

# ipcc

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON climate change

**THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE IPCC**  
**Kampala, 18-19 November 2011**

IPCC-XXXIV/Doc. 9  
(19.X.2011)  
Agenda Item: 5.2  
ENGLISH ONLY

## **REVIEW OF THE IPCC PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES**

**Procedures: Adoption of the revised “Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC Work: Procedures for the Preparation, Review, Acceptance, Adoption, Approval and Publication of IPCC Reports”**

(Submitted by the IPCC Secretariat on behalf of the Task Group Co-chairs)

*Governments are invited to submit comments on the draft recommendations prepared by the Task Group by 11 November 2011 to [ipcc-review@wmo.int](mailto:ipcc-review@wmo.int)*

### **IPCC Secretariat**

c/o WMO • 7bis, Avenue de la Paix • C.P. 2300 • 1211 Geneva 2 • Switzerland  
telephone : +41 (0) 22 730 8208 / 54 / 84 • fax : +41 (0) 22 730 8025 / 13 • email : IPCC-Sec@wmo.int • [www.ipcc.ch](http://www.ipcc.ch)



1 **REVIEW OF THE IPCC PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES**

2  
3 **Proposal by the Task Group on Procedures**

4  
5 (Submitted by the IPCC Secretariat on behalf of the Task Group Co-chairs)

6  
7 *Governments are invited to submit comments on the draft recommendations prepared by the Task*  
8 *Group by 11 November 2011 to [ipcc-review@wmo.int](mailto:ipcc-review@wmo.int)*

9  
10  
11 **Table of Contents**

12  
13  
14  
15  
16 **PART 1**

- 17  
18 1. Introduction  
19 2. Incorporation of IPCC-33 decisions in procedures  
20 3. IPCC guidance material  
21 4. Selection of participants to IPCC Workshops and Expert Meetings  
22 5. Matters relating to the transparency, quality and efficiency of the review process  
23 6. Anonymous expert review  
24 7. Summary for Policymakers Approval Sessions  
25 8. Incorporation of IPCC-34 proposed decisions in procedures  
26 9. Resource implications of procedural decisions IPCCs-33 and IPCC-34  
27 10. Removal of internal inconsistencies and editorial improvement

28  
29 Appendix 1. Extension of mandate of the Task Group on Procedures

30 Appendix 2. List of members of the task group for procedures for IPCC-34

31 Appendix 3. IPCC Anonymous Expert Review: Past experiences and arguments in favor or against

32  
33  
34 **PART 2**

35  
36 Revised Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC Work: Procedures for the Preparation,  
37 Review, Acceptance, Adoption, Approval and Publication of IPCC Reports

## **PART 1**

### **1. Introduction**

#### *History*

The Task Group on Procedures was established at the 32nd Session of the IPCC, held 10-14 October 2010 in Busan, Republic of Korea and extended at the 33rd Session of the IPCC, held 10-13 May 2011 in Abu Dhabi (see Appendix 1 for its extended mandate). The Task Group on Procedures relates to Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC Work (Procedures for the preparation, review, acceptance, adoption, approval and publication of IPCC Reports) and its Annexes, hereafter called 'Procedures'.

Membership of the Task Group on Procedures was open to all IPCC members (see Appendix 2 for its membership for this mandate period). The Task Group on Procedures held four teleconferences in the period 16 August–11 October 2011. It developed a first draft of its work plan and zero-order draft of the revised procedures on 18 August 2011 for review by the Executive Committee and a final draft of its work plan on 12 September 2011 for review by the IPCC Bureau and Executive Committee.

Taking into account the comments received from the Executive Committee and the IPCC Bureau, the Task Group on Procedures developed this proposal for consideration by the 34th session of the IPCC in Kampala, Uganda, 18-19 November 2011.

#### *The present proposal*

The extended mandate of the Task Group on Procedures is addressed in Sections 2 to 10 of Part 1 this proposal.

*Section 2* deals with the revisions of the procedures that reflect the decisions on the procedures taken at IPCC 33rd Session.

*Sections 3–7* addresses outstanding issues with respect to the procedures, derived from IPCC-33 decisions and the extension of the mandate of the Task Group on Procedures.

