

CDM-EB83-A16-PROC

Procedure

Selection and performance evaluation of experts on the CDM Registration and Issuance Team and Methodologies rosters of experts

Version 01.0



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	3
1.1. Background	3
2. SCOPE, APPLICABILITY, AND ENTRY INTO FORCE	3
2.1. Scope	3
2.2. Applicability	3
2.3. Entry into force	3
3. NORMATIVE REFERENCES	3
4. DEFINITIONS	4
5. SELECTION OF EXPERTS FOR THE ROSTERS	4
5.1. Competence requirements.....	4
5.2. Selection process.....	4
5.2.1. General.....	4
5.2.2. Launch of call and applications.....	4
5.2.3. Processing of applications	5
5.2.4. Appointment and termination of roster membership	6
6. ASSIGNMENT OF CASES	7
7. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF EXPERTS ON THE ROSTERS	8
7.1. Performance evaluation	8
7.2. Performance reporting	9
APPENDIX 1. REFERENCE SHEET FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF RIT ROSTER EXPERTS.	11
APPENDIX 2. REFERENCE SHEET FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF METH ROSTER EXPERTS.....	12

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

1. The Executive Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board) of the clean development mechanism (CDM) has established the following rosters of experts to support its work in the supervision of the CDM in the areas of registration and issuance and methodology development:
 - (a) The Registration and Issuance Team (RIT) roster from which experts are drawn to assist the Board in the consideration of requests for registration of proposed project activities and programmes of activities and requests for issuance of certified emissions reductions by providing independent assessments of the requests placed under review. Experts for the RIT roster are selected by the Board;
 - (b) The Methodologies roster of experts (Meth roster), managed by the secretariat and from which experts are drawn to assist the secretariat and the methodological bodies (i.e. the Methodologies Panel, the Small-Scale Working Group, the Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group and the Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage Working Group) in the development, revision and clarification of methodologies, methodological tools and standardized baselines by providing technical input. Experts for the Meth roster are selected by the secretariat.

2. Scope, applicability, and entry into force

2.1. Scope

2. The procedure elaborates specific processes and guiding evaluation criteria to operationalize the selection and performance evaluation of experts on the rosters, in line with the provisions contained in paragraphs 19, 20 and 24 of the “Terms of reference of the CDM rosters of experts” (ToR).

2.2. Applicability

3. This procedure is applicable to applicants for and experts on the CDM Registration and Issuance Team and Meth rosters. It is not applicable to applicants for and experts on the Accreditation roster of experts.

2.3. Entry into force

4. The date of entry into force of the procedure is the date of publication of the report of the eighty-third meeting of the Board, i.e. 16 April 2015.

3. Normative references

5. This procedure should be read in conjunction with the following document:
 - (a) “Terms of reference of the CDM rosters of experts” (CDM-EB74-A02-PROC).

4. Definitions

6. The definitions contained in the “Glossary: CDM terms” (CDM-EB07-A04-GLOS) shall apply.
7. Unless otherwise specified, the provisions in the following paragraphs shall apply to experts on the Meth and the RIT rosters.

5. Selection of experts for the rosters

5.1. Competence requirements

8. Applicants interested in serving as experts on the rosters shall fulfil the minimum requirements elaborated in paragraphs 13-16 of the ToR, as well as any further requirements specified by the Board for each call for applications. Such further competency requirements shall be specified on the respective web pages of the calls.

5.2. Selection process

5.2.1. General

9. The secretariat shall initiate the selection process every two years. A call for experts to become UNFCCC approved methodology or RIT experts shall be open to both external applicants and existing experts on the rosters who wish to reapply. The call shall specify whether experts on the rosters may respond to the call by confirming their intention to remain as experts on the respective rosters or whether they need to reapply.

5.2.2. Launch of call and applications

10. 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.
11. The secretariat shall ensure the following information is available to applicants:
 - (a) General information on the selection process and timelines;
 - (b) The “Terms of reference of the CDM rosters of experts” (ToR) containing information related to competence requirements and the code of conduct, including the conflict of interest provisions;
 - (c) Application questionnaire related to demonstration of competence requirements;
 - (d) Information on assignment types, timeliness and remuneration.
12. A call for experts may be limited to specific areas of expertise, considering the performance of existing experts on the rosters, overlaps of expertise, the need for new perspectives and a balanced workload among experts on the rosters.
13. The secretariat shall inform existing experts on the rosters of the calls and invite them to reapply or confirm their continued interest to be on the roster as applicable. Existing roster experts who confirm their interest in continuing the term of service shall update their United Nations Personal History Form (P.11) form, but shall not, however, be required to submit a new application unless otherwise instructed by the secretariat (for

reasons such as changes in competency requirements, a need for consent to the ToR, etc.).

