

**A6.4-SB008-AA-A04**

---

**Establishment of expert panels under the  
Supervisory Body and related regulations**

Version 01.0

## COVER NOTE

### 1. Procedural background

1. The CMA, at its third session, adopted decision 3/CMA.3, containing in its annex, the "Rules, modalities and procedures for the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4 of the Paris Agreement" (RMPs),<sup>1</sup> setting out principles key requirements and processes of the Article 6.4 mechanism (A6.4 mechanism).
2. Paragraph 70 of annex II to decision 7/CMA.4 (hereinafter referred to as the rules of procedure of the Supervisory Body) indicates that the Supervisory Body of the A6.4 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. The Supervisory Body may draw on the expertise necessary to perform its functions, including from the UNFCCC roster of experts.
3. At its third meeting, the Supervisory Body agreed on the terms of reference for experts who provide specialized services to the Supervisory Body relating to the work of the A6.4 mechanism. At this meeting, the Supervisory Body also agreed to establish an A6.4 mechanism roster of experts with three specializations; accreditation, methodologies, and climate policy
4. The Supervisory Body, at its sixth meeting, approved the Procedures for submission and consideration of methodologies and, at this eighth meeting, it is considering the Accreditation procedures. The two procedures are currently planned to be operational as of quarter 2 of 2024 and entail the support of a Methodological Expert Panel (MEP) and Accreditation Panel (AP).
5. In this regard, the Supervisory Body, at its sixth meeting, requested the secretariat to develop a concept note that includes the draft terms of references for the MEP, as well as the proposed process to establish the MEP, including drawing on the existing roster of experts, for consideration by the Supervisory Body. The Supervisory Body requested the secretariat to include in the proposal a calibration workshop to orient the members of the MEP and working groups to ensure that they have a common understanding of the scope of work, A6.4 mechanism methodology requirements and priorities and type of substantive inputs that are needed by the Supervisory Body.

---

<sup>1</sup> See decision 3/CMA.3 contained in document FCCC/PA/CMA/2021/10/Add.1 available at <https://unfccc.int/documents/460950>.

6. As of this meeting, the Supervisory Body has established one MEP<sup>2</sup> and is considering the establishment an AP to support the accreditation process, as contained in annex 12 to the annotations to this eighth meeting.<sup>3</sup>

## **2. Purpose**

7. The purpose of this document is to launch the processes to operationalize panels under the Supervisory Body to assist the Body in performing its functions and achieving its objectives Key issues and proposed solutions.

## **3. Key issues and proposed solutions**

### **3.1. General**

8. This document contains appendices of the following two draft procedures:
- (a) Draft terms of reference for the expert panels under the Supervisory Body of the Article 6.4 mechanism, as contained in appendix 1; and
  - (b) Draft procedure for the selection and performance evaluation of members of the expert panels under the Supervisory Body, as contained in appendix 2.

### **3.2. Draft terms of reference for the expert panels**

9. The draft terms of reference (herein after referred to as ToR) of the expert panels stipulates the general guidelines of the MEP and, to anticipate its establishment, an AP.

### **3.3. Draft procedure for selection and evaluation of members of the panels**

10. The draft procedure elaborates processes and evaluation criteria to operationalize the selection and performance evaluation of members of panels in line with the related ToRs.

### **3.4. Selecting expert panel members from existing roster of experts**

11. At the fourth meeting, the Supervisory Body established the roster of experts, taking into account regional and gender balance. Experts included on the roster will serve for a two-year period ending in March 2025, with a possibility of renewal. The roster includes two specializations relevant to expert panels: the methodologies and the accreditation specializations.
12. The competence requirements contained in the draft ToRs for the MEP and the AP are aligned to the existing roster of experts, allowing the Supervisory Body to select experts from this roster to serve as panel members. This is in line with the decision of the

---

<sup>2</sup> The MEP was established to support the Supervisory Body 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 programme of activities (A6.4 PoAs). Refer to paragraph 19(a) of SB 004 meeting report available at <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/a64-sb004.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> The AP would support the Supervisory Body in the implementation of standards and procedures for the accreditation of operational entities that conduct validations and verifications regarding A6.4 project and A6.4 PoAs.