*Section 8* deals with the revisions of the procedures that reflect the proposed decisions on the procedures to be taken at IPCC 34th Session.

*Section 9* addresses the resource implications of the procedural decisions.

Finally, *Section 10* addresses the non-substantive changes to the procedures text which are proposed to remove inconsistencies and include editorial improvements.

The proposed outcome of IPCC-34 is the revised procedures appendix presented in Part 2 of this proposal.

### **2. Incorporation of IPCC-33 decisions in procedures**

In Part 2 of this proposal the IPCC-33 decisions on procedures (see [http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session33/ipcc\\_p33\\_decisions\\_taken\\_procedures.pdf](http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session33/ipcc_p33_decisions_taken_procedures.pdf)) have been incorporated in the procedures text using the color green (with comments indicating to which decisions the changed/inserted texts correspond). No changes were made to the decision text. The decided texts have only been inserted in the existing procedures text at the most logical position and the resulting procedures text has been checked for legal consistency. The following decisions have been incorporated in this way:

- decision on 'selection of participants to scoping meetings' (IPCC-33 decisions, section 2)
- decision on 'selection of Coordinating Lead authors (CLAs) and Lead Authors (LAs)' (IPCC-33 decisions, section 3)
- decision on 'sources of data and literature' (IPCC-33 decisions, section 4)
- decision on 'handling the full range of views' (IPCC-33 decisions, section 5)
- decision on 'further assuring quality of the review' (IPCC-33 decisions, section 7)

- 1 - decision on 'confidentiality of draft reports' (IPCC-33 decisions, section 8)
- 2 - decision on 'Summary for Policymakers' (IPCC-33 decisions, section 9)
- 3 - decision on 'procedures for handling possible errors identified after approval of IPCC reports'
- 4 (IPCC-33 decisions, section 10)
- 5 - decision on 'IPCC evaluation of evidence and treatment of uncertainty' (IPCC-33 decisions,
- 6 section 11).

### 3. IPCC guidance material

At its 33rd Session, The Panel noted that some IPCC guidance material now plays a significant role in the processes of IPCC and that there is a need for transparency related to the development of such material. The IAC Review has elevated the importance of such guidance.

The Panel noted that some of this material has until this point not been classified or has been classified as IPCC supporting material.

The Task Group for Procedures considered the option of introducing a separate class of IPCC material for IPCC guidance material, but decided against it, since the present procedures with only minor adjustment can indeed include guidance material as a sub-category of IPCC supporting material. Therefore, the Task Group on Procedures recommends the Panel to take the following decision:

The Panel decided that guidance material (guidance notes and guidance documents) is a category of IPCC supporting material aimed to guide and assist authors in the preparation of comprehensive and scientifically sound IPCC Reports and Technical Papers. Guidance notes and documents are usually the responsibility of Working Group Bureaux, TF Bureau or Chair as appropriate, but may also be commissioned by the Panel, the IPCC Executive Committee or the IPCC Bureau. Guidance notes and documents are developed by the relevant Working Group Bureaux, Task Force Bureau or the IPCC Chair. The Executive Committee will oversee the consistency of these materials. Guidance notes and documents should be accessible together with other principles and procedures and published.

This decision will be incorporated in the procedures.

The text at the beginning of Chapter 6 (IPCC Supporting Material) in the procedures appendix needs to be changed accordingly:

Supporting material consists of three categories:

- (i) published reports and proceedings from Workshops and Expert Meetings within the scope of the IPCC work programme that have IPCC recognition,
- (ii) material, including databases and software, commissioned by Working Groups, or by the Bureau of the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories in support of the assessment or methodology development process which IPCC decides should have wide dissemination, and
- (iii) guidance material (guidance notes and guidance documents) that guides and assists authors in the preparation of comprehensive and scientifically sound IPCC Reports and Technical Papers.

Procedures for the recognition of Workshops and Expert Meetings are given in Sections 6.1 and 6.2; procedures for guidance material are given in Section 6.3. Arrangements for publication of supporting material should be agreed as part of the process of IPCC recognition or commissioned by Working Groups/the Task Force Bureau to prepare specific supporting material. All supporting material of categories (i) and (ii) should be formally and prominently described on the front and other introductory covers as:

"Supporting material prepared for consideration by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. This supporting material has not been subject to formal IPCC review processes."

