Anhang 1: ACCORD-Checkliste

Item No.	Section	Checklist Item (*help text*)	Abschnitt
T1	**Title**	Identify the article as reporting a consensus exercise and state the consensus methods used in the title. *For example, Delphi or nominal group technique.*	Titel
I1	**Introduction**	Explain why a consensus exercise was chosen over other approaches.	2. Methoden
I2		State the aim of the consensus exercise, including its intended audience and geographical scope (national, regional, global).	1.3 Zielsetzung
I3		If the consensus exercise is an update of an existing document, state why an update is needed, and provide the citation for the original document.	n.a. - Das vorliegende Positionspapier stellt kein Update eines bestehenden Dokuments dar, sondern ist eine Neuentwicklung, die maßgeblich auf dem POiL-Positionspapier zu Kernkompetenzen von Lehrenden in der Ausbildung aufbaut und dieses auf den Weiterbildungskontext überträgt
M1	**Methods** Registration	If the study or study protocol was prospectively registered, state the registration platform and provide a link. If the exercise was not registered, this should be stated. *Recommended to include the date of registration.*	Wir haben kein Protokoll registriert.
M2	Selection of SC and/or panellists	Describe the role(s) and areas of expertise or experience of those directing the consensus exercise. *For example, whether the project was led by a chair, co-chairs or a steering committee, and, if so, how they were chosen. List their names if appropriate, and whether there were any subgroups for individual steps in the process.*	2.1 Arbeitsgruppe; Anhang 2
M3		Explain the criteria for panellist inclusion and the rationale for panellist numbers. State who was responsible for panellist selection.	n.a. - Da das Konsensusverfahren innerhalb der bestehenden Arbeitsgruppe der GMA-Ausschüsse POiL und WB stattfand, gab es keine externe Panellist-Rekrutierung mit separaten Einschlusskriterien
M4		Describe the recruitment process (how panellists were invited to participate). *Include communication/advertisement method(s) and locations, numbers of invitations sent, and whether there was centralised oversight of invitations or if panellists were asked/allowed to suggest other members of the panel.*	n.a. – siehe M3
M5		Describe the role of any members of the public, patients or carers in the different steps of the study.	n.a. - *Keine Einbeziehung von Patient:innen, Angehörigen oder Vertreter:innen der Öffentlichkeit*
M6	Preparatory research	Describe how information was obtained prior to generating items or other materials used during the consensus exercise. *This might include a literature review, interviews, surveys, or another process.*	2.2 Vorhandene Ressourcen für die Entwicklung des Kompetenzrasters

Anhang 1 zu Steinweg B, Sonntag U, Bennett F, Fehr F, Hahn EG, Kollewe T, Kunisch R, Hennel EK. *A competency framework for programme directors, teachers and clinical supervisors in postgraduate medical training: A position paper by the committees for personnel and organizational development in teaching (POiL) and postgraduate medical training (WB) of the DACH Association for Medical Education (GMA).* GMS J Med Educ. 2026;43(7):Doc100. DOI: 10.3205/zma001894

M7		Describe any systematic literature search in detail, including the search strategy and dates of search or the citation if published already. *Provide the details suggested by the reporting guideline PRISMA and the related PRISMA-Search extension.*	n.a. - Es wurde keine systematische Literaturrecherche durchgeführt. Die Informationsbeschaffung erfolgte durch gezielte Nutzung bekannter Schlüsselpublikationen und Rahmendokumente (POiL-Positionspapier, DEGAM-Checkliste, BÄK-Rahmenempfehlungen, WFME-Standards), die der Arbeitsgruppe aufgrund ihrer Fachexpertise bekannt waren (siehe M6)
M8		Describe how any existing scientific evidence was summarised and if this evidence was provided to the panellists.	2.2 Vorhandene Ressourcen für die Entwicklung des Kompetenzrasters
M9	Assessing consensus	Describe the methods used and steps taken to gather panellist input and reach consensus (for example, Delphi, RAND-UCLA, nominal group technique). *If modifications were made to the method in its original form, provide a detailed explanation of how the method was adjusted and why this was necessary for the purpose of your consensus-based study.*	2.3 Konkrete Arbeitsschritte der Entwicklung
M10		Describe how each question or statement was presented and the response options. State whether panellists were able to or required to explain their responses, and whether they could propose new items. *Where possible, present the questionnaire or list of statements as supplementary material.*	2.3 Konkrete Arbeitsschritte der Entwicklung
M11		State the objective of each consensus step. *A step could be a consensus meeting, a discussion or interview session, or a Delphi round.*	Anhang 4
M12		State the definition of consensus (for example, number, percentage, or categorical rating, such as ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’) and explain the rationale for that definition.	2.3 Konkrete Arbeitsschritte der Entwicklung
M13		State whether items that met the prespecified definition of consensus were included in any subsequent voting rounds.	2.3 Konkrete Arbeitsschritte der Entwicklung
M14		For each step, describe how responses were collected, and whether responses were collected in a group setting or individually.	2.3 Konkrete Arbeitsschritte der Entwicklung
M15		Describe how responses were processed and/or synthesised. *Include qualitative analyses of free-text responses (for example, thematic, content or cluster analysis) and/or quantitative analytical methods, if used.*	2.3 Konkrete Arbeitsschritte der Entwicklung
M16		Describe any piloting of the study materials and/or survey instruments. *Include how many individuals piloted the study materials, the rationale for the selection of those individuals, any changes made as a result and whether their responses were used in the calculation of the final consensus. If no pilot was conducted, this should be stated.*	4. Diskussion

