

CDM-EB79-A01-PROC

Procedure

Selection and performance evaluation of members of panels and working groups under the CDM Executive Board

Version 01.0



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	3
1.1. Background	3
1.2. Objectives.....	3
2. SCOPE, APPLICABILITY, AND ENTRY INTO FORCE	3
2.1. Scope	3
2.2. Applicability	3
2.3. Entry into force	4
3. NORMATIVE REFERENCES	4
4. DEFINITIONS	4
5. SELECTION OF PANEL AND WORKING GROUP MEMBERS.....	4
5.1. Competence requirements.....	4
5.2. Selection process.....	5
5.2.1. Launch of call for applications	5
5.2.2. Eligibility check.....	5
5.2.3. Screening process	6
5.2.4. Consultation and approval	7
5.2.5. Shortlisting	8
5.2.6. Appointment of membership.....	9
6. EVALUATION AND REPORTING OF PERFORMANCE OF MEMBERS OF PANELS AND WORKING GROUPS	10
6.1. Performance evaluation	10
6.1.1. Performance evaluation of members reapplying for further terms	11
6.2. Performance reporting	11
APPENDIX. REFERENCE SHEET.....	12

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

1. Paragraph 18 of the annex to decision 3/CMP.1 (modalities and procedures for the clean development mechanism) and rule 32 of annex I to decision 4/CMP.1 (rules of procedure of the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism) provide for the establishment of committees, panels and working groups to assist the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (hereinafter referred to as the Board) in the performance of its functions.
2. Based on these, the Board established the following bodies:

The Methodologies Panel, the Small-Scale Working Group, the Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group and the Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage Working Group (these groups are hereinafter collectively referred to as “methodological bodies”), to support it in the creation of methodological standards, guidelines and clarifications and other methodological matters applicable to proposed and registered clean development mechanism (CDM) project activities or programmes of activities (PoAs);

The Accreditation Panel, to support it in the implementation of standards and procedures for the accreditation of operational entities that conduct validations and verifications regarding CDM project activities and PoAs.

1.2. Objectives

3. The objective of this procedure is to elaborate specific processes and guiding evaluation criteria to operationalize the selection and performance evaluation of members of panels and working groups, in line with paragraphs 23 and 27 respectively of the “Terms of reference of the support structure of the CDM Executive Board” version 04.0 (hereinafter referred to as the ToR).

2. Scope, applicability, and entry into force

2.1. Scope

4. The procedure elaborates specific processes and guiding evaluation criteria to operationalize the selection and performance evaluation of members of panels and working groups, in line with the provisions contained in the ToR.

2.2. Applicability

5. This procedure is applicable to applicants for and members of the following panels and working groups:
 - (a) CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP);
 - (b) Methodologies Panel (MP);
 - (c) Small-Scale Working Group (SSC WG);

- (d) Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group (A/R WG);
- (e) Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage Working Group (CCS WG).

6. This procedure is not applicable to applicants for and experts on the CDM Registration and Issuance Team roster of experts, the Methodological roster of experts or the Accreditation roster of experts.

2.3. Entry into force

7. The date of entry into force of the procedure is the date of publication of the EB 79 meeting report on 1 June 2014.

3. Normative references

8. This procedure should be read in conjunction with the following documents:
- (a) “Terms of reference of the support structure of the CDM Executive Board”.

4. Definitions

9. The definitions contained in the “Glossary of CDM terms” shall apply.

5. Selection of panel and working group members

5.1. Competence requirements

10. Experts interested in serving as members of panels and working groups shall fulfil the minimum requirements elaborated in the ToR, appendix, as well as any further requirements specified by the Board for each call for applications. Such further competency requirements will be specified on the respective call pages.
11. Table 1 specifies the evaluation criteria for the demonstration of skills and professional expertise.