### 4. Selection of participants to IPCC Workshops and Expert Meetings

The issue of the selection of participants to IPCC Workshops and Expert Meetings was raised during the discussions of the Task Group on Procedures under its previous mandate in Geneva, February

1 2011, and addressed by some government comments in submissions before the Plenary IPCC-33 in  
 2 Abu Dhabi, May 2011 (see IPCC-XXXIII/INF.1). The Task Group noted that the IAC recommendations  
 3 about transparency in the process and criteria for selecting participants for scoping meetings and the  
 4 recommendation about criteria and processes for selecting Authors also is relevant to the selection of  
 5 participants for IPCC Workshops and Expert Meetings. Draft decision text was discussed in Abu  
 6 Dhabi, but it was decided that some elaboration on the distinction between Workshops and Expert  
 7 Meetings was required.

8  
 9 Nominations for Expert Meetings may take place through the relevant Bureau(x)/TFI and/ or through  
 10 government focal points and, as appropriate, participating organizations and stakeholders.  
 11 Nominations for Workshops will take place through government focal points and, as appropriate,  
 12 participating organizations and stakeholders. Participants to IPCC Workshops and Expert Meetings  
 13 should be selected by the IPCC Bureau or the respective Working Group Bureau/Task Force, taking  
 14 into account scientific, technical and socio-economic expertise, geographical representation, the range  
 15 of scientific views, and a balanced representation of experts from stakeholder groups as appropriate.  
 16

17 The Task Group on Procedures under its present mandate discussed this distinction. It noted that in  
 18 the past, Workshops generally required nominations of experts through government focal points, and,  
 19 as appropriate, participating organizations and stakeholders. It also noted a comment from the IPCC  
 20 Bureau that Workshops or Expert Meetings could create opportunities for outreach meetings with a  
 21 view to contributing to capacity building including in developing countries and economies in transition.  
 22 The Task Group recommends the Panel to take the following decision:  
 23

24 The Panel decided:

25  
 26 *An IPCC Expert Meeting* focuses on a specific topic bringing together a limited number of relevant  
 27 experts. The relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureaux, or the IPCC Chair, will nominate and select  
 28 participants to Expert Meetings.

29  
 30 *An IPCC Workshop* considers cross-cutting or complex topics requiring input from a broad community  
 31 of experts. It requires nominations by Government Focal Points and, as appropriate, participating  
 32 organizations. The relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureaux, or the IPCC Chair, will also nominate  
 33 experts and will select the participants to Workshop.

34  
 35 Proposals for IPCC Workshops or Expert Meetings will be submitted to the Panel for its decision  
 36 through the relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureaux, or the IPCC Chair. The proposals will  
 37 include descriptions of the topic, and clarify the choice for an Expert meeting or a Workshop.  
 38

39 The composition of participants to Expert Meetings and Workshops shall aim to reflect:

- 40 - The relevant range of scientific, technical and socio-economic views and expertise,
- 41 - Geographical representation as appropriate,
- 42 - A mixture of experts with and without previous experience in IPCC,
- 43 - Gender balance.

44  
 45 The relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureaux, or the IPCC Chair, may install a Scientific Steering  
 46 Committee to assist them in organizing these meetings, taking into account the criteria mentioned  
 47 above.  
 48

49 Government Focal Points should be notified of the list of invited participants of an Expert Meeting or  
 50 Workshop at the earliest opportunity after the selection has taken place.  
 51

52 The relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureaux, or the IPCC Chair, will convene the Expert Meeting  
 53 or Workshop and report to the IPCC Bureau and Panel on the selection process, including a  
 54 description of how the selection criteria for participation and any other considerations have been  
 55 applied.  
 56

57 This decision will be incorporated in the procedures.  
 58  
 59  
 60

**5. Matters relating to the transparency, quality and efficiency of the review process**

*Review Editors*

At its 33rd Session, the Panel decided to request the Bureaux of Working Group I, II and III and TFI to develop and agree an additional guidance document that fully responds to the IAC recommendations on the role of Review Editors<sup>1</sup> in time for implementation in the AR5 assessment process. The Working Group/TFI Bureaux should consider the guidance document “Role of Review Editors”<sup>2</sup> The Panel decided furthermore that the Panel may subsequently revise the Procedures as required at a future session.

