

INTERNATIONAL INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL

TERMS OF REFERENCE

(Approved by the GCERF Governing Board at the 1st Board Meeting, in November 2014;
Revised March 2016)

A. MANDATE

1. **Identity.** The international Independent Review Panel (“IRP”) is an independent, impartial group of experts appointed by the Governing Board (the “Board”) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (“GCERF”) to provide a rigorous technical assessment of requests for funding made to GCERF.
2. **Advisory Body.** The IRP may serve as an advisory body to the Board upon the Board’s request.
3. **Roles and Responsibilities.** The IRP is responsible for:
 - a. providing feedback to the independent entity commissioned to undertake the Country Needs Assessments (“CNAs”), prior to the CNAs’ completion;
 - b. providing recommendations informed by the CNAs to advise on the selection of new beneficiary countries by the Board;
 - c. reviewing and providing feedback on the recommendations of Country Support Mechanisms (“CSMs”), concerning where and how GCERF funding could make the most significant contribution;
 - d. providing recommendations on the pre-allocation of funding by the Board, informed by the CNAs and the recommendations of the CSMs. Specifically, providing recommendations on:
 - i. the relative weighting of funding to each beneficiary country under consideration; and
 - ii. specific funding criteria for each beneficiary country, including but not limited to funding priorities, geographic, and demographic foci;
 - e. participating alongside the CSMs and the Secretariat in the joint selection of Potential Principal Recipients (“PPRs”); and
 - f. reviewing funding applications against established technical standards, and providing the Board with recommendations for funding.

B. MEMBERSHIP

- 1. Size.** The IRP shall consist of no less than eight (8) and no more than fourteen (14) experts.
- 2. Independence.** The IRP is a group of experts who are all institutionally independent of the Secretariat, Board, and other governance structures of the Board. IRP members serve in their personal capacities and do not represent their employer, any government, or other entity. Members of the Secretariat are ineligible to serve on the IRP. Board Members, Alternate Board Members, Board committee members or individuals who participate in Board meetings as part of Board constituency delegations, and CSM members shall stand down from these roles if selected and agreed upon to serve on the IRP.
- 3. Expertise.** As a whole, IRP membership shall, to the extent possible, include experts in the following areas:
 - a. community engagement and action;
 - b. preventing and countering violent extremism (“P/CVE”) and understanding the drivers of recruitment and radicalisation to violent extremist agendas;
 - c. community-level resilience and capacity development
 - d. conflict transformation;
 - e. government-community relations;
 - f. formal education and informal learning;
 - g. small- and medium-size enterprise development;
 - h. professional and vocational education;
 - i. livelihoods and human security;
 - j. interfaith relations;
 - k. non-profit governance and management;
 - l. public private partnerships, private sector engagement, and corporate social responsibility;
 - m. radicalisation dynamics;
 - n. social entrepreneurship and innovation;
 - o. engendered issues – youth, women, and victims/survivors of terrorism; and

p. information and communications technology.

4. Other. In addition to the expertise listed above, IRP members should ideally have:

- a. knowledge of GCERF and its purpose, as well as general policy issues in the field of P/CVE, community engagement and resilience, human security, and international development;
- b. experience in applying for or assessing requests for grant funding and making recommendations;
- c. experience in developing, funding, managing or overseeing programmes in the fields listed in paragraph 3 above in developing countries;
- d. experience in participating in the governance structures of a grant-making institution or mechanism; and
- e. financial management experience including budgeting and financial reporting.

5. Diversity. The membership of the IRP as a whole shall, to the extent possible, reflect geographic, ethnic, religious, and gender diversity.

6. Term. IRP members shall serve for up to two years and are eligible for appointment for a second term of up to two years. IRP members may resign from the IRP at any time before the end of their term by informing the Chair of the IRP in writing. IRP members are expected to continue to serve on the IRP until such time as a replacement is appointed.

