

CDM-EB79-A01-PROC

Procedure

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

Version 02.0



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
1. BACKGROUND	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	6
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. Purposes	10
6.2. Performance evaluation	10
6.3. Performance reporting	11
APPENDIX . REFERENCE SHEET	12

1. Background

1. Paragraph 18 of the annex to decision 3/CMP.1 (hereinafter referred to as the CDM modalities and procedures) and rule 32 of annex I to decision 4/CMP.1 (hereinafter referred to as the rules of procedure of the Board) provide for the establishment of committees, panels and working groups to assist the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM) (hereinafter referred to as the Board) in the performance of its functions.
2. Based on these provisions, the Board established the following bodies:
 - (a) The Methodologies Panel (MP), the Small-Scale Working Group (SSC WG), the Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group (A/R WG) and the Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage Working Group (CCS WG) (these bodies are hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Methodological Bodies”), to support it in the creation of methodological standards, guidelines and clarifications and other methodological matters applicable to proposed and registered CDM project activities or programmes of activities (PoAs);
 - (b) The Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP), 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.
3. The Board, at its ninety-third meeting, decided to merge the MP with the SSC WG, by expanding the scope of work of the MP to include work relating to small-scale methodologies and by including members with small-scale expertise, with effect from September 2017.

2. Scope, applicability, and entry into force

2.1. Scope

4. This 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 “Procedure: Terms of reference of the support structure of the CDM Executive Board” (herein after referred to as the ToR).

2.2. Applicability

5. This procedure is applicable to applicants for and members of the following panels and working groups:
 - (a) CDM-AP;
 - (b) MP;
 - (c) A/R WG;
 - (d) 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. Version 02.0 of this procedure enters into force on 1 September 2017.

3. Normative references

8. This procedure should be read in conjunction with the following document:
- (a) Rules of procedure of the Board;
 - (b) "Procedure: Terms of reference of the support structure of the CDM Executive Board".

4. Definitions

9. In addition to the definitions in the "Glossary of CDM terms", the following terms apply in this procedure:
- (a) "Shall" is used to indicate requirements to be followed;
 - (b) "Should" is used to indicate that among several possibilities, one course of action is recommended as particularly suitable;
 - (c) "May" is used to indicate what is permitted.

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 competence requirements elaborated in the ToR, as well as any further competence requirements specified by the Board for each call for applications. Such further competence requirements will be specified on the respective call pages.
11. Table 1 below specifies the evaluation parameter for the demonstration of skills and professional expertise for each competence requirement.

Table 1. Evaluation parameters for fulfilment of competence requirements

Competence requirement		Evaluation parameter
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 cycle	Provision of examples where work undertaken (in academic, or, private/ public sector) had a direct impact on or link to the CDM project cycle

Competence requirement	Evaluation parameter
3. Demonstrate 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. Demonstrate technical/scientific expertise, inter alia, through peer-reviewed publication in at least one of the areas specified in the ToR	Listing of publications in the P.11 form and provision of responses to the technical/scientific questions
5. 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
6. Have excellent drafting skills, strong operational and analytical skills, and ability to work as a member of a team	Provision of examples of where work undertaken has required operational/analytical skills, and listing of previous and current memberships in relevant bodies
7. Have an advanced university degree in the relevant academic disciplines as specified in the ToR	Demonstration via P.11 form

5.2. Selection process

12. The selection process shall be open to both external applicants and existing 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 process (interviews, performance evaluation), consultation with the chair and the vice-chair of the respective panel or working group, 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 days and ensure that the announcement of the opening of the call covers a well distributed geographical target audience.
15. The secretariat shall ensure that the following information is available to applicants:
 - (a) General information on the selection process and timelines;
 - (b) The ToR, which includes the information on competence requirements, modalities of work, code of conduct of the Board and compensation, etc. for panel or working group members;
 - (c) Application questionnaire related to demonstration of competence requirements.
16. Experts interested in being appointed as members of any of the panels or working groups, 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;
 - (c) Fulfilment of competence requirements as presented in table 1 above.
18. Any failure to agree to the ToR and the code of conduct provisions, late submission of a completed P.11 form and/or application form, or non-fulfilment of the competence requirements shall result in disqualification.

5.2.3. Screening process

19. An application form that is only partially completed shall be evaluated based on the information given, and in case of any discrepancies between the information provided in the submitted application form 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 an interview using telephone call or an internet-based call to assess their competencies, whereas re-applying members shall be considered to have fulfilled the competence requirements and therefore are evaluated based on the extent of fulfilment of their role as appointed members (see section 6 below).

5.2.3.1. External applicants - interviews

21. The secretariat shall prepare a list of applicants for interviews (interview list) based on the criteria referred to in paragraph 22 below and in consultation with the relevant panel/working group chair and vice chair (see section 5.2.4 below). The secretariat shall seek to ensure that applicants represent a fair regional balance, including as a minimum three applicants from each region, where possible.
22. The criteria for inclusion of external applicants in the interview list are as follows:
 - (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.
23. In case of applications for multiple panels and working groups, and in accordance with the composition requirements of the MP, the A/R WG and the CCS WG as specified in appendix 1 of the ToR, applicants may be interviewed for the multiple 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 per applicant.
25. The interview panels shall use a standardized set of interview questions for each panel or working group and record the results of the interviews in the form of numeric values.
26. Applicants' competencies shall be evaluated based on the parameters listed in table 1 above 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 balanced regional representation and/or gender balance.

