

A6.4-PROC-GOV-004

Procedure

Selection and performance evaluation of members of Article 6.4 expert panels

Version 03.0



| 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 | 3 |
| 3. NORMATIVE REFERENCES | 4 |
| 4. DEFINITIONS | 4 |
| 5. SELECTION OF PANEL 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 1. REFERENCE SHEET | 12 |

1. Background

1. Paragraph 70 of annex II to decision 7/CMA.4 (hereinafter referred to as the rules of procedure of the Supervisory Body) stipulates that the Supervisory Body of the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4 of the Paris Agreement (hereinafter referred to as the Article 6.4 mechanism) may establish expert groups comprising internal or external experts, such as committees, panels, working groups and/or rosters of experts, as required, to assist it in performing its functions and achieving its objectives.¹
2. Based on this provision, the SB established the following panels:
 - (a) The Accreditation Expert Panel (AEP), to support it in the implementation of standards and procedures for the accreditation of operational entities that conduct validations and verifications regarding A6.4 projects and A6.4 PoAs;
 - (b) The Methodological Expert Panel (MEP), to support it in the creation of methodological standards, guidelines and clarifications and other methodological matters applicable to proposed and registered Article 6, paragraph 4, mechanism projects (A6.4 projects) or Article 6, paragraph 4, mechanism programmes of activities (A6.4 PoAs).

2. Scope, applicability, and entry into force

2.1. Scope

3. This procedure elaborates specific processes and guiding evaluation criteria to operationalize the selection and performance evaluation of members of panels, in line with the “Terms of reference: Article 6.4 expert panels” (hereinafter referred to as the ToR).

2.2. Applicability

4. This procedure is applicable to applicants for and members of the following panels:
 - (a) AEP;
 - (b) MEP.

2.3. Entry into force

5. This document enters into force on 16 May 2025.

¹ See decision 7/CMA.4, annex II. Available at:
https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/cma2023_10a02E.pdf#page=46.

3. Normative references

6. This procedure should be read in conjunction with the following document:

- (a) Rules of procedure of the Supervisory Body;
- (b) Terms of reference: Article 6.4 expert panels.²

4. Definitions

7. 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 members

5.1. Competence requirements

- 8. Experts interested in serving as members of panels shall meet the members’ competence requirements elaborated in appendix 1 to the ToR, as well as any further competence requirements specified by the Supervisory Body for each call for applications. Such further competence requirements will be specified on the respective call pages.
- 9. Table 1 below specifies the evaluation parameters for the demonstration of skills and professional expertise required to meet each competence requirement.

Table 1. Evaluation parameters for fulfilment of competence requirements

| Competence requirement | Evaluation parameter |
|---|---|
| 1. Be familiar with the rules, modalities and procedures (RMPs) for the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4 of the Paris Agreement and relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement | Demonstration of knowledge and familiarity with key decisions and challenges relevant to the Article 6.4 mechanism |
| 2. Have recognized experience and/or knowledge relevant to the Article 6.4 mechanism project cycle | Provision of examples demonstrating how work undertaken (in the academic, private, or public sectors) had a direct impact on or link to the Article 6.4 mechanism project cycle |
| 3. Demonstrate the number of years of relevant working experience as specified in the appendix 1 of the ToR | Listing of professional employment and provision of references in the United Nations Personal History Form (hereinafter referred to as the P.11 form) |

² See A6.4-PROC-GOV-003. Available at: <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/A6.4-PROC-GOV-003.pdf>.

| Competence requirement | Evaluation parameter |
|--|---|
| 4. Demonstrate technical/scientific expertise, inter alia, through peer-reviewed publication in at least one of the areas specified in the appendix 1 of 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. A working knowledge of other United Nations languages is desirable. | 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 an ability to effectively work as a member of a team | Provision of examples of work undertaken that required operational, or analytical skills. Additionally, provide a list of all previous and current memberships in relevant bodies |
| 7. Hold an advanced university degree in a relevant academic disciplines as specified in the appendix 1 of the ToR | Demonstration via P.11 form |

5.2. Selection process

10. The selection of expert panel members shall be either from the existing rosters of experts or through a specific call for experts. If from the existing rosters, the secretariat shall confirm with experts in the roster whether they are interested in serving as panel members.
11. The Supervisory Body may consider launching a call for experts for renewal of membership within the panel or whenever specific expertise is needed or sought.
12. The selection process, where applicable, includes:
 - (a) The launch of the call for applications;
 - (b) Eligibility checks;
 - (c) Screening process (interviews, performance evaluation);
 - (d) Consultation with the co-chairs of the respective panel or assigned members;
 - (e) Shortlisting; and
 - (f) Selection by the Supervisory Body.