7. Chair. The IRP, at its first meeting of any term, shall elect a Chair from among its membership. The Chair serves a term of three years or until the appointment of his/her successor. The maximum term of service of three years may be extended for the IRP Chair to cover the period of his/her service as Chair.

C. SELECTION

1. Transparency. The recruitment of IRP members shall be managed in an open, transparent, and criteria-based manner.

2. Management. The appointment of the initial IRP shall be managed by the Secretariat in consultation with the Chair of the Board. The replenishment of the IRP once established shall be managed by the Chair of the IRP.

3. Outreach. The outreach for IRP recruitment shall include both targeted outreach and a referral mechanism. When requested by the Board, the Secretariat shall:

- a. post a call for applications on the GCERF website, partner websites, and selected expert networks; and

- b. request the Board and other participants in GCERF governance structures to identify and encourage suitable candidates to apply.
4. **Screening of Applicants.** The Secretariat will screen and complete appropriate reference checks for all applications for IRP membership, reaching out to candidates as necessary.
5. **Replenishment.** An IRP membership replenishment process should be commenced at the following times:
- a. In the event that, due to resignations or removal of IRP members or any other reason, the membership of the IRP falls below eight (8) members;
 - b. When requested by the Board following the recommendation of the Chair of the IRP for any reason, including the need to expand the expertise of the IRP;
 - c. No later than six (6) months prior to the end of any three-year term of the IRP.

The replenishment process should balance, to the extent possible, the need for continuity in the IRP membership, while recognising the benefits of rotation.

6. **Board approval.** Once a selection of IRP membership is made, either by the Chair of the Board for the initial IRP, or by the Chair of the IRP for the replenishment, a recommendation shall be sent to the Board for a decision. Where necessary, at the determination of the Chair of the Board, the email no objection process set out in Article 2.9a of the Bylaws will be used.

D. ETHICS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

1. **Covered Persons.** IRP members must abide by the requirements of the Policy on Ethics and Conflicts of Interest, including making an annual declaration of their conflicts of interest. In addition, IRP members may not participate in the review of a funding request in which they had any participation either in its development or at the CSM level.
2. **Disclosure.** IRP members shall uphold the integrity of the IRP and its independence. IRP members shall disclose all actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interest to the IRP chair and recuse themselves from review of particular funding requests or other IRP work.

E. WORKING METHODS

1. **Virtual meetings.** In general, the IRP will work through the use of telecommunications, including audio/video conference, or email communications. The IRP Chair, in consultation with the Executive Director, will decide on the modality to use for meetings of the IRP, taking into consideration budgetary implications.
2. **Quorum.** The IRP may conduct business when a majority of its members are present and/or participate.
3. **Review Criteria.** For review of funding requests, the IRP will use:
 - a. Board-approved country-specific criteria, if any including, as appropriate, the recommendations and findings of the needs assessment; and
 - b. the criteria set forth in Attachment 1 to these Terms of Reference.
4. **Decision-Making.** To the extent possible, recommendations will be made by consensus of the IRP. If the IRP Chair determines that consensus cannot be reached, he or she may call for a decision by majority vote. The IRP has up to one month to make its recommendation with any reservations/requests for modifications. In the event that modification and/or clarifications are sought by the IRP, the CSM will be provided with a reasonable amount of time to address them, including consulting with the Potential Principal Recipient(s), if necessary. The IRP will then have a further two weeks to accept modifications or clarifications provided by the Potential Principal Recipients through their CSM.
5. **Recommendations to the Board.** The IRP's recommendation for funding shall be transmitted to the Board for decision. As part of its recommendation, the IRP may, *inter alia*:
 - a. identify issues that may need to be addressed during grant implementation but do not affect the recommendation made concerning the grant; and/or
 - b. identify reservations or specific requests for modification related to aspects or dimensions of the application, and request re-submission of the application.
6. **Lessons Learned.** The IRP has the responsibility to share lessons learned, in particular those that may have broader policy and financial implications. These are to be submitted to the Board.

F. OPERATIONAL COSTS

IRP members may receive an honorarium of USD 2,000 a year, in addition to travel expenses where applicable.