5.2.3.2. Reapplying members - performance evaluation

28. Reapplying members' applications shall be evaluated based on the performance evaluation, as referred to in section 6 below, of the extent of fulfilment of their responsibilities as appointed members.
29. For consideration in the selection process, members' performance results shall, as a minimum, cover two full meetings, and for members of the MP 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 to determine the modality for handling it. Special circumstances such as maternity or extended sick leave should not negatively impact the performance evaluation of a member.
30. 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.
31. The performance evaluation scores shall generally be treated as indicative. For the selection process, this implies that special skills may, for example, result in a recommendation for appointment despite a below-average performance evaluation score; likewise, a well performing member's set of skills may be considered superfluous in the context of the annual workplan for the panel or working group and therefore may not result in a recommendation for appointment.

5.2.4. Consultation and approval

32. The secretariat shall consult with the chair and the vice-chair of the respective panel or working group throughout the process and seek agreement from them on the following documents relevant to the selection process:
 - (a) Final performance evaluations of reapplying members;
 - (b) Interview list of external applicants;
 - (c) Shortlist of applicants recommended for appointment and applicants as alternatives to the recommended ones for the Board's consideration.
33. The presentation of the shortlist for the Board's consideration shall include information on the consultation processes and clearly indicate whether the agreement was reached on

the matters referred to in paragraph 32(a), (b) and (c) above and, in the event that the agreement was not reached, reflect the different views for the Board's consideration.

34. The chair and the vice-chair of the respective panel or working group shall be provided with the following information:
- (a) Full list of applicants, clearly indicating:
 - (i) Eligible and non-eligible applicants;
 - (ii) External applicants invited for interviews;
 - (iii) Applicants who are reapplying members;
 - (iv) Applicants proposed for inclusion in the longlist referred to in paragraph 36 below;
 - (v) Applicants proposed for inclusion in the shortlist referred to in paragraph 37 below;
 - (b) Performance evaluation scores (see section 6 below);
 - (c) P.11 forms of shortlisted applicants.
35. The chair and vice-chair of the respective panel or working group shall also have access to the following information, if they so wish:
- (i) Interview reports;
 - (ii) P.11 forms of all applicants.

5.2.5. Shortlisting

36. The secretariat shall prepare a longlist, clearly indicating regional affiliation and gender, which includes:
- (a) External applicants whose interview results indicate that they deserve further consideration;
 - (b) All reapplying members.
37. Based on the longlist, the secretariat shall prepare a first draft of a shortlist for consideration and input by the chair and the vice-chair of the respective panel or working group, clearly indicating regional affiliation and key words related to skills and value-added. The shortlist shall include:
- (a) For the CDM-AP, the A/R WG and the CCS WG:
 - (i) Five applicants recommended for appointment;
 - (ii) A maximum of three applicants as alternatives;
 - (b) For the MP:
 - (i) Twelve applicants recommended for appointment;
 - (ii) A maximum of six applicants as alternatives.

38. The inclusion of applicants in the shortlist or their exclusion from it shall be based on the consideration of:
 - (a) Overall composition of skills required in the context of the annual workplans;
 - (b) Benefits of continuity in membership (i.e. added value of the continuity of the specific set of skills of reapplying members to the composition of the group) and benefits of access to new skills and experience;
 - (c) Regional representation and gender balance.
39. 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 chair of the respective panel or working group, supported by the secretariat. The shortlist shall be accompanied by the full list of applicants.

5.2.6. Appointment of membership

40. The Board shall consider the shortlist and select members for each panel or working group. The selected and outgoing members' names shall be recorded in the corresponding Board meeting report.
41. The secretariat shall notify the result of each application to the respective applicant, prioritizing the notifications to reapplying members.
42. Selected members shall inform the secretariat at the earliest possible time of any conflicting commitments and shall provide justification for any expected absence, including partial absence, at a particular meeting. Proper justifications include:
 - (a) Hospitalization/sickness or emergencies in the immediate family;
 - (b) Previously planned professional commitments that present a time conflict with the meeting.
43. The secretariat shall update the incoming and outgoing members' status in the methodologies roster of experts based on their new or terminated membership in accordance with "Procedure: Selection and performance evaluation of experts on the CDM Registration and Issuance Team and Methodologies rosters of experts".
44. The secretariat shall update the public website for the panels and working groups with the newly appointed members' names in accordance with the start/end of their term of service.
45. The chair of a panel or working group may request specific outgoing members to attend the first meeting for incoming members to ensure the continuity of the work of the panel/ or 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.
46. 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 panel or working group upon receipt of a signed declaration of no conflict of interest.