Table 1. Evaluation parameters for fulfilment of competence requirements

Competence requirement (ToR)	Evaluation parameters
1. Be familiar with the CDM modalities and procedures and relevant decisions of the CMP	Exhibition of knowledge and overview of the main decisions and challenges relevant to the CDM
2. Have recognized experience and/or knowledge relevant to the CDM project activity cycle/programme of activities cycles	Demonstration by provision of examples where work undertaken (academia/private and public sector) had a direct impact on or link to the CDM project activity/programme of activities cycles
3. Demonstrated number of years of relevant working experience as specified in the ToR	Listing of professional employment and provision of references in the United Nations Personal History Form (P.11)
4. Be able to communicate effectively in English, both in writing and orally	Provision of well formulated (short, concise and non-repetitive) answers and references/links to publications or other major written output if any

Competence requirement (ToR)	Evaluation parameters
5. Have excellent drafting skills, strong operational and analytical skills, and ability to work as a member of a team	Demonstration by provision of examples of where work undertaken has required operational/analytical skills, and listing of previous and current memberships of relevant bodies
6. Have an advanced university degree in economics, environmental studies, natural sciences, engineering, or any related disciplines	Demonstration via P.11 form

5.2. Selection process

12. The selection process shall be open to both external applicants and appointed members who wish to reapply at the end of their term.
13. The selection process covers the launch of the call for applications, eligibility checks, screening (interviews/performance evaluation), consultation with chairs/vice-chairs, shortlisting, and selection by the Board.

5.2.1. Launch of call for applications

14. The secretariat shall launch the call for a period of 30 calendar days and ensure the announcement of the open call covers a well distributed geographical target audience.
15. The secretariat shall ensure the following information is available to applicants:
 - (a) General information on the selection process and timelines;
 - (b) The ToR containing information related to competence requirements and the code of conduct;
 - (c) Application questionnaire related to demonstration of competence requirements.
16. Experts interested in being appointed as members of any of the panels and working groups under the Board, and existing members who wish to reapply for a new term shall respond to the call for applications within the deadline specified on the call page in order to be considered.

5.2.2. Eligibility check

17. The secretariat shall undertake an eligibility check of applicants. The following constitute the eligibility criteria:
 - (a) Timely submission of a completed P.11 form and a completed application questionnaire;
 - (b) Confirmation of agreement to all provisions of the ToR, including the code of conduct;
 - (c) Fulfilment of competence requirements.
18. Any failure to agree to the ToR and the code of conduct provisions, late submission of the P.11 and/or application forms or non-fulfilment of the competence requirements shall result in disqualification.

5.2.3. Screening process

19. An application questionnaire that is only partly completed shall be evaluated based on the information given, and in case of any discrepancies between the information provided in the submitted application questionnaire and the P.11 form, the most conservative response shall be regarded as the applicable response.
20. The further process for evaluation of applicants depends on whether an applicant is external (i.e. new) or an existing member who has re-applied. External applicants may be invited to participate in a telephone/Skype interview to assess their competencies, whereas reapplying members shall be considered to fulfil the competence requirements and therefore are evaluated based on extent of fulfilment of their role as appointed members (see section 6).

5.2.3.1. External applicants - interviews

21. An external applicant shall be proposed for inclusion on the interview list based on the following criteria:
 - (a) Eligibility;
 - (b) Extent and depth of technical competencies;
 - (c) Relevance of technical competencies for the panel or working group's workplan (e.g. special skills);
 - (d) Regional affiliation;
 - (e) Gender.
22. The interview list shall be developed based on the above criteria in consultation with the relevant panel/working group chair/vice chair (see section 5.2.4.) and the final list shall seek to ensure applicants represent a fair regional balance and include as a minimum three applicants from each region, where possible.
23. In case of multiple applications, and in accordance with the composition requirements of the MP, the SSS WG, and the CCS WG as specified in annex 1 of the ToR, applicants may be interviewed for multiple related panels/working groups in one interview.
24. The interviews shall be conducted by interview panels consisting of cross-unit secretariat staff with process- and technical skills and shall last no more than 45 minutes.
25. The interview panels shall use standardized interview questions for related panels/working groups and record the results from the interviews as "for recommendation", "may be considered for recommendation pending other candidates" and "not suitable for recommendation".
26. Applicants' competencies shall be evaluated based on the criteria listed in table 1 with specific attention to oral and general communication skills in English (satisfactory/non-satisfactory), the type (technical/academic/political) of previous work, specific attributes as a member (value-added) and other issues (e.g. multiple applications).

