

PLAN  VIVO

PV Climate

**Request for Proposals:  
Methodology Approval  
Panel (MAP) Review of  
the Grassland  
Management Tool Suite**

*Version 1.0*

# Contents

- 1 Introduction ..... 3
- 2 Methodology Overview ..... 4
  - 2.1 Replacement of Legacy CDM A/R Tools ..... 4
  - 2.2 Soil Organic Carbon (SOC) Measurement and Baseline Estimation ..... 5
  - 2.3 Documents for Review ..... 6
- 3 Scope of Work ..... 6
- 4 Expertise Requirements ..... 7
- 5 Proposal Requirements ..... 8
- 6 Submission and Selection ..... 8
- Annex 1 – Methodology Approval Panel Review Support Terms of Reference ..... 9

# 1 Introduction

Plan Vivo is a charity, registered in Scotland, that administers the Plan Vivo Climate Standard (PV Climate) – a robust and widely applied framework for community-led land-use projects that deliver measurable climate, environmental, and livelihood benefits.

Projects registered under PV Climate may issue Plan Vivo Certificates (PVCs), representing past or future (depending on certificate type) greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions or removals achieved through project interventions.

Version 5 of PV Climate requires that projects apply **approved methodologies** to quantify emission reductions and removals (collectively referred to as *carbon benefits*). To support this, Plan Vivo has developed a set of **Methodology Requirements**, which define the minimum criteria that all methodologies, modules, and tools must meet<sup>1</sup>.

All methodologies submitted for use under PV Climate undergo a public consultation process followed by a multi-stage internal technical review<sup>2</sup>. The final stage of technical review is conducted by a **Methodology Approval Panel (MAP)** convened by Plan Vivo.

Plan Vivo is seeking **3-5 technical experts** to form a MAP to review a suite of six tools (hereafter referred to as the *Grassland Management Tool Suite*). The Grassland Management Tool Suite has been developed to support GHG accounting for grassland-based project activities and to replace several existing Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) A/R tools currently referenced in the **Agriculture and Forestry Carbon Benefit Assessment Methodology (PM001)**<sup>3</sup> and the **Estimation of Baseline and Project GHG Removals by Carbon Pools in Plan Vivo Projects module (PU001)**<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at <https://www.planvivo.org/pv-climate-documentation>

<sup>2</sup> Please refer to Section 3 of the Procedures Manual, which can be found at <https://www.planvivo.org/projects/certify-a-project/pvclimate/documents>

<sup>3</sup> Available at <https://www.planvivo.org/projects/certify-a-project/pvclimate/methodologies/approved-methodologies>

<sup>4</sup> Available at <https://www.planvivo.org/projects/certify-a-project/pvclimate/methodologies/approved-modules>

## 2 Methodology Overview

The **Estimation of Baseline and Project GHG Removals by Carbon Pools in Plan Vivo Projects module (PU001)** was developed primarily to support afforestation and reforestation projects and is therefore not currently well suited to application in **grassland and rangeland systems**, where project interventions, carbon pools, and baseline dynamics may differ substantially.

The **Grassland Management Tool Suite** has been developed to address these limitations and to provide a coherent, internally consistent set of procedures for quantifying GHG removals from **grassland- and rangeland-based management activities** implemented under PV Climate projects. The suite is intended to support project activities such as **grazing management, fire management, and land restoration**, while improving alignment with **Methodology Requirements** and reducing reliance on legacy external methodological elements.

### 2.1 Replacement of Legacy CDM A/R Tools

Several CDM A/R tools are currently referenced within approved PV Climate Methodologies to support baseline scenario identification, additionality assessment, carbon pool and emission source significance testing, and estimation of carbon stock changes. These tools were originally developed for application within the CDM context and have been adopted within PV Climate to support a range of land-use interventions. As PV Climate has evolved, there is an opportunity to introduce **Plan Vivo-specific procedures** that are more closely aligned with the structure, terminology, and application of the **Methodology Requirements**.

The **Grassland Management Tool Suite** is designed to replace the following CDM A/R tools by introducing procedures that enhance **clarity, internal consistency, and ease of application** across PV Climate projects, including but not limited to grassland and rangeland interventions:

- **AR-TOOL02:** Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality in A/R CDM project activities (Version 1.0)
- **AR-TOOL04:** Tool for testing significance of GHG emissions in A/R CDM project activities (Version 1.0)
- **AR-TOOL12:** Estimation of carbon stocks and change in carbon stocks in dead wood and litter in A/R CDM project activities (Version 1.1.0)
- **AR-TOOL14:** Estimation of carbon stocks and change in carbon stocks of trees and shrubs in A/R CDM project activities (Version 2.1.0)

While some tools introduce procedures that are specifically tailored to grassland and rangeland contexts, others are intended to **streamline and clarify core methodological steps** (such as baseline identification, additionality assessment, and significance testing) across PV Climate methodologies more generally.

