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**Terms of Reference for the CSPEs Internal Reference Group (IRG)**

1. **Background**

The Internal Reference Group (IRG) is an advisory group providing advice and feedback to the Evaluation Manager and the evaluation team at key moments during the evaluation process. It is established during the preparatory stage of the evaluation and is mandatory for all CSPEs.

1. **Purpose and Guiding Principles of the IRG**

The overall purpose of the IRG is to contribute to the credibility, utility and impartiality of the evaluation. For this purpose, its composition and role are guided by the following principles:

* *Transparency*: Keeping relevant stakeholders engaged and informed during key steps ensures transparency throughout the evaluation process.
* *Ownership* and *Use*: Stakeholders’ participation enhances ownership of the evaluation process and products, which in turn may impact on its use.
* *Accuracy*: feedback from stakeholders at key steps of the preparatory, data collection and reporting phases contributes to accuracy of the facts and figures reported in the evaluation and of its analysis.
1. **Roles**

Members are expected to review and comment on evaluation deliverables and share relevant insights at key consultation points of the evaluation process.

The IRGs main role is as follows:

* Participate in face-to-face or virtual briefings to the evaluation team during the inception phase and/or evaluation phase.
* Suggest key references and data sources in their area of expertise.
* Participate in field debriefings (optional).
* Review and comment on the draft evaluation report and related annexes, with a particular focus on: a) factual errors and/or omissions that could invalidate the findings and change the conclusions; b) issues of political sensitivity that need to be refined in the way they are addressed or in the language used; c) recommendations.
* Participate in national learning workshops to validate findings and discuss recommendations.
* Provide guidance on suggested communications products to disseminate learning from the evaluation.

IRG members, particularly those nominated as country office evaluation focal points are responsible for gathering inputs to evaluation products from their colleagues.

1. **Membership**

The IRG is composed of selected WFP stakeholders from mainly country office and regional bureaus. IRG members should be carefully selected based on the types of activities being implemented at country level, the size of the country office and the staffing components at regional bureau level. Selected HQ staff may also be included in the IRG, depending on the CSPE context and the availability of expertise at RB level[[1]](#footnote-1) (where no technical lead is in post at RB level, HQ technical staff should be invited to the IRG).

The table below provides an overview of IRG composition that allows for flexibility to adapt to specific country activities. The IRG should not exceed 15 active members.

| **Country Office** | **Regional Bureau** | **Head Quarters****(optional as needed and relevant to country activities)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * Evaluation focal point (nominated by CD)
* Head of Programme
* Deputy Country Director(s)
* Country Director (for smaller country offices)
 | *Core Members:** Regional Supply Chain Officer
* Senior Regional Programme Advisor
* Regional Head of VAM
* Regional Emergency Preparedness & Response Unit Officer
* Regional Gender Adviser
* Regional Humanitarian Adviser (or Protection Adviser)
* Regional Monitoring Officer

*Other possible complementary members as relevant to country activities:** Senior Regional Nutrition Adviser
* Regional School Feeding Officer
* Regional Partnerships Officer
* Regional Programme Officers (Cash-based transfers/social protection/resilience and livelihoods)
* Regional HR Officer
* Regional Risk Management Officer

**Keep in copy: REO and RDD** | * [Technical Assistance and Country Capacity Strengthening Service](https://newgo.wfp.org/about/technical-assistance-and-country-capacity-strengthening-service), OSZI
* School Based Programmes, SBP
* Protection and AAP, OSZP
* Emergencies and Transition Unit, OSZPH.
* Cash-based Transfers, CBT.
* Staff from Food Security, Logistics and Emergency Telecoms Global Clusters

A broader group of senior stakeholders should be kept informed at key points in the evaluation process, in line with [OEV Communication Protocol](https://wfp.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/s/OfficeofEvaluation/EdHJDGtqeoBOnWC6jVZgawIBEJkNTsm20EpV_Tlb19cKGw)  |

1. **Approach for engaging the IRG:**

The OEV Regional Unit Head will engage with regional bureau (DRD) ahead of time to prepare for the upcoming evaluation, and to agree on the types and level of engagement expected from IRG members.

While the IRG members are not formally required to provide feedback on the Terms of Reference (ToR), the OEV Regional Unit Head and OEV Evaluation Manager will consult with the Regional Programme Advisor and the Regional Evaluation Officer at an early stage of ToR drafting, particularly as relates to: a) temporal and thematic scope of the evaluation, including any strategic regional strategic issues; b) evaluability of the CSP; c) humanitarian situation and d) key donors and other strategic partners.

Once the draft ToR are ready, the OEV Evaluation Manager will prepare a communication to be sent from Director OEV to the Country Director, with copy to the Regional Bureau, requesting comments to the ToR from the Country Office and proposing the composition of the IRG for transparency.

The final version of the CSPE TORs will be shared with the IRG for information. IRG members will be given the opportunity to share their views on the evaluation scope, evaluability, partnerships etc. during the inception phase. The final version of the inception report will also be shared with the IRG for information. As mentioned in section 3 of this ToR, IRG members will also be invited to comment on the draft evaluation report and to participate in the national learning workshop to validate findings and discuss recommendations.

1. An example would be members from the Emergencies Operations Division where there is a level 2 or level 3 emergency response as a CSPE component. Or a HQ technical lead where there is an innovative programme being piloted. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)