Supervisory Body, at its fourth meeting, to establish an MEP comprised of 10 members, also drawing on the roster of methodological experts. A similar approach is recommended for selecting members of an AP, proposed to comprise by 5 members once the Supervisory Body agrees to establish it.

### **3.5. Sufficiency of the experts in the roster of experts for selection**

13. To select expert panel members from the roster, an analysis was conducted to ensure that there are sufficient experts in the roster (86 experts under the category of methodologies and 23 experts under the category of accreditation). Based on the analysis on the range of expertise of the experts available for selection in the roster of experts, there are:
  - (a) Sufficient experts to select from for expert panel members that has expertise on emission reduction in the MEP;
  - (b) Insufficient number of experts to select from for expert panel members that has expertise on removals activities in the MEP;
  - (c) Sufficient experts to draw upon for the selection of expert panel members in an AP.
14. It is therefore recommended that the selection of members to serve on the panels is be drawn upon from the existing experts in the roster, as these were already assessed and selected by the Supervisory Body, taking into account their expertise, as well as regional and gender balance. Nevertheless, since the tasks to be undertaken as a member to serve on the panels would entail different assignments and increased time commitments, experts in the roster would be asked whether they would be interested in being considered to serve as member of the panels. In the case a significant number of experts in the roster indicate not being available to serve as a panel members, the secretariat recommends to be able to launch specific calls in order to ensure sufficient expertise as well as regional and gender balance.
15. To respond to the insufficient number of experts with expertise on removal activities, it is recommended that a specific and focused call for experts in this area be launched.
16. This combined approach of selecting members of the panels drawing upon the experts in the approved roster of experts and opening a call for the expertise currently not sufficiently covered in the roster, would allow the establishment of both panels using the existing experts available to the Supervisory Body in an expedited manner.

## **4. Impacts**

17. These draft procedures will form the framework for the panels to support the efficient and effective operationalization of the A6.4 mechanism.

## **5. Subsequent work and timelines**

18. Subject to guidance from the Supervisory Body, subsequent work will include the following:
  - (a) Launch focused call for experts for expertise in removal activities (Q4 2023);

- (b) Review of experts from roster of experts and experts responding to the above-mentioned call by the secretariat, in consultation with chairs and vice-chairs of the respective panels (once elected at the first meeting in 2024 – SB 009);
  - (c) Consideration of shortlists and selection of expert panel members by the Supervisory Body (second meeting in 2024 – SB 0010).
  - (d) Calibration workshop for new members of the MEP and AP (June 2024).
19. Relevant terms of reference of the rosters of experts for the methodologies and accreditation process, as well as for the expert review team will be prepared based on the relevant procedures approved by the Supervisory Body for consideration for the first meeting in 2024. Until then the existing roster of experts established by the Supervisory Body will be used, when required.

## **6. Recommendations to the Supervisory Body**

20. The secretariat recommends that the Supervisory Body:
- (a) Adopt the ToR for the support structure of the Supervisory Body making any further modifications to the draft as contained in appendix 1, as necessary;
  - (b) Adopt the procedure to select and evaluate panel members under the Supervisory Body and select members of the MEP and, once established, members of an AP, drawing from the current Article 6.4 mechanism roster of experts;
  - (c) Request the secretariat to open a specific and focused call for experts on removals, as per the procedure to select panel members under the Supervisory Body, and launch other specific expert calls in case insufficient experts available;
  - (d) Request the secretariat to start the selection process, as defined in the procedures for selection of members of the panels, in consultation with chairs and vice-chairs of the respective panels (once elected at the first meeting in 2024) for consideration and selection by the Supervisory Body.