27. For applicants with similar skills, preference shall be given to an applicant whose membership will contribute to a regionally balanced representation and/or gender balance.

5.2.3.2. Reapplying members - performance evaluation

28. See section 6.1.1.
29. The result of a reapplying member's performance evaluation shall clearly indicate the member's performance according to above average, average or below average performance. The performance evaluation results shall, for the purpose of shortlisting, be supplemented with a proposal for recommendation. A reapplying member may be proposed:
- (a) "For recommendation", if the member has an above average/average performance result;
 - (b) "To be considered for recommendation pending other candidates" if the member has an average/below average performance;
 - (c) "Not for recommendation" if the member has a below average performance or the possessed skills are no longer deemed in demand.
30. The performance evaluation scores shall generally be treated as indicative. For the selection process and pursuant to paragraph 29 above, this implies that special skills may for example result in a "for recommendation" rating despite a below average performance evaluation and likewise, a well performing member's set of skills may be considered superfluous in the context of the annual workplan for the panel/working group.

5.2.4. Consultation and approval

31. The secretariat shall consult with chairs and vice-chairs throughout the process and seek agreement from them on the following documents relevant for the selection process:
- (a) Final performance evaluations;
 - (b) Interview list;
 - (c) Shortlist for the Board's consideration, including nomination of alternatives.
32. The presentation of the shortlist for the Board's consideration shall include information on the consultation processes and clearly indicate whether agreement was reached on the matters referred to in paragraph 31(a), (b) and (c) and, in the event that agreement was not reached, reflect the different views for the Board's consideration.
33. The chairs and vice-chairs shall be provided with the following information:
- (a) Full list of applicants clearly indicating:
 - (i) Non-eligible/eligible applicants;
 - (ii) Applicants invited for interviews;
 - (iii) Applicants who are reapplying members;

- (iv) Applicants proposed for inclusion on the longlist;
 - (v) Applicants proposed for inclusion on the shortlist including nominations as alternatives;
 - (b) Performance evaluation scores (see section 6);
 - (c) P.11 forms of shortlisted applicants.
34. The chair and vice-chair shall further have access to the following information:
- (i) Interview reports;
 - (ii) P.11 forms of all applicants.

5.2.5. Shortlisting

35. The secretariat shall prepare a longlist, clearly indicating regional affiliation and gender, which includes:
- (a) Interviewed applicants whose interview result was “for recommendation” or “may be considered pending other candidates”;
 - (b) All reapplying members.
36. Based on this longlist, the secretariat shall prepare a first draft of a shortlist for consideration and input by the respective chairs and vice-chairs clearly indicating regional affiliation and key words related to skills/value-added. The shortlist shall include:
- (a) For the CDM-AP, the SSC WG, the A/R WG and the CCS WG:
 - (i) Five recommendations for appointment;
 - (ii) A maximum of three nominations for alternatives;
 - (b) For the MP:
 - (i) Ten recommendations for appointment;
 - (ii) A maximum of five nominations for alternatives.
37. The inclusion of applicants in the shortlist or their exclusion from it shall be based on consideration of:
- (a) Overall composition of skills in relation to the annual workplans;
 - (b) Benefits of continuity in memberships (i.e. added value of the continuity of the specific set of skills of reapplying members to the composition of the group) and the benefit of access to new skills and experience;
 - (c) Regional representation and gender balance.
38. The shortlist shall be circulated to the Board as a confidential annex to the annotations for the next Board meeting and presented during the Board meeting by the chairs of the respective panels and working groups, supported by the secretariat. The shortlist shall further be accompanied by the full list of applicants.