## 2.2 Soil Organic Carbon (SOC) Measurement and Baseline Estimation

Within the **Agriculture and Forestry Carbon Benefit Assessment Methodology (PM001)**, PU001 provides procedures for estimating baseline and project greenhouse gas (GHG) removals in **soil organic carbon (SOC)**. PU001 allows a range of approaches, including

- i. Measurements in matched control areas using an approved tool;
- ii. Process-based modelling following the **Small-holder Agriculture Monitoring and Baseline Assessment Tool (PT001)**;
- iii. Assumptions of zero baseline removals under specific applicability conditions; and
- iv. The use of conservative default factors from published sources.

In practice, there is currently **no approved tool** under PV Climate that enables projects to apply a **dynamic, measurement-based baseline approach for SOC**, and the applicability of **PT001** is limited to interventions involving tree planting, agroforestry, or conservation agriculture and to use of the RothC model. As a result, options for estimating SOC dynamics (particularly under grassland- and rangeland-based management activities) are constrained, and guidance for establishing conservative yet credible baselines outside of afforestation, reforestation, and agroforestry contexts is limited.

The proposed **SOC measurement tool**, developed as part of the Grassland Management Tool Suite and applied within **PM001**, addresses these gaps by providing procedures for estimating **changes in SOC stocks under both baseline and project scenarios**, following the procedures as set out in **PU001**. The tool includes procedures for the use of **in-situ measurements, process-based models validated with in-situ data**, and **conservative default values** to determine the parameters required to estimate baseline and project SOC removals. These procedures are designed to support transparent, conservative, and methodologically consistent SOC accounting for grassland and rangeland management activities, such as grazing management and land restoration.

## 2.3 Documents for Review

The review covers the following suite of documents<sup>5</sup>:

- **Methodology:**
  - Agriculture and Forestry Carbon Benefit Assessment Methodology, Version 1.1
- **Module:**
  - Estimation of Baseline and Project GHG Removals by Carbon Pools in Plan Vivo Projects, Version 1.2
- **Tool:**
  - Baseline Scenario and Additionality Assessment, Version 1.0
  - Carbon Pool and Emission Source Significance Testing, Version 1.0
  - Estimation of Change in Dead Wood and Litter Carbon Stocks, Version 1.0
  - Estimation of Change in Non-woody Biomass in Grasslands, Version 1.0
  - Estimation of Change in Soil Organic Carbon, Version 1.0
  - Estimation of Change in Woody Biomass, Version 1.0

## 3 Scope of Work

The appointed MAP is required to conduct an independent technical review of the Grassland Management Tool Suite and associated documentation listed in Section 2.3.

The key tasks and deliverables of the MAP include:

- Assess the Grassland Management Tool Suite for compliance with the **Methodology Requirements**, and for consistency with **PM001** and **PU001**.
- Review and verify the adequacy of the methodology developer's responses to all feedback received during the public consultation period, including whether comments have been appropriately addressed within the revised documents.
- Complete a consolidated final technical assessment using the **Methodology Approval Report Template**, providing a clear, evidence-based recommendation for approval, conditional approval, or rejection of the Grassland Management Tool Suite.

---

<sup>5</sup> Available at <https://www.planvivo.org/projects/certify-a-project/pvclimate/methodologies/pipeline>

Full details on review procedures, roles and responsibilities, and expectations for MAP members are provided in the **Methodology Approval Panel Review Support Terms of Reference (Annex 1)**.

## 4 Expertise Requirements

To be eligible for appointment to the **MAP**, experts must demonstrate technical expertise relevant to one or more components of the **Grassland Management Tool Suite**.

In accordance with the Methodology Approval Panel Review Support Terms of Reference (Annex 1), the MAP is expected to collectively provide the range of expertise required to review the full suite of tools. **Individual MAP members are not required to demonstrate expertise across all technical areas**, but should clearly demonstrate competence in the specific elements they propose to review (Section 5).