M17		If applicable, describe how feedback was provided to panellists at the end of each consensus step or meeting. *State whether feedback was quantitative (for example, approval rates per topic/item) and/or qualitative (for example, comments, or lists of approved items), and whether it was anonymised.*	n.a. – In den Arbeitstreffen wurde Feedback unmittelbar in der gemeinsamen Diskussion gegeben; ein separater, strukturierter Feedback-Mechanismus nach jeder Sitzung war nicht vorgesehen.
M18		State whether anonymity was planned in the study design. Explain where and to whom it was applied and what methods were used to guarantee anonymity.	n.a. - Anonymität war nicht Teil des Studiendesigns. Die Konsensustreffen fanden nicht-anonymisiert statt und alle Beteiligten konnten ihre Positionen offen äußern.
M19		State if the steering committee was involved in the decisions made by the consensus panel. *For example, whether the steering committee or those managing consensus also had voting rights.*	2.1 Arbeitsgruppe
M20	Participation	Describe any incentives used to encourage responses or participation in the consensus process. *For example, were invitations to participate reiterated, or were participants reimbursed for their time.*	2.1 Arbeitsgruppe
M21		Describe any adaptations to make the surveys/meetings more accessible. *For example, the languages in which the surveys/meetings were conducted and whether translations or plain language summaries were available*.	n.a.
R1	Results	State when the consensus exercise was conducted. List the date of initiation and the time taken to complete each consensus step, analysis, and any extensions or delays in the analysis.	Anhang 4
R2		Explain any deviations from the study protocol, and why these were necessary. *For example, addition of panel members during the exercise, number of consensus steps, stopping criteria; report the step(s) in which this occurred.*	n.a. – da kein prospektives Studienprotokoll registriert wurde (siehe M1), kam es auch nicht zu Abweichungen
R3		For each step, report quantitative (number of panellists, response rate) and qualitative (relevant socio-demographics) data to describe the participating panellists.	Anhang 4
R4		Report the final outcome of the consensus process as qualitative (for example, aggregated themes from comments) and/or quantitative (for example, summary statistics, score means, medians and/or ranges) data.	Anhang 3; Tab. 2
R5		List any items or topics that were modified or removed during the consensus process. Include why and when in the process they were modified or removed.	2.3 Inhaltliche Diskussion
D1	Discussion	Discuss the methodological strengths and limitations of the consensus exercise. *Include factors that may have impacted the decisions (for example, response rates, representativeness of the panel, potential for feedback during consensus to bias responses, potential impact of any non-anonymised interactions)*.	4. Diskussion

D2		Discuss whether the recommendations are consistent with any pre-existing literature and, if not, propose reasons why this process may have arrived at alternative conclusions.	4. Diskussion
O1	Other information	List any endorsing organisations involved and their role.	Förderung
O2		State any potential conflicts of interests, including among those directing the consensus study and panellists. Describe how conflicts of interest were managed.	Interessenskonflikt
O3		State any funding received and the role of the funder. *Specify, for example, any funder involvement in the study concept/design, participation in the steering committee, conducting the consensus process, funding of any medical writing support. This could be disclosed in the methods or in the relevant transparency section of the manuscript. Where a funder did not play a role in the process or influence the decisions reached, this should be specified.*	2.1 Arbeitsgruppe; Förderung

From: PLoS Med 21(1): e1004326. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1004326 For more information see: https://www.ismpp.org/accord