

SDM-CDM-SOP01

Procedure

Payments of task fees to members of the support structure of the CDM Executive Board

Version 2.0



TABLE OF CONTENTS		Page
1. INTRODUCTION		3
2. SCOPE, APPLICABILITY, AND ENTRY INTO FORCE.....		3
2.1. Scope		3
2.2. Applicability		3
3. NORMATIVE REFERENCES		4
4. PAYMENT OF FEES FOR SPECIFIC TASKS UNDERTAKEN BY MEMBERS OF PANELS AND WORKING GROUPS.....		4
Appendix Standard days and range of effort for tasks undertaken by members of panels and groups		7

1. Introduction

1. In accordance with paragraph 32 of the “Terms of reference of the support structure of the CDM Executive Board” (hereinafter referred to as the Terms of Reference), members of panels and working groups established under the Executive Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board) of the clean development mechanism (CDM) shall be compensated for specific tasks requested of and undertaken by the members, by means of payment of daily fees subject to the provision of good quality and timely submission. In this context, the same paragraph further states that “The daily fee shall be determined in accordance with United Nations rules and regulations” and “The determination of the effort of the task in terms of days shall be determined by the secretariat in consultation with the chair of the panel or working group”.
2. Currently, the procedures developed by the Board that involve members of a panel or working group to perform specific tasks do not define the effort of the tasks in terms of days. Furthermore, there are cases where tasks that are not specified in any of the existing procedures developed by the Board are required to be undertaken by members of panels and working groups based on a request by the Board or the secretariat. Regardless of the origin of requests, the secretariat has been making payments of all of these task fees to the members following internally established practices.

2. Scope, applicability, and entry into force

2.1. Scope

3. The purpose of this document is to:
 - (a) Specify and consolidate in a single document the provisions and the practices that the secretariat has developed in consultation with the Chairs of the Board, panels and working groups in order to provide compensation for the tasks undertaken by members of the panels and working groups as required by relevant procedures, or requested by the Board or the secretariat;
 - (b) Ensure consistent and equitable compensation to all members of the panels and working groups for the tasks that they have undertaken;
 - (c) Provide a framework to staff members of the secretariat to carry out their functions with respect to the payment of fees for the tasks undertaken by members of the panels and working groups.
4. The linkage of this document to the applicable United Nations rules and regulations complies with the mandate given by the Board in the Terms of Reference.

2.2. Applicability

5. The document shall be applicable for payments made to members of panels and working groups established under the Board for tasks assigned on specific cases (in preparation of physical or virtual meetings and electronic decision-making).

3. Normative references

6. Due to the nature of the functions that the members of panels and working groups perform, the secretariat has classified them, for the purpose of task fee payment, as “consultants” as defined in Administrative Instruction ST/AI/1999/7, “Consultants and participants in advisory meetings” as last amended by ST/AI/1999/7A,EMD.¹ and in the “Secretary-General’s comprehensive guidelines for the use of consultants in the Secretariat” of 15 September 1998 (A/53/385). However, in the case of members of panels and working groups, the guidelines can only be applied mutatis mutandis.
7. With regard to the remuneration of consultants, section 5.7 of ST/AI/1999/7 states that: “The level of remuneration payable to a consultant shall be determined on the basis of the following elements:
 - (a) The level of gross salary, that is, excluding post adjustment, for staff in the Professional and higher categories;
 - (b) Levels of expertise and professional capacity, linked to grades in the salary scale;
 - (c) Special circumstances, including hardship involved in the performance of the work assignment.”
8. Based on the United Nations rules and regulations referred to in paragraphs 6 and 7 above, the daily fee rate for the tasks undertaken by members of the panels and working groups has been set at USD 400.