5.2.6. Appointment of membership

39. The Board shall consider the recommended shortlist and select members. The selected and outgoing members' names shall be recorded in the corresponding Board meeting report.
40. Applicants shall be notified of the result of their application. The secretariat shall as a priority inform the selected and unsuccessful reapplying member applicants of the outcome.
41. Selected members shall inform the secretariat at the earliest possible time of any conflicting commitments and be prepared to provide justification for any absence, including partial absence, at a particular meeting. Proper justifications includes:
 - (a) Hospitalization/sickness or emergencies in the immediate family;
 - (b) Previously planned professional commitments that clashes with the meeting.
42. The secretariat shall review and update incoming and outgoing members' status in the roster of experts system based on their new or terminated appointment as applicable.
43. The secretariat shall update the public panel and working group website with the newly appointed members' names in accordance with the start/end of their term of service.
44. The chair of a panel or working group may request specific outgoing members to attend the first meeting for incoming members to ensure continuity of the work of the panel/working group. Such a request may be made if the outgoing member has been assigned work which is placed on the agenda for the next meeting.
45. For the transition period of outgoing and incoming members, newly appointed members shall be treated as observers until the first meeting of the panel or working group for the incoming members. Observers may be granted access to the relevant extranet of the panels/working groups upon receipt of a signed no conflict of interest form.
46. New members shall be briefed by the secretariat on sources of information, their roles and responsibilities and performance monitoring either electronically and/or at the first meeting they attend.
47. Members shall provide the secretariat with:
 - (a) A scanned copy of their passport;
 - (b) Bank details;
 - (c) Signed declaration of no conflict of interest;
 - (d) A curriculum vitae as per the Board's template.
48. Members shall be assigned an index number by the secretariat no later than six weeks before their first scheduled meeting.

6. Evaluation and reporting of performance of members of panels and working groups

49. The performance evaluation activity is mandated in the ToR and used for three purposes:
- (a) Provision of input to the selection process;
 - (b) Provision of feedback from chairs to members on performance;
 - (c) Reporting to the Board.

6.1. Performance evaluation

50. Members' performance shall be evaluated based on the fulfilment of their responsibilities which are derived directly from the roles specified in the ToR in paragraph 4 for methodological bodies, and paragraph 5 for the CDM-AP.
51. The criterion for fulfilment is the active provision of input to all the sub-components of these roles and the fulfilment of responsibilities as an appointed member shall be evaluated based on performance.
52. Where a member's appointment is attached to a specific role in line with the provisions in the ToR, appendix 1, the performance evaluation shall take this into consideration.
53. Performance evaluation shall be undertaken for the duration of the terms of service and cover both physical and electronic meetings and coincide with the schedule of meetings.
54. The results of performance evaluation of individual members of panels and working groups shall be treated as confidential.
55. The secretariat shall ensure that the performance evaluations are undertaken in a standardized manner i.e. by using standard evaluation forms and a reference sheet which shall be consulted for guidance on interpretation of parameters and scores (appendix).
56. The secretariat and chair and vice-chair of the respective panel or working group shall evaluate the performance of individual members also ensuring that the parameters are evaluated by the most competent part.
57. Members' performance shall be evaluated based on the following two parameters, designed to cover the key functions of appointed members and depending on relevance for each panel/ working group:
- (a) Paid work (evaluated for each case individual members have been assigned to);
 - (b) In-meeting activity.
58. The "paid work" performance parameter is evaluated as a function of level of complexity of the case, quality of input, and timeliness which refers to severity of missed deadlines.
59. The "in-meeting activity" is evaluated as a function of level of activity and quality of inputs.

60. The results of the performance evaluations shall be recorded as numeric values and compiled in a spreadsheet for tracking, analysis and reporting purposes. The results shall be accompanied by information on members' adherence to the code of conduct including the conflict of interest forms.