Relevant expertise may be evidenced through prior professional experience, methodological work, validation or verification activities, or applied research. This may include, but is not limited to:

- Prior experience in developing, assessing, validating, or verifying GHG accounting methodologies or projects in the **AFOLU, grassland, rangeland**, or related land-use sectors.
- Familiarity with **baseline scenario identification, additionality assessment**, and **carbon pool and emission source significance testing** including experience with CDM A/R tools and/or their application within non-CDM standards.
- A documented track record of work or research in one or more of the following areas:
  - GHG accounting in grassland or rangeland ecosystems;
  - Estimation of carbon stock changes in non-woody biomass pools;
  - Measurement, modelling, or monitoring of **soil organic carbon (SOC)** stocks and dynamics;
  - Application of **process-based models** and/or field-based measurement approaches for SOC;
  - Application of **IPCC AFOLU guidance** and conservative carbon accounting principles.

MAP members must be able to demonstrate independence and objectivity and must disclose any **actual or potential conflicts of interest** related to the development of the Grassland Management Tool Suite or associated Plan Vivo documentation.

## 5 Proposal Requirements

Interested experts who meet the eligibility criteria outlined in Section 4 are invited to submit a proposal to review **some or all components** of the Grassland Management Tool Suite described in Section 2.3.

Proposals must include the following elements:

- Written confirmation of acceptance of the fixed remunerated rate of **USD 450 per 7.5-hour day (pro rata)**, in accordance with the Methodology Approval Panel Review Support Terms of Reference (Annex 1).
- A clear indication of **which elements of the Grassland Management Tool Suite** the applicant proposes to review (e.g. specific tools, the SOC measurement tool, or the full suite), consistent with their area(s) of expertise.
- A CV or résumé highlighting relevant experience in GHG accounting, land-use or AFOLU methodologies, grassland or rangeland systems, soil organic carbon measurement or modelling, or related areas.
- A brief statement of interest (maximum **one page**) describing the applicant's relevant technical expertise, experience, and how this qualifies them to review the proposed methodology elements within the scope they have identified.
- A statement declaring any actual or potential conflicts of interest, including details of any past or current services provided to the developer of the Grassland Management Tool Suite or related Plan Vivo documentation.

## 6 Submission and Selection

Proposals should be submitted by email to [hamish@planvivofoundation.org](mailto:hamish@planvivofoundation.org) by 15<sup>th</sup> June 2026. Short-listed proposals will be assessed by the Plan Vivo Secretariat for technical relevance, demonstrated expertise, and overall balance of expertise across the MAP. Final selection and appointment of MAP members will be made by Plan Vivo. All applicants will be informed of the outcome of the selection process.

# Annex 1 – Methodology Approval Panel Review Support Terms of Reference

## 1. Introduction

Projects registered under the **Plan Vivo Climate Standard (PV Climate)** may receive **Plan Vivo Certificates (PVCs)** representing a past or future (depending on certificate type) reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or removal of GHGs from the atmosphere resulting from project activities<sup>6</sup>.

Version 5 of PV Climate requires projects to apply **approved methodologies** to quantify emission reductions and removals (hereafter referred to as *carbon benefits*)<sup>7</sup>. Under PV Climate, methodologies may take one of the following forms:

- **Stand-alone methodology:** A single document that includes all information necessary to meet the Methodology Requirements without reference to other methodological elements.
- **Modular methodology:** A methodology that references other methodological elements, whether internal or external to Plan Vivo, to meet the Methodology Requirements.

Within PV Climate, methodological elements may be defined as either **Modules** or **Tools**, where:

- **Module:** A methodological element that describes the procedures, data, and parameters required to estimate one or more parameter values in an approved methodology.
- **Tool:** A methodological element that describes procedures for performing a specific analysis applied within an approved methodology or module.

While stand-alone methodologies are generally simpler for projects to apply, modular methodologies can offer advantages by minimising the proliferation of methodological elements. This approach can reduce the risk of errors or inconsistencies across methodologies and facilitate more efficient updates to maintain alignment with best practice.

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.planvivo.org/Pages/Category/projects?Take=30>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.planvivo.org/projects/certify-a-project/pvclimate/methodologies>

## 2. Purpose

Upon submission of a new methodology, module, or tool, an initial screening process is conducted by Plan Vivo. This process is led by the Secretariat and may include support from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), where necessary. The purpose of the screening is to confirm that submissions are complete and suitable to proceed to full technical review<sup>8</sup>.

Following successful screening, the submission enters the full review process. At this stage, a **Methodology Approval Panel (MAP)** is convened and tasked with conducting a comprehensive technical assessment of the submitted methodology, module, and/or tool (hereafter referred to as “the submission”) in accordance with the latest version of the **Methodology Requirements**<sup>9</sup>.