The Task Group on Procedures requested the Working Group/TFI Bureaux to inform the Task Group on the progress that had been made in the production of the additional guidance document. The Working Group/TFI Bureaux provided the Task Group on Procedures with this information. The Task Group on Procedures has invited the Co-chairs to submit a proposal for a revised IPCC Guidance Note on Review Editors as an Add. document to the present proposal before IPCC-34.

Pending the timely availability of this revised IPCC Guidance Note on Review Editors, the Task Group recommends to the Panel to take the following decision:

The Panel welcomed the revised Guidance Note on Review Editors and found that the recommendations of the InterAcademy Council on the Review Editors have been taken adequately into account. The Panel encouraged the implementation of this revised guidance note to the forthcoming report reviews of the AR5, and invites the Working Group Co-chairs to address its performances in their WG progress reports.

Furthermore, in order to bring the procedures in line with current practice, the Task Group on Procedures proposes to expand the maximum number of Review Editors per chapter to four (the need for this expansion derives from the increased workload for Review Editors also flagged by the IAC), and hence recommends the Panel to take the following decision:

The Panel decided:

To help ensure that Reports provide a balanced and complete assessment of current information, each Working Group/Task Force Bureau should normally select two to four Review Editors per chapter (including the executive summaries) and per technical summary of each Report.

This decision will be incorporated in the procedures.

*Open invitation for expert reviewers*

According to the present procedures text, governments are invited to nominate expert reviewers. For AR5, however, a conscious decision has been made by the Working Groups to continue the practice developed in AR4 to openly invited experts to sign up as expert reviewers through the websites of the respective WGs/TFI. Indeed, recently, Working Group I announced the review of its First Order Draft from 16 December 2011 to 10 February 2012. The Task Group on Procedures agrees with this new procedure and hence recommends the Panel to take the following decision:

The Panel decided:

First draft Reports should be circulated by Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs for review. The Working Group/Task Force Bureaux shall seek the participation of reviewers encompassing the

<sup>1</sup> Recommendations by the InterAcademy Council:

- The IPCC should adopt a more targeted and effective process for responding to reviewer comments. In such a process, Review Editors would prepare a written summary of the most significant issues raised by reviewers shortly after review comments have been received. Authors would be required to provide detailed written responses to the most significant review issues identified by the Review Editors, abbreviated responses to all non-editorial comments, and no written responses to editorial comments.
- The IPCC should encourage Review Editors to fully exercise their authority to ensure that reviewers' comments are adequately considered by the authors and that genuine controversies are adequately reflected in the report.

<sup>2</sup> General Guidance on the Role of Review Editors, Decisions taken at 32nd Session of the IPCC, appendix 3.

1 range of scientific, technical and socio-economic views, expertise, and geographical representation  
2 and shall undertake to invite as wide a group of experts as possible. The review should be open to:

- 3
- 4 • Experts who have relevant expertise in the areas covered by the Report.
- 5 • Experts nominated by governments as Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors or contributing
- 6 authors as included in lists maintained by the IPCC Secretariat.
- 7

8 This decision will be incorporated in the procedures.

## 9

### 10 **6. Anonymous expert review**

11  
12 The Task Group on Procedures further considered anonymous expert review as required by their  
13 mandate from IPCC-33, with a view to conclude this matter by IPCC-34, given the fact that the first  
14 expert review of an AR5 report (of WG I) is due in December 2011.

15  
16 At the 44th IPCC Bureau Meeting (23 September 2011) the Co-chairs of the 3 Working Groups  
17 submitted the view that IPCC expert reviews for the AR5 reports should not be anonymous. In  
18 addition, the IPCC Executive Committee (third meeting, 23 September 2011) advised the Task Group  
19 on Procedures that 'a uniform procedure of open reviews be followed at least across the three  
20 Working Groups. While recognizing that the TFI has been following an anonymous review process,  
21 they were requested by the Executive Committee to reconsider this issue'.