14. New applicants shall submit a duly completed application form P.11 form as well as clearly indicate where required in the application form their agreement to abide by the code of conduct in the ToR, including the conflict of interest provisions and consent to the publication of their name on the website if approved as an expert on the roster and the publication of a short curriculum vitae (CV) upon request.

5.2.3. Processing of applications

15. Applicants who fail to agree to the ToR or who submit their application after the deadline shall be disqualified and rejected.
16. The processing of applications for the RIT shall be done by the secretariat via presentation to the Board of proposals of the best qualified applicants for the Board's consideration. Such proposals shall be accompanied by the full list of applicants. All the proposals shall take into account the coverage of sectoral scopes and regional and gender balance.
17. The proposals shall take into account and include:
 - (a) A shortlist of new applicants ranked according to fulfillment of the criteria prescribed in the ToR. For this purpose, each applicant is evaluated against each criterion using a rating scale of 1 to 4, where a score of 1 is used to indicate that the applicant is deemed eligible, and 2-4 are used to indicate increasing levels of competence. For example, with regard to the criteria on publications by the applicant, the more publications, the higher the rating will be;
 - (b) A report on the performance of existing roster experts for those RIT experts who have reapplied for a further term of service (refer to section 6.1).
18. The processing of applications for the Meth roster shall be done via an automated workflow by the secretariat.
19. For Meth roster applicants, the secretariat shall undertake the evaluations in the workflow and determine, for each application, whether to approve the applicant as an expert on the roster, reject the applicant or request more information from the applicant taking into account the coverage of sectoral scopes and regional and gender balance.
20. For the processing of Meth roster applications, the secretariat may consult with panel/working group members and delegate the evaluation function to members directly in the workflow. In this case, the secretariat shall select panel or working group members who have the same field of expertise as the applicant to be evaluated. The secretariat shall also seek to mitigate any potential conflicts of interest between the member evaluator and the applicant by requesting members to disclose any such conflicts of interest prior to the start of the evaluation. The secretariat shall seek a balanced distribution of delegated evaluations among panel and working group members.
21. New Meth roster applicants shall be evaluated based on the quality and relevance of the responses provided concerning the competency requirements specified in the ToR and responses to the application questions. In cases of multiple applicants with similar skills and profiles, the applicants shall be re-evaluated for each criterion using a rating scale of 1 to 4, where a score of 1 is used to indicate that the applicant deemed eligible, and 2-4

are used to indicate increasing levels of competence and the highest ranking applicants chosen.

22. A partially completed application form shall be evaluated based on the information given. In case of discrepancies between the information provided in the application form and the P.11 form, the most conservative information shall be regarded as the applicable response.
23. Existing roster experts who reapply for a further term, shall be evaluated based on the performance evaluation obtained for paid work undertaken in the previous period of service as well as their updated P.11 form, with a view to a decision on continuation or discontinuation being made by the secretariat for the Meth roster experts and by the Board for the RIT roster experts in accordance with the ToR, while also considering the overall composition of the roster and access to skills.
24. The secretariat may further take into consideration performance exhibited during other memberships of panels, working groups, teams or rosters under the Board if deemed relevant.

5.2.4. Appointment and termination of roster membership

25. The Board shall select RIT roster experts, and the secretariat shall select Meth roster experts, taking into account the coverage of sectoral scopes, and regional and gender balance as appropriate so that the number of available experts at all times is:
 - (a) For the RIT roster: no fewer than 20 approved experts;
 - (b) For the Meth roster: no fewer than 20 approved experts, and a maximum of 50 experts.
26. The term of service of experts on the RIT and Meth rosters shall be for a minimum of two years in accordance with the ToR. The experts shall be kept on the roster and may be assigned work until they are replaced by other experts for a new term.
27. All applicants for the rosters shall be notified of the result of their application by the secretariat.
28. Once the term of service as an expert on the roster has started or ended, the secretariat shall take all administrative steps to effectuate the status.
29. The secretariat shall make publicly available approved experts' names on the UNFCCC CDM website no later than 15 working days after selection by the Board of RIT experts, and closure of the call for Meth roster experts.
30. To avoid conflict of interest of experts working in multiple bodies under the Board and thereby to ensure the integrity and independence of the system the following shall apply for the Meth roster:¹
 - (a) If an existing expert on the Meth roster is appointed as a member of a panel or working group under the Board or as a Board member or alternate, his/her roster membership shall be placed "on hold";

¹ RIT assessments are submitted directly to the Board, in contrast to methodological desk reviews which are considered by panel/working groups prior to making recommendations to the Board.