These **Terms of Reference** define the scope of work, roles and responsibilities, composition, timelines, and remuneration arrangements for MAPs convened by Plan Vivo.

## 3. Objectives

The primary objectives of a **MAP** are to ensure the validity, practical applicability, and compliance of submissions presented for approval under PV Climate.

For **submissions seeking initial approval**, the MAP’s objectives include:

- Conducting a comprehensive assessment to confirm that the submission fully complies with the **Methodology Requirements** relevant to its stated scope.
- Evaluating the scientific basis, methodological approach, and calculations within the submission to confirm their validity, conservativeness, and appropriateness for the intended application.
- Assessing the clarity, completeness, and internal consistency of the submission to ensure it can be practically and consistently applied at the project level.
- Providing a clear, transparent, and justified recommendation to Plan Vivo regarding approval of the submission, documented through a **Methodology Review Report**.

---

<sup>8</sup> For more information, see Section 3.2 of the Procedures Manual. Available at <https://www.planvivo.org/projects/certify-a-project/pvclimate/documents>

<sup>9</sup> Available at <https://www.planvivo.org/projects/certify-a-project/pvclimate/documents>

For **existing submissions presented as a Major Revision**<sup>10</sup>, the MAP's objectives include:

- Evaluating all proposed changes within the submission to determine their impact on scope, applicability, and calculations.
- Verifying that the revised submission continues to meet all current Methodology Requirements relevant to its scope.
- Assessing how the submission has addressed any previous **New Information Requests (NIRs)** or **Corrective Action Requests (CARs)** arising from earlier reviews (e.g. Concept Note review or prior MAP assessments).
- Confirming that the proposed updates maintain or improve scientific validity, conservativeness, verifiability, and practical implementability.
- Delivering a clear and justified recommendation to Plan Vivo regarding approval of the revised submission.

Where a MAP review covers both cases (for example, a Major Revision that integrates new Modules or Tools into an existing methodology), the MAP shall address the relevant objectives from both categories.

## 4. Scope of Work

The MAP for a given review comprises experts selected for their technical expertise relevant to the scope and content of **the submission**. MAP members may be drawn from the following categories:

- **Plan Vivo Internal Technical Representatives:** At least one representative from the PV Climate **TAC**, providing institutional knowledge and supporting alignment with approved PV Climate methodologies.
- **Core Methodology Experts (type-specific):** A minimum of two TAC and/or **Technical Review Panel (TRP)** members whose primary expertise aligns with the subject matter of the submission. This may include expertise in areas such as:

---

<sup>10</sup> Defined in Section 11.2.1 of the PV Climate Procedures Manual V3.6 as those that “involve significant changes to the Methodology’s scope, applicability, or any alteration that could materially affect the estimated Carbon Benefits. Major revisions may also include the integration of new Modules or Tools, and any changes to associated models that significantly alter their output, core logic, underlying assumptions, or the scientific principles upon which they are based. For the purpose of this definition, a material alteration is considered a cumulative change of 5% or more in calculated Carbon Benefits.”

- Forest carbon (e.g. REDD+, ARR, improved forest management);
- Soil carbon (e.g. soil organic carbon modelling, agricultural land management);
- Blue carbon (e.g. coastal and marine ecosystems, hydrology);
- General greenhouse gas accounting principles.
- **Additional Technical Experts (as required by the submission):** One or more experts with specialised technical expertise relevant to the submission, who may be TAC or TRP members or qualified external experts. Depending on scope, this may include:
  - Remote sensing and GIS specialists;
  - Process-based or empirical modelling experts.

A **Lead Reviewer** shall be appointed by Plan Vivo from among the MAP members based on their technical expertise, experience, and suitability for the scope and complexity of the submission under review. The Lead Reviewer shall chair the MAP for the duration of the review, coordinate the review process, facilitate technical discussions, and be responsible for drafting the final Methodology Review Report.

Within the assigned MAP, reviewers shall:

- Conduct an independent desk review of the submission and raise any **NIRs** or **CARs** relevant to their area of expertise.
- Participate in internal MAP meetings and follow-up discussions to consolidate and resolve review findings.
- Conduct a follow-up desk review of any revised versions of the submission to confirm that agreed findings and requests have been adequately addressed.

