X when you arrived here?
   - Do you think Partner X is efficient in the way they work? If not, how can Partner X improve?
   - What have they done well in supporting you? What would you like to see them do differently in the future?
   - What do you think agencies such as TF can do better?
   - What advocacy issues do you think we can support partners in? Partner X has mentioned that ABC are some advocacy asks we can support them with. What are your thoughts on this?

3. IMPACT PERSPECTIVES and 4. COVERAGE AND STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES
   - What support have you / and your family received?
   - How has this helped you / and your family?
   - Why are these changes significant to you and/or your family?
   - What do you think should be continued? What should be stopped?
   - How has the project staff listened to your needs? Do they ask for feedback on how the project is being implemented? Do you think that they are responsive to your needs?
   - How has the support from Partner X given you and your family hope for the future?
   - How have they supported you in living in Lebanon/Jordan?
   - What challenges do you continue to face? What solutions do you see for these?
   - Have your psycho-social, legal, medical. social needs been met? How has Partner X supported relationships within your family or within the community? Do you have an good example? What could they do better?

Closing Questions and Lessons learned
   - Is there any question that you were expecting which we have not asked
   - What is the one thing that you hope for in the future and that you would hope can be provided for by Partner X?
   - How have you found this process? How do you think it can be improved for you and/your family?
Annex 5 – Advocacy Rationale

Six months into the Syria appeal it has become clear that the advocacy response within the strategy needs to be updated and better reflect changing nature of the crisis, specifically because:

- Conditions inside Syria are worsening, safety and protection for aid workers becoming even greater concern.
- UK Government approach very anti-regime but lacks a viable alternative to resolve the fighting.
- International community including NGOs struggling to cope with current levels of need as rate and scale of crisis intensifies
- Ultimately political resolution is required otherwise humanitarian response is undermined
- Syria will remain a ‘hot topic’ – Tearfund’s advocacy response needs to adapt, be better prepared for when Syria peaks in the political and news agendas, with sufficient capacity to respond and scale up resources for advocacy
- Tearfund’s current advocacy link capacity is now overstretched, in order to build on the progress made thus far a decision is required on how to resource a role for advocacy

What can Tearfund do to develop its advocacy approach? What specific role can Tearfund play in advocacy?

- Policy analysis of the humanitarian challenges37 - highlight these to UK government (Jordanian and Lebanese govts when applicable), use the analysis to develop stronger policy lines, messages and advocacy asks based on partner and beneficiary needs
- Power/stakeholder mapping of key decision makers in UK/international, opportunities to influence eg Cabinet Office Syria Implementation Unit; regional/in country local faith leaders, Jordan Ministry of Planning and International Coordination (MOPIC), Lebanese government, church and interfaith networks
- Speak into the complexity of the crisis, voicing concern over potential power vacuum if change in Syrian regime, the need for a peaceful, democratic and representative governing body. Also highlight conditions on the ground in Lebanon and Jordan, children without education, limited access to health care, families struggling to make ends meet
- Highlight to decision makers role of local churches in responding to the crisis, interfaith dialogues in restoring peace, alleviating tensions between hosts and refugees
- Support inter agency advocacy calls for action ie Crisis Action, but contributing Tearfund’s own developed messages and communicate value of faith communities in the humanitarian response

Why should Tearfund invest in advocacy?

- Without speaking into and influencing the political space Tearfund’s response to the humanitarian crisis will not be as impactful as it could be. The evidence of how previous advocacy actions have helped to strengthen the response thus far reinforces the fact that Tearfund has a significant role to play in advocacy
- Speak out for justice using Tearfund’s position as a faith-based humanitarian organisation to advocate for change in difficult situations on behalf of partners and beneficiaries, and bring this distinctiveness to joint agency advocacy initiatives
- Influence to strengthen humanitarian response and ultimately speak out for a peaceful and political resolution. Although there are other active agencies it is clear that there is strength in numbers for joint advocacy as each organisation has an area of expertise that adds value in advocacy initiatives. For Tearfund it is highlighting role of faith communities/local churches within the humanitarian response and opportunities for interfaith networks in alleviating suffering for refugees and IDPs

37 This was also a recommendation in the DEC’s evaluation report of all members response to the crisis citing ‘a lack of concerted policy analysis and advocacy, particularly on protection issues’ of agencies
- Accountability with partners, beneficiaries, supporters and allies e.g. World Evangelical Alliance to actively engage in political dialogue bringing its Christian distinctiveness in calling for change