22  
23 The Task Group on Procedures noted that current Procedures are silent on this issue, allowing the  
24 current Co-chairs of the Working Groups or Task Force on Inventories to proceed with either named or  
25 anonymous expert reviews. Given the messages from the WG co-chairs and the IPCC Executive  
26 Committee, the Task Group felt, on the one hand, that there is currently no consensus for amending  
27 the Procedures prescribing anonymous or named/open expert reviews. On the other hand, the Task  
28 Group on Procedures also wishes not to preclude a different approach in future assessment cycles.  
29 For future reference, the Task Group on Procedures has prepared documentation on past experiences  
30 with anonymous review and arguments in favour or against an open or anonymous expert review  
31 (Appendix 3).

32  
33 Therefore, the Task Group on Procedures recommends the Panel to take the following decision:

34  
35 The Panel, having considered the pros and contras of anonymous expert reviews of IPCC reports,  
36 decided:

- 37 - to note the agreement by the Executive Committee at its third session (23 September 2011) that
- 38 the Working Groups will conduct named expert reviews during the AR5;
- 39 - not to amend the IPCC Procedures in any way with respect to the anonymity or non-anonymity of
- 40 expert reviews and not to preclude a different approach in future assessments;
- 41 - to document the past experiences with anonymous expert reviews by Working Group III and the
- 42 Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories during the AR4, including listing all
- 43 arguments in favour or against an open or anonymous expert review, in an Annex to the Report of
- 44 IPCC-34.

### 45

### 46 **7. Summary for Policymakers Approval Sessions**

47  
48 At its 33rd Session, the Panel decided that the existing procedures should be amended to clarify the  
49 current practices related to submitting written comments prior to the plenary approval session. The  
50 Task Group on Procedures recommends the Panel to take the following decision:

51  
52 The Panel decides:

53  
54 The first review of the Summaries for Policymakers will take place during the same time period as the  
55 Expert Government Review of the Second Order Draft of the full report. The final draft of the  
56 Summaries for Policymakers prepared by the respective Working Groups and Overview Chapters of  
57 Methodology Report related to National Greenhouse Gas Inventories will be circulated for a final  
58 government distribution and for a government round of comments in preparation of the Session of the  
59 Working Group(s) that approves it or Session of the Panel that adopts it.

1 This decision will be incorporated in the procedures.

2  
3 In addition, the Task Group on Procedures discussed two suggestions for improvement of the SPM  
4 approval session submitted by a Task Group member.

5  
6 The first suggestion concerned the desirability of a prompt establishment of contact groups. The  
7 importance of such prompt establishment was shared among the members. However, it was not found  
8 that a change to the procedures would solve a problem of late establishment of contact groups. It is  
9 more a matter of efficient execution of their tasks by the chairs.

10  
11 The second suggestion concerned the desirability to have balanced press releases. Again, this  
12 concern was shared among the members. It was not found feasible, however, to have the plenary  
13 approve the SPM press release, as proposed by a Task Group member. Again this is a matter of a  
14 proper execution of a communication strategy that emphasizes the importance of balance in all  
15 communications. The Secretariat has informed the Task Group on Procedures that this issue will be  
16 taken up in the development and implementation of the IPCC's communication strategy. No changes  
17 in the procedures are presently proposed for ensuring balanced press releases.

#### 18 19 **8. Incorporation of IPCC-34 proposed decisions in procedures**

20  
21 In Part 2 of this proposal the proposed IPCC-34 decisions (3, 4, 5 and 7) have been incorporated in  
22 the procedures text using the color red (with comments indicating to which decisions the  
23 changed/inserted texts correspond). These changes have been checked for legal consistency.

#### 24 25 **9. Resource implications of procedural decisions IPCCs-33 and IPCC-34**

26  
27 According to the Task Group on Procedures and the Secretariat, the implementation of the Panel's  
28 decisions on Procedures at IPCC-33 and the proposed decisions in this Proposal will have no  
29 significant resource implications.