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1.</b>	<b>DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EXPERT PANELS UNDER THE SUPERVISORY BODY OF THE ARTICLE 6.4 MECHANISM .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2.</b>	<b>DRAFT PROCEDURE FOR THE SELECTION AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF MEMBERS OF THE EXPERT PANELS UNDER THE SUPERVISORY BODY .....</b>	<b>16</b>

## **Appendix 1. Draft terms of reference for the expert panels under the Supervisory Body of the Article 6.4 mechanism**

### **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) specified 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 the 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.
2. The Supervisory Body has established two panels to support its work in two areas.
  - (a) 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);<sup>1</sup>
  - (b) The Accreditation Panel (AP), 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.<sup>2</sup>

### **2. Scope, applicability and entry into force**

#### **2.1. Scope**

3. This procedure elaborates principles and rules applicable to all standing panels established by the Supervisory Body as well as to the secretariat regarding its support to the Supervisory Body.

#### **2.2. Applicability**

4. This procedure is applicable to the following support structure of the Supervisory Body:
  - (a) AP;
  - (b) MEP;
  - (c) Secretariat.

---

<sup>1</sup> See meeting report of the 5<sup>th</sup> SB meeting. Available at <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/a64-sb005.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> See meeting report of the 8<sup>th</sup> SB meeting. Available at: <insert link when available>.

### **2.3. Entry into force**

5. Version 01.0 of this procedure enters into force on 2 November 2023.

## **3. Normative references**

6. This procedure should be read in conjunction with the following documents:
  - (a) Rules of procedure of the Supervisory Body;
  - (b) "Procedure: Selection and performance evaluation of members of the expert panels under the Supervisory Body".

## **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. General guidelines**

### **5.1. Role of panels**

8. The MEP performs the following key functions in support of the Supervisory Body:
  - (a) Consider draft recommendations regarding the establishment, revision or withdrawal of methodological standards, guidelines, and clarifications for A6.4 projects and A6.4 PoAs;
  - (b) Consider draft recommendations for other methodological requirements for A6.4 projects and A6.4 PoAs;
  - (c) Provide advice and recommendations to the Supervisory Body regarding the need and priority areas for methodological guidance.
9. The AP performs the following key functions in support of the Supervisory Body:
  - (a) Consider the results of assessments of designated operational entities (DOEs) regarding their compliance with accreditation requirements;
  - (b) Provide advice and recommendations to the Supervisory Body on accreditation requirements for operational entities;
  - (c) Provide advice and recommendations to the Supervisory Body on the improvement of the accreditation process.

## **5.2. Role of the secretariat**

10. The secretariat performs the following key functions in support of the Supervisory Body:
  - (a) Institutional support to the Supervisory Body and its panels, including:
    - (i) Administering meetings and other activities of the Supervisory Body and its panels;
    - (ii) Administering the implementation of the processes under the Article 6.4 mechanism;
    - (iii) Securing and providing advice of a strategic and legal nature to the Supervisory Body and its panels;
    - (iv) Developing recommendations regarding the establishment, revision or withdrawal of procedures for each process under the Article 6.4 mechanism;
  - (b) Technical support to the Supervisory Body and its panels, including:
    - (i) Providing recommendations regarding the establishment, revision or withdrawal of standards, guidelines and clarifications for A6.4 projects and A6.4 PoAs and for DOEs and applicant entities (AEs);
    - (ii) Assessing the compliance of proposed and registered A6.4 projects and A6.4 PoAs with established requirements, and providing recommendations for further actions as appropriate;
    - (iii) Assessing compliance of DOEs and AEs with established requirements and providing recommendations for further actions as appropriate.
11. In addition to supporting the Supervisory Body in the conduct of its regulatory functions, the secretariat supports the Supervisory Body's broader supervisory role for the processes under the Article 6.4 mechanism. In particular, the secretariat:
  - (a) Keeps the Supervisory Body informed of the developments in the global carbon market;
  - (b) Provides capacity-building services for key stakeholders;
  - (c) Acts as an interface between the Supervisory Body and stakeholders in the development of new and revised regulations;
  - (d) Develops strategic partnerships with relevant agencies to support the enhanced regional and subregional distribution of A6.4 projects and A6.4 PoAs.