**What are Tearfund's advocacy asks?**

- **Funding: more aid that matches the scale of the crisis.** Referring to the shortfall in the UN appeal but also Tearfund, when appropriate, advocating on the need for funding opportunities for faith communities and local churches who are able to access beneficiaries
- **Humanitarian access inside Syria:** essential assistance for the internally displaced
- **Political solution: words of peace translated into action.** Referring to the diplomatic process and Tearfund speaking out so that the international community recognises the complexities of the conflict; the impact that not only regime but also rebel controlled areas are having on civilians especially vulnerable minorities

Note: The original advocacy proposal clearly in May 2013 explained the outcomes, outputs and ways to manage risks based on Tearfund’s advocacy asks

**What has been the impact of the previous advocacy actions?**

Over the past 5-6 months the advocacy link role has worked beyond capacity to lead and deliver on a variety of actions with impact as explained clearly below. It is important to remember that in order to demonstrate the impact (and potential impact) of advocacy, the link person has been performing as a regional policy officer but with limited resources. Nonetheless the evidence provides Tearfund with a clear indication of the niche it can play in the advocacy:

1. Informed Dr Geoff Tunnicliffe, CEO/Secretary General of World Evangelical Alliance of the humanitarian conditions in Jordan as he was invited to speak at a conference in August convened by King Abdullah and Prince Ghazi of Jordan regarding the plight of Arab Christians. Dr Tunnicliffe contacted Tearfund exclusively for his briefing. Signs of impact include that Dr Tunnicliffe was able to hold frank and open discussions about many topics including the official registration of the Jordanian Evangelical Council. He was able to hold private discussions with a number of the Orthodox, Catholic and Anglican leaders in regards to building better relationships with evangelical Christians. Tearfund’s input in briefing Geoff for the conference led to him meeting with the National Security Council of the US government to communicate his findings from the conference, in particular, the concerns of the Christians about military action. These strategic international and in-region level discussions allow Tearfund to utilise its contacts to influence decision makers and is having a demonstrable impact in reminding the international community on the humanitarian crisis. The fact that the US did not immediately retaliate with military action in response to the chemical weapons attack shows the impact that Tearfund providing clear evidence and policy messages on a complex crisis can have in combination with other relevant advocacy initiatives

2. Produced high quality parliamentary briefings to keep Tearfund’s supporters inside the UK parliament informed with its emergency appeal, highlighting work of local partners and different aspects of the humanitarian response i.e. food assistance, cash for rent, trauma care. Evidence of impact includes Baroness Berridge welcoming the launch of Tearfund’s appeal in February 2013, she continued to express an active interest in the response and

---

38 These advocacy asks can be developed and refined over the course of Tearfund’s appeal strategy, but will require extra capacity and resourcing
39 Current advocacy link role has worked beyond the 10 per cent of capacity allocation (equivalent of half a day a week)
40 Two briefing papers produced; one shortly after launch of Tearfund’s appeal in March and another in September following the UK parliamentary vote in response to chemical weapons
accepted an invitation to visit partner project\(^{41}\) to help advocate and remind UK Government the complexities of the protracted crisis. Tearfund is also using the briefings to communicate with other parliamentary supporters in positions of power such as Alistair Burt, Foreign Office Minister (Christian background) and Nadhim Zahawi (Kurdish background). In addition Dr Charles Reed, Church of England’s Foreign Policy Adviser has found Tearfund’s briefing of significant value to inform peers ahead of any House of Lords debates on Syria so that they can use evidence-based positions to speak into the complex humanitarian crisis. These impacts from a UK parliamentary perspective help to build the case of the value and expertise of faith based organisations like Tearfund in humanitarian contexts. This is an area that the UK Government, specifically DFID has recognised, for instance inviting a strong faith communities presence at a high level meeting on Violence Against Women and Girls.\(^{42}\)