4. Payment of fees for specific tasks undertaken by members of panels and working groups

9. The tasks for which fees shall be paid to the members of the panels and working groups who undertook the tasks are as follows:
10. For members of the Methodologies Panel, Small-Scale Working Group, Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group, Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage Working Group (hereinafter these panel/groups are collectively referred to as methodological bodies) the following tasks are performed:
 - (a) Development of new methodologies or methodological tools:
 - (i) Review of a draft recommendation prepared by the secretariat in the bottom-up process of development of methodologies;
 - (ii) Review the draft development plan prepared by the secretariat in the top-down process of development of methodologies;
 - (iii) Review the draft methodology or methodological tool prepared by the secretariat in the top-down process of development of methodologies;

¹ A consultant is “an individual who is a recognized authority or specialist in a specific field, engaged by the United Nations under temporary contract in an advisory or consultative capacity to the secretariat”. Members of panels and working groups are specialists in their respective fields and it is in this capacity that they are required to perform tasks between meetings of panels and groups.

- (b) Revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool:
 - (i) Review the recommendation prepared by the secretariat in the bottom-up process of development of methodologies;
 - (ii) Review the draft revised methodology or methodological tool prepared by the secretariat in the top-down process of development of methodologies;
 - (iii) Review a draft editorially revised methodology or methodological tool prepared by the secretariat;
 - (c) Clarification of an approved methodology or methodological tool:
 - (i) Review the draft recommendation of a clarification prepared by the secretariat;
 - (d) Provide input to the preparation of a summary note on a request for deviation from an approved methodology;
 - (e) Assess specific technologies/measures as conferring additionality on microscale clean development mechanism (CDM) project activities proposed by a designated national authority (DNA) for its country and the draft recommendation on it prepared by the secretariat;
 - (f) Review the draft recommendation prepared by the secretariat on a proposed standardized baseline;
 - (g) Provide inputs to the secretariat on draft guidelines, revision to guidelines, standards, concept notes, etc.;
 - (h) Perform specific tasks, such as:
 - (i) Providing input on requests from the Board or Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP);
 - (ii) Undertaking the assigned peer review of cases for complex revisions and reformatted methodologies (approved methodologies or revision of approved methodologies);
 - (iii) Drafting new methodologies and tools (top-down development);
 - (iv) Revision of methodologies or tools initiated by the commenting system, panel/working group members and the secretariat.
11. For members of the Accreditation Panel:
- (a) Provide inputs on regulatory documents, such as the accreditation procedure and the accreditation standard;
 - (b) Provide inputs on the draft guidelines for the CDM assessment teams, forms and other documents;
 - (c) Review the qualification/competence of proposed CDM assessment team experts;
 - (d) Draft any other recommendations as required.

12. The secretariat shall pay the fees for the tasks listed in paragraphs 11 and 12 to the members of the panels and working groups who undertook the tasks, using the standard person-days of the effort for each task, as defined in the appendix to this document.
13. Assignments of specific tasks to members of panels and working groups shall be made in consultation with the secretariat's Process Management Unit (PMU).
14. If the secretariat in consultation with the chair of the corresponding panel/working group finds that a task requires a longer or shorter time to complete than the standard time specified in person-days for the corresponding task in the appendix, it shall, notwithstanding paragraph 12 above, adjust the person-days of the effort within the range indicated in the appendix, and pay the adjusted fees for the task to the members of the panel or working group accordingly.
15. If the secretariat in consultation with the chair of the corresponding panel or working group finds that a task requires a longer or shorter time for the effort outside the range of the person-days of the effort defined in the appendix for the corresponding task, it shall, notwithstanding paragraphs 12 and 14 above, adjust the person-days of the effort to the appropriate level, and pay the adjusted fees for the task to the members of the panel or working group accordingly.
16. The secretariat after consultation with the chair of the corresponding panel or working group shall initiate the payment of a task fee in accordance with paragraph 12, 14 or 15 above only after it has confirmed that the completed task was of good quality and submitted on time. In case of doubt about the quality of the completed task, or if the completion was not on time, or no input was received, the secretariat shall consult with the chair of the panel or working group on whether to pay the fee to the member in full or at reduced person-days of the effort, or to withhold all payment of the fee.
17. With regard to a task performed by a panel or working group member, the task shall be regarded as completed when the panel has considered the task performed, or, if applicable, the secretariat has received the deliverable produced in good quality.
18. The secretariat shall record all payments of task fees, specifying, inter alia, the name of the fee recipient, the name of the panel or working group that the recipient belongs to as a member, the type of task, the date of finalization of the task (submission of the completed work), the amount of fee paid, the reason for increase or decrease from the standard person-days as applicable, and the date of disbursement of fee to the recipient.
19. The secretariat shall disburse the payment of task fees to each panel member or working group member for all the tasks completed by the member upon publically reporting the consideration of the case.