- (b) A member whose roster membership was placed on hold, may have his/her roster membership reinstated and be contracted for roster assignments based on the following three criteria:
 - (i) The methodological body of which the expert is a member has been designated a “sleeping panel/working group”;
 - (ii) The assigned case is not on the agenda for consideration by the sleeping panel/working group; or
 - (iii) Upon termination of his/her membership of the panel/working group or the Board;
- (c) An approved expert on the Meth roster may remain an approved expert on the Accreditation Roster of Experts, the RIT, or as a CDM Accreditation Panel member, as applicable.

6. Assignment of cases

- 31. When assigning cases to roster experts the secretariat shall initiate the provision of expert services by taking into consideration the technical skills required, the sectoral scope(s) of the project activity or PoA to be reviewed and:
 - (a) From the Meth roster identify one or two experts as required in accordance with the relevant procedure;
 - (b) From the RIT roster identify two experts, one being the lead and one being the member;
 - (c) Send a notification of appointment to the identified roster expert with a request for confirmation of availability and a case specific conflict of interest declaration within three calendar days of receipt of the notification, or another deadline as specified. A failure to respond by the deadline given, shall be interpreted as the roster expert not being available.
- 32. The secretariat shall seek to ensure a balanced workload among approved experts on the roster. For this purpose, the secretariat may place an upper limit on the number of times an approved expert may be assigned to specific types of cases (desk reviews or assessments), while also recognizing that certain fields of expertise have a very narrow scope and the ultimate goal is to deliver high quality products. The secretariat shall review the workload balance among approved experts on the roster throughout the term and use this information to help develop the specification of a new call for experts.
- 33. Approved experts on the roster shall provide the secretariat with:
 - (a) A scanned copy of their passport;
 - (b) Their bank details.
- 34. Upon request, experts on the roster shall provide the secretariat with:
 - (a) A CV as per the Board’s template;
 - (b) A duly signed contract as provided to them for signature by the secretariat, including a statement of no conflict of interest for each assignment.

7. Performance evaluation of experts on the rosters

7.1. Performance evaluation

35. All approved experts who are appointed to undertake work, shall be subject to performance evaluation.
36. Performance evaluation results shall be treated as confidential and shall not be disclosed to any party other than the Board and panels and working groups if applicable and agreed to by the respective chair of a panel or working group or upon request to an expert for his/her own results.
37. The performance evaluation shall be undertaken in an aligned and standardized manner for work (RIT assessment reports and meth desk reviews) that entitles an expert to payment and by use of a reference sheet for guidance on interpretation of parameters and scoring (see appendices 1 and 2).
38. For the RIT roster:
 - (a) The Board shall undertake the performance evaluation of experts on the RIT roster of experts and for this purpose shall designate four members or alternate members of the Board as evaluators for a period of one year, taking into account regional balance;
 - (b) The evaluators shall elect the lead of the evaluator group at the same Board meeting at which the evaluators are elected;
 - (c) The secretariat shall prepare draft performance evaluation recommendations based on a review of the RIT assessment reports and submit them to the Board and the evaluators before the penultimate meeting of the year, including supporting documentation;
 - (d) The secretariat shall, on a continuing basis, provide to each Board member and alternate member, the RIT assessment reports, whenever they are received from the RIT expert, together with a form pre-filled with relevant information for each assigned case, containing project number, title, type, assessment team names and issues at stake, if any, for the evaluators to prepare their individual evaluation of the performance of each RIT expert;
 - (e) All other Board members and alternate members may provide input on a voluntary basis to the secretariat using the form, which shall be forwarded to the evaluators;
 - (f) Each evaluator shall prepare his/her own performance evaluation recommendations and submit them to the lead of the evaluator group before the penultimate meeting of the year;
 - (g) The lead of the evaluator group shall consider the recommendations prepared by individual evaluators, taking into account the draft recommendations prepared by the secretariat, and prepare final performance evaluation recommendations based on consensus by all evaluators.