G. ATTENDANCE AT BOARD MEETINGS

- 1. Chair Attendance.** The Chair of the IRP shall be invited to attend all face-to-face meetings of the Board, and, at the discretion of the Chair, depending on the agenda for the meeting, audio or teleconferences of the Board.
- 2. Other.** Other IRP members may request to attend face-to-face meetings of the Board as observers.

H. ASSESSMENTS

The IRP shall undertake and submit to the Board an annual assessment of its own performance. As part of this process, the Chair of the IRP may recommend to the Board the removal of an IRP member whose performance is deemed inadequate. The Board will review the assessment, evaluate the IRP's effectiveness in fulfilling its terms of reference, and respond accordingly.

I. REVIEW OF TERMS OF REFERENCE

The IRP shall review its Terms of Reference, including the Review Criteria set forth in Attachment 1 to these Terms of Reference, on an annual basis and submit any recommendations for changes to the Board for its review and approval. The Board or Secretariat may, after consulting with the IRP, also initiate suggested amendments to these Terms of Reference as necessary.

ATTACHMENT 1: REVIEW CRITERIA

A. PROPOSAL

Soundness of Approach

1. Responds to highest priorities and most critical gaps in preventing and countering violent extremism (“P/CVE”), reflecting the drivers, demography (including engendered issues), and geography of radicalisation to violence in a particular country.
2. Demonstrates a focus on identified vulnerable target populations.
3. Demonstrates local community ownership, leadership, and participation in the proposal.
4. Reflects current, evidence-based technical good practices and approaches that best fit specific country contexts for P/CVE and addressing the drivers of recruitment and radicalisation to violent extremist agendas.
5. Shows creativity and initiative in responding to opportunities and challenges posed by radicalisation to violent extremist agendas in a particular country.
6. Leverages the assets and resources available nationally and internationally to achieve its intended impact, while at the same time de-conflicting and harmonising with existing initiatives, to minimise duplication.
7. Delivers a technically sound and strategically focused response in a cost-effective manner, avoiding replication and any other form of waste.

Feasibility

1. Understands and responds to local political, social, legal, and economic opportunities and constraints that may enhance or prevent grant implementation.
2. Ensures structural barriers to accessing services, including those related to human rights, are adequately understood and addressed to achieve the goals.

Capacity Development

1. Demonstrates how the following capability of consortia members will be developed in the following areas:
 - Act and commit: to plan, take decisions, and act on these decisions collectively (e.g. appropriate governance, structures, leadership, management, ability to mobilise resources, programme and financial management).
 - Deliver on objectives (e.g. available resources, appropriate human resources, infrastructure, standards, performance measures).
 - Adapt and self-renew through learning and adaptation to changing external and internal environmental factors.
 - Establish and maintain relations with external stakeholders (e.g. their communities, government, private sector, and other civil society organisations).

- Achieve coherence in their identity, self-awareness, and discipline (e.g. clear mandate, mission, values and strategic directions, operationalised through appropriate principles, systems).

Potential for sustainable outcomes

1. Addresses the drivers of recruitment and radicalisation to violent extremist agendas in ways that bring about lasting improvements in the lives of focus populations and wider society.
2. Is consistent with broader P/CVE and development efforts, and complements national or international counterterrorism and development strategies and goals.
3. Develops the resilience and capacities of supported organisations, as long-term assets to their communities and countries.

B. APPLICANT

The Potential Principal Recipient in the application demonstrates the capacity to:

1. Engage with and mobilise relevant communities and other stakeholders in the development of a GCERF application.
2. Provide a robust and practical framework for monitoring and evaluation (M&E), appropriate to the scale of funding involved, while managing the risks associated with innovative approaches.
3. Provide necessary financial accountability and management of the grant funds, including those managed by its staff and those managed by other consortium members as required.
4. Identify and support the development of capacity of other consortia members.
5. Facilitate learning, coordination, and cooperation amongst key stakeholders.