#### 30 31 **10. Removal of internal inconsistencies and editorial improvement**

32  
33 In Part 2 of this proposal the text incorporating IPCC-33 and proposed IPCC-34 decisions has been  
34 edited in track changes mode, to remove internal inconsistencies and to introduce editorial  
35 improvements.



## APPENDIX 1

### EXTENSION OF MANDATE OF THE TASK GROUP ON PROCEDURES

Excerpt from

#### DECISIONS TAKEN WITH RESPECT TO THE REVIEW OF IPCC PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

IPCC 33rd SESSION, 10-13 May 2011, ABU DHABI

(see [http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session33/ipcc\\_p33\\_decisions\\_taken\\_procedures.pdf](http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session33/ipcc_p33_decisions_taken_procedures.pdf))

### 13. Extension of mandate of the Task Group on Procedures

1. The Panel decided that the mandate of the Task Group on Procedures, as established at IPCC 32nd Session, will be extended to IPCC 34th Session in order to develop revised procedures reflecting the decisions on the procedures taken at IPCC 33rd Session. This revision should also take into account internal consistency, editorial improvement, and legal consistency. This work should be carried out in consultation with the IPCC Secretariat. The Task Group will produce draft decisions for IPCC 34th Session. The Panel agreed to consider the resource implications of its procedural decisions.

2. The Task Group may also consider, taking note of the deliberations during IPCC 33rd Session:

- Proposals to address relevant inconsistencies in current procedures
- Selection of participants to IPCC workshops and expert meetings
- Matters relating to the transparency, **quality** and efficiency of the review process
- Anonymous expert review
- Summary for Policymakers Approval Sessions

**APPENDIX 2**

## LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE TASK GROUP FOR PROCEDURES FOR IPCC-34

Country	Name	Email
ARMENIA	Mr Martiros TSARUKYAN	martiros@nature.am
AUSTRALIA	Mr Neville SMITH	n.smith@bom.gov.au
BELGIUM	Mr Philippe MARBAIX	marbaix@astr.ucl.ac.be
BOLIVIA	Ing Oscar PAZ	oscarpaz2@hotmail.com
BOTSWANA	Ms Maphoi KOMANYANE	bbogatsu@gov.bw
BRAZIL	Ms Suzana KHAN RIBEIRO	skr@pet.coppe.ufrj.br
CANADA	Ms Katie LUNDY	kathryn.lundy@ec.gc.ca
CHILE	Ms Maritza JADRIJEVIC	mjadrijevic@conama.cl
DENMARK	Ms Anne Mette JORGENSEN	amj@dmi.dk
GERMANY	Ms Christiane TEXTOR	christiane.textor@dlr.de
INDIA	Dr Subodh K. SHARMA	subodh.kumar@nic.in
IRAN, ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF	Dr Ali Mohammad NOORIAN	noorian@irimet.net
JAPAN	Ms Kasumi YASUKAWA	yasukawa-kasumi@meti.go.jp cc:kawagishi-syunsuke@meti.go.jp
MALDIVES	Mr Amjad ABDULLA	abdulla.amjad@gmail.com
NETHERLANDS (The) **	Dr Arthur PETERSEN	Arthur.petersen@pbl.nl
NEW ZEALAND	Mr Todd KRIEBLE	todd.kriebble@mfe.govt.nz
NIGER	Mr Abdoul-Karim TRAORE	traore.karim62@yahoo.fr
NORWAY *	Mr Oyvind CHRISTOPHERSEN	oyvind.christophersen@klif.no
PERU *	Dr Eduardo CALVO	e13calvo@gmail.com
SAUDI ARABIA	Dr Taha M. ZATARI	tahazat@yahoo.com
SOUTH AFRICA	Mr Jongikhaya WITI	jwiti@environment.gov.za
SPAIN	Mr Francisco PASCUAL	FPascualP@marm.es
SWAZILAND	Mr Emmanuel Dumisani DLAMINI	ed_dlamini@swazimet.gov.sz
SWITZERLAND	Dr José ROMERO	Jose.Romero@bafu.admin.ch
THAILAND	Dr Sitanon JESDAPIPAT	jsitanon@gmail.com
UNITED KINGDOM	Ms Lucy HAYES	lucy.hayes@decc.gsi.gov.uk
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	Mr Ko BARRETT	ko.barrett@noaa.gov