47. New members shall be briefed by the secretariat on their roles and responsibilities, performance monitoring and sources of information, either electronically and/or at the first meeting of the panel or working group that they attend.
48. New 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) Curriculum vitae as per the Board's template.
49. 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

6.1. Purposes

50. The performance evaluation activity, to be conducted in accordance with the ToR, is used for the following three purposes:
 - (a) Provide input to the process for selection of members of panels and working groups;
 - (b) Provide feedback from the chairs of panels and working groups to their members on their performance;
 - (c) Report on the performance of the members of panels and working groups to the Board.

6.2. Performance evaluation

51. Members' performance shall be evaluated based on the fulfilment of their responsibilities that are derived directly from the roles specified in the ToR.
52. The criterion for fulfilment of responsibilities is the active provision of input to all the sub-components of these roles, and the fulfilment of responsibilities as a member shall be evaluated based on his or her performance.
53. Performance evaluation of members shall be undertaken for each meeting (physical or electronic), including its pre- and post-meeting tasks.
54. The results of the performance evaluation of individual members shall be treated as confidential.
55. The secretariat shall ensure that the performance evaluations are undertaken in a standardized manner by using standard evaluation forms and a reference sheet in the appendix).

56. The chair and the vice-chair of the respective panel or working group and the secretariat shall evaluate the performance of its individual members.
57. Members' performance shall be evaluated in the following two areas of activities:
 - (a) Inter-meeting work (evaluated for each case that individual members have been assigned to);
 - (b) In-meeting activity.
58. The performance in inter-meeting work is evaluated as a function of the level of complexity of the assigned case, the quality of input, and the timeliness of provision of input.
59. The performance in in-meeting activity is evaluated as a function of level of activity and the quality of inputs during the meetings.
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 of the Board, including the declaration of no conflict of interest.

6.3. Performance reporting

61. The secretariat shall compile the members' individual performance evaluation results mid-term, with the aim of supporting the process of providing feedback on the performance to the members. The modality for provision of feedback to individual members shall be at the prerogative of the respective chairs.
62. The aim of such feedback shall be to allow a member to improve his or 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 inputs, ensure a higher level of preparedness for in-meeting discussions, or more actively share his or her expertise with the rest of the panel or working group members.
63. Where the performance evaluation has identified an unsatisfactory level of performance of a member with no prospect of improvement, the provisions on suspension and subsequent termination of membership of the member in the ToR shall apply.
64. If the secretariat receives a query from a member in response to the feedback on his or her performance, the secretariat shall process it in consultation with the chair and the vice-chair of the respective panel or working group.
65. The secretariat shall report to the Board on the members' performance by preparing a consolidated performance report. This report shall include data on the performance of each member.
66. The reporting shall be undertaken 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 as confidential.

Appendix . Reference sheet

Score	Definition	Examples and description of definition levels
Inter-meeting work (assigned work)		
Complexity (required effort level): 1 to 5		
1	Very easy	Typically a pre-assessment of a proposed new methodology (PNM) or request for clarification.
2	Easy	Typically a pre-assessment of a PNM or 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 or recommendation on the secretariat's drafts of top-down methodologies, revisions and tools.
5	Complicated	Typically a recommendation on a PNM or recommendation on the secretariat's drafts of top-down methodologies, revisions and tools.
Quality level: 1 to 3		
1	Poor	The response needs substantial content and format review by the secretariat. Input is 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	Response/inputs are well considered and relevant, and the response needs very limited further work by the secretariat.
Timeliness (submission delays): -2 to 0		
0	No delay	Response/input is submitted on time and in accordance with agreed deadline.
-1	Maximum two days' delay	Response/input is submitted within a maximum of two calendar days after agreed deadline and without agreement on extension of deadline.
-2	More than two days' delay	Response/input is submitted more than two days after agreed deadline.
In-meeting activity		
Level of participation: 1 to 3		
1	Not active	No exhibition of interest in understanding issues of relevance to the whole panel or working group. Participation is limited to own fields of expertise.

Score	Definition	Examples and description of definition levels
2	Active	Participation is active in the majority of discussions. Participation extends to all cases relevant to the member's field of expertise. Exhibition of interest in issues of general interest to the panel or working group.
3	Proactive	Proactive engagement in the work of the panel or working group. Always engages in discussion on issues of his/her area of expertise and relevant to fields of expertise. Seeks to understand and reach consensus in order to arrive at conclusions.
Quality of interventions: 1 to 3		
1	Poor	Provision of general comments that adds no value, is factually incorrect, and/or leads to misunderstanding.
2	Good	Provision of input that adds value to the discussion within own field of expertise.
3	Very good	Provision of substantive input that adds value and moves the discussion forward (also on issues of general interest), opens new aspects, proposes relevant solutions and/or improves clarity.

- - - - -

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
02.0	13 July 2017	EB 95, Annex 2 Revision to remove reference to Small-Scale Working Group, update the number of applicants in the shortlist for the methodologies panel and introduce editorial changes.
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, appointment of members, performance evaluation, rules of procedure, terms of reference