## **5.3. Modalities of work**

### **5.3.1. General**

12. All panels shall operate under the guidance of the Supervisory Body. The secretariat shall operate under the guidance of the Supervisory Body with regard to those activities that fall under the responsibility of the Supervisory Body. The assignment of tasks to the various elements of the support structure shall be conducted in accordance with their roles as

described in sections 5.1 and 5.2 above or as described in applicable procedures, the management plan and workplans of the Supervisory Body and its support structure.

13. The secretariat conducts technical assessments of issues for consideration by the Supervisory Body and its panels, and ensures that these are provided in sufficient time for due consideration by its members.

### **5.3.2. Functioning of panel meetings**

14. The meetings of a panel may be held either with their members being physically present or by electronic means. The dates and mode (i.e., physical or electronic) of the meetings shall be determined by the secretariat in consultation with the chair of the panel, bearing in mind the needs arising from its mandates and available resources.
15. Agreements by a panel shall be made by consensus, whenever possible. The chair and vice-chair of a panel shall moderate the discussion among the panel members and facilitate them in achieving consensus. If all efforts at reaching consensus on an issue have been exhausted and no agreement has been reached, the range of views or options on the issue resulting from the discussion by the panel shall be reflected in its report to the Supervisory Body, and the chair of the panel shall present the range of views or options to the Supervisory Body with clear justification for each.
16. Subject to the confidentiality provisions set out in paragraph 29 of the rules of procedure of the Supervisory Body, recommendations by a panel to the Supervisory Body shall be made publicly available, unless otherwise decided by the Supervisory Body or required by relevant procedures. Any questions with regard to the application of these confidentiality provisions to specific recommendations shall be resolved by the Supervisory Body.
17. Recommendations by a panel to the Supervisory Body shall be circulated to the Supervisory Body members and alternate members at least two weeks before the Supervisory Body meeting that is to consider the recommendations unless the chair of the Supervisory Body decides otherwise, in particular when a panel meeting is held shortly before the Supervisory Body meeting.

### **5.3.3. Officers**

18. In accordance with paragraph 19(b) of the fourth meeting of the Article 6.4 mechanism Supervisory Body,<sup>3</sup> the Supervisory Body shall elect two Supervisory Body members/alternates to act as the chair and vice-chair of a panel. In any case, the Supervisory Body shall select the chair and vice-chair of a panel, with one being from a Party included in Annex I to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the other being from a Party not included in Annex I to the Convention.
19. In addition to the chair and vice-chair of a panel, the Supervisory Body may also elect its members or alternate members to support meetings of a panel, as appropriate.
20. The Supervisory Body shall elect the chair and vice-chair, and any additional members or alternate members referred to in paragraph 19 above, to each of its panels at the first meeting of each calendar year.

---

<sup>3</sup> See the report of the fourth meeting of the Article 6.4 mechanism Supervisory Body, available at: <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/a64-sb004.pdf>

21. If the chair or vice-chair of a panel ceases to be able to carry out his or her functions, or ceases to be a member or alternate member of the Supervisory Body, the Supervisory Body shall elect a new chair or vice-chair of the panel for the remainder of the term following the same rule in paragraph 18 above with regard to the availability of Supervisory Body members and Annex I/non-Annex I Party affiliation.
22. If the chair of a panel is not able to serve in that capacity for a meeting, the vice-chair shall serve as the chair for that meeting. If neither are able to serve in their respective capacities, one of the Supervisory Body members or alternate members elected to support the meetings of the panel, if applicable, shall serve as the chair for that meeting, subject to their availability. Otherwise, the panel shall elect a member from its members present to serve as the chair for that meeting.
23. The chair of a panel shall facilitate a free exchange of views and information between members and between the secretariat and members. In fulfilling this role, the chair of a panel shall declare the opening and closing of meetings, ensure the observance of the relevant sections of this procedure, accord the right to speak and announce agreements. The chair shall rule on points of order and, subject to this procedure, shall have complete control of the proceedings and over the maintenance of order at the meeting.
24. The chair of a panel shall, without prejudice, convey the mandate or guidance from the Supervisory Body, including the priority in setting the agenda of the meetings of the panel, where applicable, and at all times shall remain neutral in the discussion within the panel. The chair and vice-chair of a panel may express their own views to the Supervisory Body in their capacity as a member or alternate member of the Supervisory Body. Before doing so, he or she shall share his or her views with the panel and always clearly distinguish between personal views and those of the panel.
25. The chair of a panel may consult with the vice-chair and supporting members referred to in paragraph 19 above at any time in fulfilling his or her role as the chair. The secretariat shall ensure that the information necessary for the chair to manage the meetings of the panel is also shared with the vice-chair and supporting members.