Appendix Standard days and range of effort for tasks undertaken by members of panels and groups

Table 1. Standard and range of effort for tasks undertaken by members of the methodological bodies

Tasks undertaken by members of the methodological bodies	Standard days and range of effort for task
Development of new methodologies or methodological tools	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of a draft recommendation prepared by the secretariat in the bottom-up process 	1 day [$\frac{1}{2}$ –1 day]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the draft development plan prepared by the secretariat in the top-down process 	1 day [$\frac{1}{2}$ –1 day]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the draft methodology or methodological tool prepared by the secretariat in the top-down process 	1 day [$\frac{1}{2}$ –2 days]
Revision of an approved methodology or methodological tool:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the recommendation prepared by the secretariat in the bottom-up process 	1 day [$\frac{1}{2}$ –1 day]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the draft revised methodology or methodological tool prepared by the secretariat in the top-down process 	1 day [$\frac{1}{2}$ –1 day]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review a draft editorially revised methodology or methodological tool prepared by the secretariat 	$\frac{1}{2}$ day [$\frac{1}{2}$ –1 day]
Clarification of an approved methodology or methodological tool	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the draft recommendation of a clarification prepared by the secretariat 	$\frac{1}{2}$ day [$\frac{1}{4}$ – $\frac{1}{2}$ day]
Review a draft response on a request for deviation from an approved methodology	$\frac{1}{2}$ day [$\frac{1}{2}$ –1 day]
Assess specific renewable technologies/measures as conferring additionality on microscale CDM project activities proposed by a DNA for its country and the draft recommendation on it prepared by the secretariat	1 day [$\frac{1}{2}$ –1 day]
Review the draft recommendation prepared by the secretariat on a proposed standardized baseline	1 day [$\frac{1}{2}$ –2 days]
Provide inputs to the secretariat on draft guidelines, revision to guidelines, standards, concept notes, etc.	$\frac{1}{2}$ day [$\frac{1}{2}$ –1day]

Table 2. Standard and range of effort for tasks undertaken by members of the methodological bodies (specific input)

Task	Standard effort and range
Draft the pre-assessment of a proposed new methodology	½ day [½–1 day]
Draft an assessment of a proposed new methodology (either submitted by project participants or initiated by the secretariat)	1 day [½–1 day]
Assess a request for revision to an approved methodology	½ day [½–1 day]
Review of a draft recommendation on a request for clarification to an approved methodology	½ day [¼ –½days]
Review a draft recommendation on a request for deviation from an approved methodology	½ day [½–1 day]
Assigned peer-review of cases for complex revisions and reformatted methodologies (approved methodologies or revision of approved methodologies)	1 day [1–2 days]
Reformatting proposed new methodologies (should be done by secretariat, exceptions need clearance by manager)	1 day [1–2 days]

Table 3. Range of effort for tasks undertaken by members of the Accreditation Panel

Tasks undertaken by members of the Accreditation Panel	Range of effort
Provide inputs on regulatory documents, such as the accreditation procedure and the accreditation standard	1–2 days
Provide inputs on the draft guidelines for the CDM assessment teams, forms and other documents	½–1 day
Review the qualification of proposed CDM assessment team experts	½–1 day
Draft other recommendations (case by case)	1–2 days

Note: The actual effort shall be estimated by the secretariat in consultation with the chairs of panels and working groups within the ranges stated above.

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
02.0	28 May 2014	Revision to correct paragraph 11 and Table 3.
01.0	26 May 2014	Initial publication.

Decision Class: Operational, Regulatory

Document Type: SDM Operating Procedure

Business Function: Governance

Keywords: AP, ARWG, CCSWG, MP, panels, payments, SSCWG