3. Signing onto Crisis Action joint-agency letters to UN General Secretary and the G20 advocating for humanitarian access and a negotiated solution in Syria. Evidence of impact include Valerie Amos briefed the UN Security Council on the humanitarian situation and, critically, made clear the need for the Council “\textit{to consider alternative forms of aid delivery, including cross-border operations.}” In response the UN Security Council agreed on the need for cross-border access “where appropriate” and “\textit{in accordance with humanitarian principles}”. Other evidence of impact include:

a) Letter to Ban Ki-moon, UN Gen Sec was acknowledged and response sent directly to Matthew Frost (and all other signatories) welcoming the efforts made to bring the issue to greater attention stating “\textit{I fully share your concerns and continue to seize all opportunities to impress upon parties their obligation to protect civilians}”

b) Advocacy correspondence to decision makers led to a meeting\(^{43}\) with Deputy Secretary General Jan Eliasson and starting point for more transparent civil society dialogue with the UN regarding humanitarian access

c) Recognition from the Indonesian President who found the G20 letter so powerful that he referred to it during the G20 discussions on Syria and that it had considerable impact on world leaders. In response to the letter the President wrote to Crisis Action: “\textit{I made a special effort during G20 summit discussions to refer to your letter to fellow leaders, where I stated: ‘I am aware that most of the G20 leaders have received a letter from 11 NGOs who are deeply concern with the worsening situation in Syria - the immense suffering of the Syrian people, the ongoing humanitarian tragedy and the difficulty to have access to deliver humanitarian assistance. Those NGOs appealed to us to reach a consensus, to end the suffering of the Syrian people.’}”

4. Supporting the Don’t Let Syria Down joint agency petition calling for Russian President Vladimir Putin, US President Barack Obama and UN/League of Arab States Envoy to Syria Lakhdar Brahimi to use their political influence to get all parties to the Syria conflict around the table for talks on finding a solution to this crisis. Tearfund used Nudge to mobilise over 500 supporters to sign the petition, as well as promoting the campaign through the One Voice prayer updates. Petition reached over 100,000 signatures with plans to present to UN, Russian and US leaders and request for meeting with their officials. Other evidence of impact include Tearfund engaging its UK supporters on a complex issue and reminding them that diplomatic negotiations must remain and priority - using advocacy to relieve a sense of powerlessness in the face of uncertainty.

\(^{41}\) Trip is being organised by the various colleagues within AMG and currently scheduled for early October

\(^{42}\) Tearfund to attend the high level meeting in November sharing examples of the role of local churches responding to conflicts

\(^{43}\) Due to limited capacity and no presence in New York Tearfund could not attend the meeting
Potential for in-country / in-region advocacy (and the potential for impact)

- Lebanon and Jordan - supporting partners on the ground to enhance their humanitarian efforts such as calling for more efficient registration and approval of projects, advocating to national and local authorities on the value of local churches, highlighting protracted nature of crisis and longer term needs of refugees eg psycho-social support, access to education, healthcare and jobs, networking with other in-region coalitions by contributing Tearfund’s niche, or strengthening the inter-faith dialogues especially when easing tensions between host and refugee communities. Although running advocacy workshops would be an initial start it was clear that the potential for advocacy in-region requires a level of expertise and sustained capacity to deliver on advocacy actions. The evidence and impact at the grassroots level also adds significant weight to any advocacy at the UN/UK level.

- No potential for in-country advocacy inside Syria at present.

Potential for Tearfund doing advocacy going forward (and the potential for impact)

- International (UN/EU) - continue to work with Crisis Action as they have access to key decision makers in New York and Brussels. Crisis Action coordinate joint agency responses so potential for greater impact in combining efforts to bring about change such as lifting of barriers for access into Syria and protection of aid workers/local churches. Tearfund can contribute to these advocacy initiatives by sharing partner experiences, highlighting conditions for vulnerable minorities, why safety and protection for all is essential whoever holds power inside Syria.

- National (UK) - with more capacity for policy analysis and more co-ordinated liaison with partners to inform clearer advocacy asks Tearfund can have a stronger presence in DFID-FCO co-ordination meetings. Opportunities to speak out on the value of local churches/faith communities in responding to the crisis (shift government thinking from acknowledging FBOs to more active dialogue). Speak out on the complexity of the crisis, repercussions of any military intervention to influence the UK government’s humanitarian and political response to the crisis.

Overview of the main advocacy issues that the partners have helped to identify during RTR visit

- Strengthen the immediate humanitarian response - active Tearfund presence in UN coordination or other humanitarian agency cluster meetings and feeding issues/reinforcing messages to other decision makers/advocacy forums. Key issues such as NGO project approval challenges, gaps in humanitarian response, livelihood needs of refugees, funding and capacity opportunities.

- Inter-faith dialogues - although the church has limited presence in Lebanon and Jordan it still has power to influence particularly through inter-faith initiatives while still maintaining Christian distinctiveness.