## 5. Qualifications

To review a submission as part of a MAP, experts must demonstrate expert knowledge of the procedures applied in the submission. This can be evidenced by:

- Prior experience in developing or assessing similar Methodologies.
- Previous involvement in the development, implementation, or validation/verification of Projects applying similar Methodologies.
- A track record of scientific research relevant to the scope of the Methodology.

## 6. Review Process

## 6.1 Communication and Reporting

Upon appointment, all MAP members shall sign a **Code of Conduct** and a **Conflict of Interest Declaration**. Any actual or potential conflicts of interest must be declared promptly and may result in exclusion from the review of the submission.

Plan Vivo shall provide MAP members with relevant documentation, templates, and procedural guidance to support consistent and structured reviews. All formal review outputs, including **New Information Requests (NIRs)**, **Corrective Action Requests (CARs)**, and consolidated assessment materials, shall be communicated to the methodology developer via Plan Vivo.

Direct communication between MAP members and the methodology developer should normally be coordinated through Plan Vivo to ensure transparency and consistency of the review process. Where direct technical engagement is considered beneficial (for example, to clarify specific methodological questions), such communication may be arranged with the knowledge and agreement of Plan Vivo and the **Lead Reviewer**. Any substantive clarifications or outcomes arising from such exchanges shall be documented and reflected in the **Methodology Review Report**.

MAP members shall coordinate their review activities through the Lead Reviewer and Plan Vivo. All individual and consolidated review outputs shall be submitted to Plan Vivo for record-keeping and process management.

## 6.2 Technical Review and Feedback Consolidation

Each MAP member shall conduct an independent, in-depth desk review of the assigned components of the submission against the applicable **Methodology Requirements**. Review findings shall be documented using the **Methodology Review Report Template** and expressed in a manner that is clear, proportionate, and defensible.

Review findings shall be categorised as follows:

- **Corrective Action Requests (CARs)**, which represent:
  - A failure to meet one or more Methodology Requirements;
  - A material risk that carbon benefits cannot be credibly monitored or calculated;
  - An inappropriate or incorrect dependency on, or reference to, another methodological element; or
  - Material duplication or overlap with approved methodologies, modules, or tools.

- **New Information Requests (NIRs)**, which represent:
  - Insufficient or unclear information that prevents a determination of whether the Methodology Requirements are met; or
  - The need for further explanation or evidence to confirm that referenced methodologies, modules, or tools are being applied appropriately.
- **Observations**, which represent:
  - Improvements in clarity, presentation, or usability, but where compliance with the Methodology Requirements is not affected. Observations shall not be framed as requirements for approval.

When consolidating individual MAP member reviews into a single set of findings, the following principles shall be applied:

- **Requirement-led outcomes:** All CARs and NIRs must be explicitly traceable to specific Methodology Requirements. Findings based on reviewer preference, alternative design choices, or potential improvements that do not demonstrate non-compliance shall be recorded as Observations only.
- **Correct scoping and attribution:** Where submissions are modular in structure, reliance on approved modules or tools shall not in itself be treated as a deficiency. Review findings shall assess whether the submission clearly specifies applicability conditions and applies referenced modules or tools consistently with their approved scope.
- **Proportional classification:** CARs shall be reserved for clear non-compliance. NIRs shall be used where clarification or additional evidence is required to confirm compliance. Findings shall not be escalated in the absence of a breached requirement.
- **Consolidation and de-duplication:** Substantively similar findings raised by multiple MAP members shall be consolidated into a single, clearly scoped CAR, NIR, or Observation. Redundant or overlapping findings shall be avoided.
- **Minimum necessary prescription:** Review findings shall specify the minimum action required to achieve compliance and shall avoid prescribing formats, structures, or methodological design choices unless explicitly required by the Methodology Requirements.

The MAP shall convene, under the facilitation of the **Lead Reviewer**, to review the consolidated findings and to consider responses to comments received during the mandatory public consultation period. The Lead Reviewer shall synthesise individual findings into a consolidated draft for MAP discussion and agreement.

## 6.3 Revision and Feedback Closure

The methodology developer shall revise the submission in response to CARs, NIRs, and relevant public consultation comments. The MAP shall then conduct a follow-up review of the revised submission to confirm that all review findings have been adequately addressed.

Review iterations may continue until all CARs and NIRs are closed to the satisfaction of the MAP. If unresolved CARs or NIRs remain after three rounds of review, the methodology developer may be required to pay an additional review fee for further rounds of assessment, or the submission may be recommended for rejection.