#### **5.4. Functional guidelines for panels**

##### **5.4.1. Membership**

26. The Supervisory Body shall select members of the panels from the roster of experts in accordance with the "Procedure: Selection and performance evaluation of members of panels under the Supervisory Body".
27. The term of service of a member of a panel shall be for the time period decided by the Supervisory Body at the time of his or her appointment to the panel. The chair of a panel may request outgoing members to attend the first meeting for incoming members to ensure the continuity of the work of the panel. A member may re-apply for further terms. If a member of a panel resigns, or his or her membership is terminated in accordance with paragraph 29 below, the Supervisory Body shall select a replacement member for the remainder of the term from the applicants for the last call for experts.
28. Members of a panel shall abide by the code of conduct of the Supervisory Body, as well as by the provisions related to conflict of interest and transparency of the Supervisory

Body,<sup>4</sup> taking into account specific confidentiality requirements. They shall declare whether they have a pecuniary or financial interest in an issue presented to them as a member of the panel, and if so, refrain from participating in any discussion or decision on the issue. Members of a panel shall not disclose any confidential or proprietary information that comes to their knowledge from serving on a panel. For these purposes, members of a panel shall take a written oath of service before assuming their duties, as contained in the attachment below.

29. The chair of a panel, in agreement with the vice-chair, may suspend and subsequently recommend to the Supervisory Body the termination of the membership of a particular member on the grounds of, inter alia, a breach of the oath referred to in paragraph 28 above, failure to attend two consecutive meetings of the panel without proper justification, or not fulfilling the duties of a member, in particular not providing work inputs of the required quality and on time. The Supervisory Body shall consider such recommendation and decide whether to terminate the membership of the member in question.
30. The chair and the vice-chair of a panel, with the support of the secretariat, shall evaluate the performance of members of the panel in accordance with the "Procedure: Selection and performance evaluation of members of panels under the Supervisory Body" and provide feedback to them. The evaluation shall be used as one of the bases for consideration of reselection of members for further terms or for the suspension of membership in accordance with paragraph 29 above.
31. The chair and the vice-chair of a panel shall evaluate the performance of the secretariat supporting the work of the panel and provide feedback to the secretariat.
32. Members of a panel shall attend each meeting of the panel. If, due to circumstances beyond their control, a member is unable to attend a meeting fully or partially, he or she shall, through the secretariat, immediately inform the chair of the panel of this fact, together with proper justification. The absent member shall provide his or her input via electronic means. Failure to do so without proper justification shall be treated as an absence from the meeting without proper justification.
33. Members of a panel are expected to commit to the following:
  - (a) Attend up to five expert panel meetings, requiring a time commitment of up to 55 working days per year, including travel time, plus up to 40 working days per year for preparation;<sup>5</sup>
  - (b) Participate in other relevant activities of the panel, requiring a time commitment of up to 10 working days per year.
34. Considering the demand of the respective area of work, the Supervisory Body may place a panel in abeyance at any time.

---

<sup>4</sup> Refer to section IV of annex II to the decision 7/CMA.4.

<sup>5</sup> The time commitments indicated are orientational and will vary depending on the submissions received.