- Peaceful end to crisis - strong concerns that the West lacks understanding of the region, culture and implications of the conflict. Partners recognise the role of advocacy, and Tearfund specifically, to speak into these debates, advise caution on military responses and keep attention on the humanitarian crisis. Beneficiaries hope to return to Syria/family links remain in Syria (opportunity to strengthen advocacy for humanitarian access).

- Livelihoods - clear awareness of the protracted nature of the crisis and longer term needs of refugees such as education, health, employment to pay for rent and support families. Even if partner projects are unable to meet these needs it does not mean Tearfund should de-prioritise or stop reminding the international community of these needs and offer recommendations.

Overview of what will be needed in terms of time / budget / people to make this happen

The current advocacy link support has worked above and beyond allocated capacity and the evidence of the impacts from advocacy actions to date speaks volumes of what can be delivered.
Nonetheless 6 months into the appeal this level of support cannot be sustained particularly as crisis becomes more complex. Options to consider for resourcing the advocacy response include:

E. Regional advocacy officer - fixed term full time contract UK or region based. The lead person directly undertaking activities to develop and implement Tearfund Syria Advocacy Strategy including research, lobby national networks, government and other key decision makers and linking and coordinating with existing NGO and faith networks, coordinate the involvement of partners to inform and where applicable implement the strategy, provides support to partners when necessary, work closely with Programme Coordinator and Comms Officer to ensure joined approach to Tearfund’s response. Liaises at all levels within and outside the organisation in relation to advocacy initiatives relating to Syrian refugees (particularly with the Lebanese and Jordanian government, local faith networks, donors and other NGOs) in relation to Tearfund Syria Advocacy Strategy

F. Seconded advocacy officer - scale up of advocacy link capacity to a (part time) advocacy officer role of 3 days a week, UK based with travel to region when needed. Lead person on policy analysis, research and messaging with strong liaison with staff members located in the region ie Programme Coordinator and Comms Officer so that advocacy messaging is informed by partners. Focus on international and UK advocacy targets, work with other agencies and networks to engage in joint activities, representing Tearfund in advocacy meetings and using evidence-based policy lines to influence decision makers. The role will not be able to lead on or support partners in-country/region advocacy initiatives

G. Humanitarian policy officer - not limited to Syria response but providing surge capacity when required for developing policy messages and attending advocacy meetings when required. Further discussions required with Head of HST

H. Advocacy link - half a day a week maximum of capacity to allow support for joint-agency advocacy initiatives only, and informing the CRICOM of topline political developments. The role will not have capacity for in depth policy analysis or developing Tearfund’s own policy positions.

Within the Tearfund Syria appeal budget there is £15k allocated for Year 2 (April 2013 - March 2014) and then another £15k for Year 3 (April 2014 - March 2015).

Recommend that given the timely need for an increase in advocacy for the Syria response, option A or B is most advisable in order for Tearfund’s approach to be in a better position to adapt to the changing nature of the crisis and scale up capacity when required. Although the advocacy link person can advise and make suggestions, the decision on resourcing must be made, agreed and owned by the Syria response team and respected by all CRICOM members - recognising the limitations of the role for whatever option is decided.

Next steps are for discussions to happen with Head/Deputy of ELAC and Director of AMG/Head of Policy on the budget and how to effectively resource advocacy for the response based on the desired option. If Option C is decided then Head of HST should also be consulted.

44 Depending on which option is decided for further review a more detailed action plan/job description can be developed

45 This is an option beyond the scope of advocacy for the Syria response and is being considered as part of the AMG strategic work stream on advocacy support for the IG
Annex 6 – Documents Consulted During the Review

A sample of documents was reviewed for the benefit of the MTR. These included strategic documents for Tearfund, as well as project proposals, budgets and the most recent reports for each of the projects visited. Additional websites and articles were consulted and are included in the footnotes in the main document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation/ Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Das, R and Davidson, J</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Profiles of Poverty – The Human Face of Poverty in Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medair</td>
<td>August 2013</td>
<td>Syria Crisis Response Jordan Programme Interim report presentation Amman, Jordan Team Presentation to Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tearfund</td>
<td>Updated May 2013</td>
<td>Emergency Response Outline Strategy Syria Crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tearfund</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>Lebanon Scoping Visit Report and Response Recommendations Syria Crisis Appeal, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tearfund</td>
<td>Mixed (2013)</td>
<td>Project Proposals and budgets for LSESD, JECRaD, Medair and VHI Financial Summary IBIS data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
<td>From slow boil to breaking point: A real-time evaluation of UNHCR’s response to the Syrian refugee emergency UNHCR Policy Development and Evaluation Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>