5.2.1. Launch of call for applications

13. When the Supervisory Body decides to open a call for experts, the secretariat shall launch the call for a minimum period of 15 days. The secretariat shall ensure that the announcement reaches a wide audience and is well distributed across all regions.
14. The secretariat shall ensure the following information is available to applicants at the time of the call:
 - (a) General information on the selection process and timelines;
 - (b) The ToR, which includes, inter alia, information on competence requirements, modalities of work, code of conduct of the Supervisory Body and remuneration for panel members;

- (c) Application questionnaire related to demonstration of competence requirements.
15. Experts interested in being appointed as members of any of the panels, and existing panel members who wish to reapply for a new term, shall respond to the call for applications by the deadline specified on the call page to be considered.

5.2.2. Eligibility check

16. The secretariat shall undertake an eligibility check of applicants. The following items constitute the eligibility criteria:
- (a) Submission of a completed P.11 form and a completed application questionnaire by the deadline specified in the call for applications;
 - (b) Confirmation of agreement to all provisions of the ToR;
 - (c) Fulfilment of competence requirements as presented in table 1 above.
17. 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

18. An application form that is only partially completed shall be evaluated based on the information provided. 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.
19. The further process for evaluation of applicants depends on whether an applicant is external (i.e. new) or an existing panel member who has reapplied. External applicants may be invited to participate in an interview via telephone or 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

20. The secretariat shall prepare a list of applicants for interviews (interview list) based on the criteria referred to in paragraph 21 below and in consultation with the relevant panel co-chairs (see section 5.2.4 below). The secretariat shall seek to ensure that applicants represent a fair regional balance, including at least three applicants from each region, where possible.
21. 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's workplan (e.g. special skills);
 - (d) Regional affiliation;
 - (e) Gender.

22. In case of applications for multiple panels, and in accordance with the composition requirements of the AEP and MEP as specified in appendix 1 of the ToR, applicants may be interviewed for the multiple panels in one interview.
23. The interviews shall be conducted by interview panels consisting of cross-unit secretariat staff with process and technical skills. Each interview shall last no longer than 45 minutes per applicant.
24. 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.
25. 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).
26. 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

27. 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.
28. For consideration in the selection process, members' performance results shall, as a minimum, cover two full meetings, and for members of the MEP, the assignment of at least two cases. If a member has been absent and only participated in one meeting, the matter shall be forwarded to the Supervisory Body to determine the appropriate modality for handling it. Special circumstances such as maternity or extended sick leave should not negatively impact the performance evaluation of a member.
29. The results of a reapplying member's performance evaluation shall clearly indicate the member's performance according to above average, average or below average.
30. 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; similarly, 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

31. The secretariat shall consult with the co-chairs of the respective panels 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 Supervisory Body's consideration.
32. The presentation of the shortlist for the Supervisory Body's consideration shall include information on the consultation processes and clearly indicate whether the agreement was reached on the matters referred to in paragraph 31(a), 31(b) and 31(c) above and, in the event that the agreement was not reached, reflect the different views for the Supervisory Body's consideration.
33. The co-chairs 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 35 below;
 - (v) Applicants proposed for inclusion in the shortlist referred to in paragraph 36 below;
 - (b) Performance evaluation scores (see section 6 below);
 - (c) P.11 forms of shortlisted applicants.
34. The co-chairs of the respective panel shall also have access to the following information, if they so wish:
- (a) Interview reports;
 - (b) 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) External applicants whose interview results indicate that they deserve further consideration;
 - (b) All reapplying members who meet performance benchmarks.
36. Based on the longlist, the secretariat shall prepare a first draft of a shortlist for consideration and input by the co-chairs 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 AEP
 - (i) A total of five applicants recommended for appointment;
 - (ii) A maximum of three applicants as alternatives;

- (b) For the MEP:
 - (i) A total of 14 applicants recommended for appointment;
 - (ii) A maximum of six applicants as alternatives.
- 37. 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.
- 38. The shortlist shall be circulated to the Supervisory Body as a confidential annex to the annotations for the next Supervisory Body meeting and presented during the Supervisory Body meeting by the co-chairs, supported by the secretariat. The shortlist shall be accompanied by the full list of applicants.

5.2.6. Appointment of membership

- 39. The Supervisory Body 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 Supervisory Body meeting report.
- 40. The secretariat shall notify each applicant of their application status, prioritizing the notifications to reapplying members.
- 41. 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.
- 42. The secretariat shall update the public website dedicated to the panels and working groups with the newly appointed members' names in accordance with the start or end of their term of service.
- 43. The co-chairs 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.
- 44. During 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 oath of service.