#### **5.4.2. Compensation**

35. Travel costs, daily subsistence allowance and a daily fee shall be paid to members of a panel attending a meeting of the panel in accordance with United Nations rules and regulations.
36. If a member of a panel is requested to carry out a specific task between meetings, the member shall be compensated for the task undertaken by means of payment of daily fees, subject to the provision of the input being of good quality and on time. The daily fee shall be determined in accordance with United Nations rules and regulations. The determination of the effort of the task in terms of days shall be determined by the secretariat in consultation with the chair of the panel.

## Attachment. Size, composition and competence requirements of panels

Panel name	Size and composition	Members' competence requirements
Accreditation Panel (AP)	AP chair and vice-chair and five expert panel members	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Be familiar with the Article 6.4 mechanism rules modalities and procedures (RMPs) and relevant decisions of the CMA</li> <li>2. Have recognized experience and/or knowledge relevant to the Article 6.4 mechanism project</li> <li>3. Demonstrate relevant working experience of at least two years in a national, regional or international accreditation body or in third-party certification activities</li> <li>4. Be able to communicate effectively in English, both in writing and orally; working knowledge of other UN languages is desirable</li> <li>5. Have excellent drafting skills, strong operational and analytical skills, and ability to work as a member of a team</li> <li>6. Have an advanced university degree in economics, environmental studies, natural sciences, engineering, or any related disciplines</li> </ol>
Methodological Expert Panel (MEP)	MEP chair and Vice-chair and 10 expert panel members	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Be familiar with the Article 6.4 mechanism RMPs and relevant decisions of the CMA</li> <li>2. Have recognized experience and/or knowledge relevant to the Article 6.4 mechanism project cycle</li> <li>3. Demonstrate relevant working experience of at least four years in methodological issues related to project-based mechanisms</li> <li>4. Demonstrate technical/scientific expertise, inter alia, through peer-reviewed publications, in at least one of the following areas: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Baseline and monitoring methodologies for A6.4 activities or PoAs under the A6.4 or other project-based mechanisms</li> <li>(b) Implementation of A6.4 activities, A6.4 PoAs or other project-based mechanisms including development of project design documents or programme of activities design documents, validation, monitoring, verification and certification</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. Be able to communicate effectively in English, both in writing and orally; working knowledge of other UN languages is desirable</li> <li>6. Have excellent drafting skills, strong operational and analytical skills, and ability to work as a member of a team</li> <li>7. Have an advanced university degree in economics, energy, environmental studies, natural sciences, engineering, or any related disciplines</li> </ol>

## Attachment. Form of oath to be taken by members of panels

"I solemnly declare that I will perform my duties as a member of the [name of the panel], honourably, faithfully, impartially and conscientiously.

"I further solemnly declare and promise that I shall disclose any financial interest or any other real or perceived conflict of interest in accreditation of operational entities, consideration and approval of methodologies, registration of the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4 of the Paris Agreement (hereinafter referred to as the Article 6.4 mechanism) projects and/or the issuance of related Article 6, paragraph 4, emission reductions (A6.4ERs) in the work as a member of the [name of panel], and subsequently refrain from participating in the consideration by the [name of panel] on the operational entity, methodology, registration or issuance in question. Subject to my responsibilities to the [name of the panel], I shall not disclose, even after the termination of my functions, any confidential or proprietary information which is transferred to the Supervisory Body or its support structure in accordance with annex II to decision 7/CMA.4 (Rules of procedure of the Supervisory Body for the Article 6.4 mechanism), or any other confidential information coming to my knowledge by reason of my duties for the [name of the panel].

"I shall disclose to the secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and to the Supervisory Body of the Article 6.4 mechanism any interest in any matter under discussion before the [name of the panel] which may constitute a conflict of interest or which might be incompatible with the requirements of integrity and impartiality expected of a member of the [name of the panel] and I shall refrain from participating in the work of the [name of the panel] in relation to such matter."