6.1.1. Performance evaluation of members reapplying for further terms

61. Reapplying members shall be considered as automatically fulfilling the competence requirements.
62. Reapplying members' applications shall therefore be evaluated based on the performance evaluation of the extent of fulfilment of their responsibilities as appointed members.
63. For consideration in the selection process, members' performance results shall, as a minimum, cover two full meetings and for the MP and SSC WG also assignment of a minimum of two cases. If a member has been absent and only participated in one meeting, the matter shall be forwarded to the Board for determining the modality to handle it. Special circumstances such as maternity or extended sick leave should not negatively impact the performance evaluation of a member.

6.2. Performance reporting

64. The secretariat shall compile the members' individual results mid-term with the aim of supporting the process of providing feedback to the members. The modality for provision of feedback to individual members of panels and working groups shall be at the prerogative of the respective chairs.
65. The aim of such feedback shall be to allow a member to improve his/her performance. Where the performance evaluation has identified a need for improvement, the feedback may include an encouragement to the member to be more proactive during discussions, improve the quality and timeliness of submissions, ensure a high level of preparedness for in-meeting discussions or more actively share his/her expertise with the rest of the group.
66. Where the performance evaluation has identified an unsatisfactory level of performance with no prospect of improvement, the provisions in paragraph 26 of the ToR apply.
67. The secretariat shall assist in the processing of queries received from members in response to the feedback in consultation with the chairs and vice-chairs.
68. The secretariat shall report to the Board on the members' performance, by preparing a consolidated performance report. This report shall include:
- (a) Data for the performance of each panel and working group member with average scores for each parameter.
69. The reporting shall be done prior to the launch of the call for the selection of new panel and working group members in order to allow the Board to consider the scope for the launch of the call for new members. The report shall be treated confidentially.

Appendix. Reference sheet

Table 1. Reference sheet

Score	Definition	Examples and description of definition levels
Assignment score (paid work)		
Complexity/ effort level: 1 to 5		
1	very easy	Typically a pre-assessment of a PNM/request for clarification
2	Easy	Typically a pre-assessment of a PNM/request for clarification
3	medium	Typically a draft response to a request for revision/input to the secretariat's draft guidelines, revisions to guidelines, standards etc.
4	difficult	Typically a recommendation on a PNM/ recommendation on the secretariat's drafts for top-down methodologies, revisions and tools
5	complicated	Typically a recommendation on a PNM/ recommendation on the secretariat's drafts for top-down methodologies, revisions and tools
Quality level: 1 to 3		
1	Poor	The response needs substantial format and content review by the secretariat. Input not well considered or relevant and creates extra work for the secretariat
2	Good	Good response/input which leaves some work by the secretariat to finalize the case
3	very good	Assessment/inputs are well considered and relevant and the response needs very limited further work by the secretariat
Timeliness (submission delays): -2 to 0		
0	0 delay	Submitted on time and in accordance with agreed deadline
-1	Max. two days delay	Submission received at a maximum of two calendar days after agreed DL and without agreement on extension
-2	More than two days delay	Submission received more than two days after agreed DL
In-meeting performance		
Level of participation: 1 to 3		
1	not active	No exhibition of interest in understanding issues of relevance to the whole group, participation is limited to own fields of expertise
2	active	Participates actively in majority of the discussions, participation extends to all cases bordering the member's field of expertise. Exhibition of interest in issues of general interest to the panel/WG
3	proactive	Proactive engagement in the work tasks of the panel/WG. Always engages in discussion on issues of his/her area of expertise and bordering fields of expertise. Seeks to understand and reach consensus in order to reach conclusions

Quality of interventions: 1 to 3		
1	poor	Provision of general comments with no value-added/factually incorrect/misunderstood
2	good	Provision of input which adds to the discussion/adds value to the presentations within own field of expertise
3	very good	Provision of substantive input which adds value and moves the discussion forward also on issues of general interest/opens new aspects/proposes relevant solutions/ improves clarity

- - - - -

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	1 June 2014	EB 79, Annex 1 Initial adoption.

Decision Class: Operational, Regulatory

Document Type: Procedure

Business Function: Governance

Keywords: AP, ARWG, CCSWG, MP, panels, SSCWG, appointment of members, performance evaluation, rules of procedure, terms of reference