- (h) The lead of the evaluator group shall report the final performance evaluation recommendations on the RIT roster experts to the Board at its last meeting of the year.
39. For the Meth roster:
- (a) The secretariat shall undertake the performance evaluations and may also consult with panel or working group members by delegating performance evaluation of work undertaken by a roster expert to specific panel or working group members who have worked closely with the expert on the subject;
 - (b) The performance evaluation scores shall be calculated as an average based on input from a minimum of two evaluators;
 - (c) The performance evaluation system shall record both the task/assessment specific score and the final average score at the time of reporting.
40. The evaluations shall be based on the level of quality using a scale of 1-4, where 4 indicates very good quality level, 3 indicates a good quality level, 2 a satisfactory quality level and 1 an unsatisfactory quality level. The score shall be adjusted in accordance with appendix 1 and 2 as applicable to reflect higher levels of complexity.
41. The outcomes of the performance evaluations of an approved expert shall be used as a basis for retaining him/her on the RIT/Meth rosters if he/she has expressed a wish to remain on the roster in connection with the selection process, or, in the case of underperformance, to discontinue the use of the expert for the remainder of the term of service and remove him/her from the roster at the end of the term.
42. The outcome of a performance evaluation as well as the average of the roster shall be shared with the roster expert upon request for feedback on his/her performance.

7.2. Performance reporting

43. The secretariat shall report the performance of RIT roster experts to the Board in the form of a confidential report as part of the preparation of the launch of the next call for experts (every second year). The report may include information on:
- (a) The distribution of roster experts by sectoral scope/assessment type, regional affiliation and gender;
 - (b) The work undertaken by roster experts:
 - (i) Distribution of assignments by sectoral scope/assessment type, regional affiliation and gender;
 - (ii) Average performance score for work in the reporting period by sectoral scope;
 - (iii) Information on the annual performance evaluation recommendations of RIT roster of experts for the last two terms of each expert;
 - (c) Any issues on conflict of interest/abuse of position, etc.;
 - (d) Identification of areas where the need for expert capacity is expected to increase.

44. The RIT performance evaluation reports shall be prepared in consultation with the evaluators nominated by the Board.

Appendix 1. Reference sheet for performance evaluation of RIT roster experts.

Table. Examples and description of definition levels

Score	Definition	Examples and description of definition levels
Quality of assessment/deliverable		
1	Unsatisfactory	The assessment/deliverable is technically incorrect or incomplete and/or submitted late.
2	Satisfactory	The assessment/deliverable is technically correct, complete, providing information within the scope.
3	Good	The assessment/deliverable is technically correct, complete, providing information within the scope and identifying further information required in order to allow the issue to move forward once this has been included.
4	Very good	The assessment/deliverable is technically correct, providing value-added information (extending the scope) allowing the issue to move forward immediately.
Timeliness		
On time		Submission received within agreed deadline or extension
Late submission		Submission received after agreed deadline or extension
Complexity of assignment		
0	Easy	Non-complex sectors/methodologies – for example submissions based on ACM0002 or AMS-I.D
+1 if quality score = 2, 3, 4	Complex	Moderately-difficult complex sectors/methodologies – for example submissions based on non-ACM0002 or non-AMS-I.D

Appendix 2. Reference sheet for performance evaluation of Meth roster experts

Table. Examples and description of definition levels

Score	Definition	Examples and description of definition levels
Quality of assessment/deliverable based on assignment classified as “easy”		
1	Unsatisfactory	The assessment/deliverable is technically incorrect or incomplete and/or submitted late.
2	Satisfactory	The assessment/deliverable is technically correct, complete, providing information within the scope.
3	Good	The assessment/deliverable is technically correct, complete, providing information within the scope and identifying further information required in order to allow the issue to move forward once this has been included.
4	Very good	The assessment/deliverable is technically correct, providing value-added information (extending the scope) allowing the issue to move forward immediately.
Timeliness		
On time		Submission received within agreed deadline or extension
Late submission		Submission received after agreed deadline or extension
Complexity of assignment		
0	Easy	Straight forward and simple proposed new methodologies (PNM)
+1 if quality score = 2, 3, 4	Medium	Moderately difficult PNM for known project areas and with moderately complex algorithms
+2 if quality score = 2, 3, 4	Difficult	PNMs for new project areas with complex algorithms and difficult baseline scenario determination and additionality requirement

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	16 April 2015	EB 83, Annex 16 Initial adoption

Decision Class: Operational, Regulatory
Document Type: Procedure
Business Function: Governance
Keywords: appointment of members, performance evaluation, terms of reference