## 6.4 Report Approval and Recommendations

The principal output of the MAP shall be a **Methodology Approval Report**, drafted by the Lead Reviewer and approved by the MAP. The report shall include:

- The scope and version of the submission reviewed;
- A list of MAP members, including areas of expertise and contributions;
- A summary of key review findings;
- All CARs and NIRs issued and a summary of how they were addressed;
- A summary of public comments received and the MAP's response;
- The MAP's recommendation for approval or rejection, with justification; and
- A clear statement on compliance with the **Methodology Requirements** and suitability for use in PV Climate projects.

The Methodology Approval Report and final version of the submission shall be submitted to Plan Vivo for formal approval. Upon approval, both documents shall be published on the Plan Vivo website.

## 6.5 Disagreement Resolution

The MAP shall seek consensus wherever possible. Where consensus cannot be reached after deliberation, the Lead Reviewer shall facilitate further discussion. If consensus remains unattainable, a majority vote shall determine the MAP's recommendation. Any material dissenting views shall be briefly documented in the Methodology Approval Report to ensure transparency.

## 7. Deliverables and Indicative Timeframes

The key stages of the review process, associated outputs, and indicative timeframes are outlined below. Timeframes are approximate and may be adjusted by Plan Vivo depending on the scope and complexity of the submission.

<b>Review Stage</b>	<b>Indicative Timeframe</b>	<b>Description and Key Outputs</b>
Public Consultation Period	4 weeks	<p>The submission is published for public consultation to solicit stakeholder input and initial feedback.</p> <p><b>Output:</b> Public consultation comments log.</p>
MAP Technical Review and Initial Deliberation (Round 1)	4 weeks	<p>MAP members conduct independent desk reviews of assigned components, followed by internal deliberation to consolidate findings. Outputs include a consolidated set of CARs, NIRs, and Observations, informed by public consultation feedback.</p> <p><b>Output:</b> Consolidated <b>Methodology Review Report</b> (iterative working version).</p>
MAP Review of Developer Revisions (Round 2)	3 weeks	<p>Assessment of the methodology developer’s response to Round 1 CARs and NIRs and any remaining public consultation comments, culminating in further consolidated feedback where required.</p> <p><b>Output:</b> Updated <b>Methodology Review Report</b></p>

		reflecting closure or continuation of findings.
Optional: MAP Review of Further Revisions (Round 3)	2 weeks	<p>If necessary, a final review round to assess responses to Round 2 feedback. Submissions with unresolved CARs after three review rounds may be recommended for rejection or require a new review cycle.</p> <p><b>Output: Final iterative Methodology Review Report.</b></p>
Finalisation of Methodology Approval Report	2 weeks	<p>Final MAP input to confirm closure of all CARs and NIRs and to complete and endorse the Methodology Approval Report, including the MAP’s recommendation.</p> <p><b>Output: Methodology Approval Report</b></p>

## 8. Compensation

MAP members shall be remunerated at a fixed rate of **USD 450 per day**, calculated on the basis of a **7.5-hour working day**, in accordance with this Terms of Reference.

MAP members shall be responsible for recording the time spent on review activities covered by this ToR. Submitted time records shall be subject to review and approval by Plan Vivo prior to payment.

## 9. Confidentiality

All non-public information shared by Plan Vivo or the methodology developer in relation to the submission, including draft documents, reviewer comments, and internal deliberations, shall be

treated as confidential. MAP members shall not disclose such information to third parties without prior written consent from Plan Vivo.

This obligation shall not apply to materials that are made publicly available by Plan Vivo, including approved methodologies and final Methodology Review Reports.

## 10. Grievances

Plan Vivo may raise concerns regarding the quality, accuracy, impartiality, professionalism, or timeliness of feedback provided by a MAP member. Where such concerns arise, Plan Vivo may seek additional input from other experts to inform its assessment.

Where a concern is substantiated, Plan Vivo shall first seek to resolve the matter through dialogue with the MAP member. If resolution is not achieved, Plan Vivo may limit or terminate the MAP member's participation in the review. In cases of serious or unresolved issues, remuneration may be withheld for review activities that are materially incomplete or non-compliant with this Terms of Reference.

## 11. Conflicts of Interest

MAP members must disclose any actual or potential conflicts of interest that could reasonably be perceived to affect their independence or impartiality. MAP members shall be excluded from review of a submission if they, or an organisation that employs them, have been involved in its development.

## 12. Contact Information

For questions relating to these Terms of Reference, or to register interest in participation as a MAP member, please contact [hamish@planvivofoundation.org](mailto:hamish@planvivofoundation.org).