- - - - -

### Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	16 October 2023	Published as an annex to the annotated agenda of SB 008.
Decision Class: Operational, Regulatory		
Document Type: Procedure, Terms of Reference		
Business Function: Governance		
Keywords: AP, MEP, A6.4 mechanism, panels, rules of procedure, terms of reference		

## **Appendix 2. Draft procedure for the selection and performance evaluation of members of the expert panels under the Supervisory Body**

### **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 the 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.
2. Based on this provision, the SB established the following panels:
  - (a) 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);<sup>9</sup>
  - (b) The Accreditation Panel (AP), 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.<sup>10</sup>

### **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 “Procedure: Terms of reference of the expert panels under the Supervisory Body of the Article 6.4 mechanism” (herein after referred to as the ToR).

#### **2.2. Applicability**

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

#### **2.3. Entry into force**

5. Version 01.0 of this procedure enters into force on 2 November 2023.

---

<sup>9</sup> See meeting report of the 5<sup>th</sup> SB meeting. Available at <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/a64-sb005.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> See meeting report of the 8<sup>th</sup> SB meeting. Available at: XXX (Placeholder)

### 3. Normative references

6. This procedure should be read in conjunction with the following document:
- (a) Rules of procedure of the Supervisory Body;
  - (b) "Procedure: Terms of reference for the expert panels under the Supervisory Body of the Article 6.4 mechanism".

### 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 fulfil the minimum competence requirements elaborated in 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 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 Article 6.4 mechanism rules, modalities and procedures (RMPs) and relevant decisions of the CMA	Exhibition of knowledge and overview of the main 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 where work undertaken (in academic, or private/ public sector) had a direct impact on or link to the Article 6.4 mechanism project cycle
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

10. The selection of expert panel members shall be either from the experts in the already existing rosters of experts or from the result of a specific call for experts. Regarding the former, the secretariat shall confirm with experts in the roster whether they would be interested in serving as expert 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 covers, where applicable, 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 assigned members, shortlisting, and 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 period of 15 days and ensure that the announcement of the opening of the call reaches a wide audience and is well distributed across regions.
14. 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, but not limited to, the information on competence requirements, modalities of work, code of conduct of the Supervisory Body and compensation 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 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

16. The secretariat shall undertake an eligibility check of applicants. The following items 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.

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 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.
19. The further process for evaluation of applicants depends on whether an applicant is external (i.e. new) or an existing member who has reapplied. External applicants may be invited to participate in an interview via telephone call 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 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.
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 MEP and AP 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 and shall last no more 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 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 Supervisory Body 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.
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.
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; 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**

31. The secretariat shall consult with the chair and the vice-chair 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 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 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 chair and vice-chair 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.
36. 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 AP
    - (i) Five applicants recommended for appointment;
    - (ii) A maximum of three applicants as alternatives;
  - (b) For the MEP:
    - (i) Ten 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 chair of the respective panel, 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 the respective applicant, 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 for the panels and working groups with the newly appointed members' names in accordance with the start/end of their term of service.
43. 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.
44. 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.
45. 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.
46. 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 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 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;
  - (b) Provide feedback from the chairs of panels to their 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 his or her 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 in the appendix).
54. The chair and the vice-chair 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 chairs.
60. 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.
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 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.
63. The secretariat shall report to the Supervisory Body on the members' performance 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.

## Attachment. Reference sheet

Score	Definition	Examples and description of definition levels
<b>Inter-meeting work (assigned work)</b>		
<b>Complexity (required effort level): 1 to 3</b>		
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 recommendation on a PNM or recommendation on the secretariat's drafts of top-down methodologies, revisions and tools.
<b>Quality level: 1 to 3</b>		
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.
<b>Timeliness (submission delays): -2 to 0</b>		
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.
<b>In-meeting activity</b>		
<b>Level of participation: 1 to 3</b>		
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. 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.
<b>Quality of interventions: 1 to 3</b>		
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>
01.0	16 October 2023	Published as an annex to the annotated agenda of SB 008.

---

Decision Class: Operational, Regulatory  
Document Type: Procedure  
Business Function: Governance  
Keywords: AP, MEP, A6.4 mechanism, panels, appointment of members, performance evaluation, rules of procedure, terms of reference

---