45. New members shall be briefed by the secretariat on their roles and responsibilities, performance monitoring criteria, and sources of information, either electronically and/or at the first meeting of the panel or working group that they attend.
46. New members shall provide the secretariat with:
 - (a) A scanned copy of their passport;
 - (b) Bank details;
 - (c) Signed oath of service in accordance with the form included in Appendix 2 to the ToR;
 - (d) Signed declaration on engagement with the United Nations system as an employee or consultant;
 - (e) Curriculum vitae as per the Supervisory Body's template.
47. 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

48. The performance evaluation of the panel members, would 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;
 - (b) Provide feedback from the co-chairs of panels to the panel members on their performance;
 - (c) Report on the performance of the members of panels to the Supervisory Body.

6.2. Performance evaluation

49. Members' performance shall be evaluated based on the fulfilment of their responsibilities that are derived directly from the roles specified in the ToR.
50. The criterion for fulfilment of responsibilities is the active provision of input to all the subcomponents of these roles, and the fulfilment of responsibilities as a member shall be evaluated based on their performance.
51. Performance evaluation of members shall be undertaken for each meeting (physical or electronic), including its pre- and post-meeting tasks.
52. The results of the performance evaluation of individual members shall be treated as confidential.
53. The secretariat shall ensure that the performance evaluations are undertaken in a standardized manner by using standard evaluation forms and a reference sheet included in Appendix 1 to this document.

54. The co-chairs of the respective panel or working group and the secretariat shall evaluate the performance of its individual members.
55. Members' performance shall be evaluated in the following two areas of activities:
 - (a) Inter-meeting work (evaluated for each case to which individual members have been assigned);
 - (b) In-meeting activity.
56. 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.
57. The performance in in-meeting activity is evaluated as a function of level of activity and the quality of inputs during the meetings.
58. 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 Supervisory Body, including the declaration of no conflict of interest.

6.3. Performance reporting

59. 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 co-chairs.
60. The aim of such feedback shall be to allow a member to improve their performance. Where the performance evaluation has identified a need for improvement, the feedback may include, inter alia, 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.
61. 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.
62. If the secretariat receives a query from a member in response to the feedback on their performance, the secretariat shall process it in consultation with the co-chairs of the respective panel or working group.
63. The secretariat shall report to the Supervisory Body on the performance of the panel members by preparing a consolidated performance report. This report shall include data on the performance of each member.
64. 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 Supervisory Body to consider the scope for the launch of the call for new members. The report shall be treated as confidential.

Appendix 1. Reference sheet

| Score | Definition | Examples and description of definition levels |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| Inter-meeting work (assigned work) | | |
| Complexity (required effort level): 1 to 3 | | |
| 1 | Simple | Typically a pre-assessment of a proposed new methodology (PNM) or request for clarification. |
| 2 | Medium | Typically a draft response to a request for revision/input to the secretariat's draft guidelines, revisions to guidelines, standards, etc. |
| 3 | Complex | Typically a request for recommendation on a PNM or on the secretariat's drafts of top-down methodologies, revisions and tools. |
| Quality level: 1 to 3 | | |
| 1 | Poor | The response requires substantial content and format review and modifications by the secretariat. Input is not well considered or relevant causing extra work for the secretariat. |
| 2 | Good | The response/input is generally good, which leaves some work by the secretariat to finalize the case. |
| 3 | Very good | The response/input is well considered and relevant, requiring minimal additional work by the secretariat. |
| Timeliness (submission delays): 1 to 3 | | |
| 1 | More than two days' delay | Response/input is submitted more than two days after agreed deadline or an agreed upon extension of deadline. |
| 2 | 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. |
| 3 | No delay | Response/input is submitted on time and in accordance with agreed deadline or an agreed upon extension of 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. |
| 2 | Active | Participation is active in the majority of discussions. Participation extends to all cases relevant to the member's field of expertise. Display of interest in broader issues of general relevance 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 add little value, are factually incorrect, and/or leads to misunderstandings. |
| 2 | Good | Provision of input that adds value to the discussion within the member's field of expertise. |
| 3 | Very good | Provision of substantive input that adds value, 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> |
|----------------|------------------|---|
| 03.0 | 16 May 2025 | SBM 016, Annex 3. Revision to include a requirement to sign an oath of service, minor title change and other editorial improvements. |
| 02.0 | 14 February 2025 | SBM 015, Annex 6. Revision to change the terms “chair” and “vice-chair” to “co-chairs”. |
| 01.0 | 2 November 2023 | SB 008, Annex 3. Initial adoption. |

Decision Class: Operational, Regulatory

Document Type: Procedure

Business Function: Governance

Keywords: AEP, MEP, A6.4 mechanism, panels, appointment of members, performance evaluation, rules of procedure, terms of reference