\* *Co-chair*\*\* *Rapporteur*

## APPENDIX 3

### **IPCC Anonymous Expert Review: Past experiences and arguments in favor or against** Note by Task Group on Procedures Co-chairs and Rapporteur IPCC -34, Kampala 2011

#### **Introduction**

The Task Group on Procedures has further considered the issue of the Anonymous Expert Review, in accordance with their mandate from IPCC-33, Abu Dhabi, May 2011, with a view to propose decisions to IPCC-34, November 2011, Kampala. The Task Group decided not to recommend or to exclude the possibility of anonymous Expert Reviews during the AR5, but suggested to document the explanation and the arguments brought forward in favor and against by the members of the Task Group as well as by the IPCC Co-chairs and Executive Committee during their discussions.

#### **Explanation**

It has been suggested that the Expert Review process could be made more objective by making it anonymous. This could filter out possible biases by authors and Review Editors with regard to the Expert Reviewer. A viewpoint is that only the content of an Expert Review comment should matter to the authors, not the person who wrote it. WG III and TFI had experiences with this practice.

The Government Review part should NOT be anonymous since it is indeed important to know what the specific viewpoints of a country are, given their differentiated information needs. Only the Expert Review part is suited for anonymity.

During the AR4, it was discussed at the Bureau whether or not to implement this practice for the three main assessment reports. Since there was no consensus among the Bureau members it was decided not to implement anonymous review but revisit the issue for the AR5

#### **Past experiences**

The Expert Reviews of the Special report on Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage of WG III of the Fourth Assessment Report were anonymous. It was organized as follows:

The TSU prepared a list of Review comments with numbers. The TSU had a conversion table linking the numbers to the Reviewer's names. During the treatment at the lead author meetings and the formulation of the authors' responses the authors only saw the numbers. The authors knew that in case they would need to consult an Expert Reviewer for getting some clarifications about his comments, the anonymity could be lifted and the coordinates of the Expert Reviewer would have been made available to the authors. In practice it turned out they did not need to use this provision. The anonymity was continued until finalization of the final draft report.

The Reviewers and authors have been informed beforehand about this procedure. The number of comments was normal compared to other special reports. No Reviewer used improper or inappropriate language. The WG III co chairs and TSU held an enquiry among the authors and Review Editors. They considered the anonymity an improvement, because it made them concentrate fully on the content of the matter, disregarding the persons and their background, which was more time efficient.

It should be noted that the massive review of an assessment report cannot be compared with the peer-review of a single scientific article – in the latter case the anonymity is needed for other reasons (sometimes for both authors and reviewers) as there are often connected through working relations with regard to the specific topic of that article.

#### **Arguments in favor and against**

##### *Arguments brought forward in favor of an anonymous Expert Review*

- Authors will concentrate on the content of the matter, excluding (subconscious) biases.
- There is positive experience in WG III AR4 – also the Task Force on the Greenhouse Gas Inventory Program (TFI) has practiced anonymous reviews with a positive judgment of the authors and Review Editors.

- Authors cannot be criticized anymore of ignoring comments of specific individuals or representatives of scientific schools or interest groups, as happened in the past.
- It remains possible for authors to contact Expert Reviewers if there is a need for clarification.

*Arguments brought forward against anonymous Review*

- The Task Group on Procedures was installed in order to consider the recommendations of the InterAcademy Council (IAC). The IAC did not recommend anonymous Reviews, so there is no compelling reason to address this.
- There is a risk that Expert Reviewers could take advantage of their anonymity by burdening authors with unprofessional or inappropriate comments.
- Measures against biases are already sufficiently taken by having Review Editors, and by having authors working as a group.
- Transparency is crucial to the IPCC process. There would be an imbalance in transparency when authors are known by name and Reviewers are not.
- IPCC needs a consistent approach with regard to its Expert Reviews. Changing the approach to require anonymous Review comments would imply that there is a problem with the named Reviewer approach, which is not the case.
- Named Expert Review is more efficient as it allows writing teams to liaise with Reviewers when there is a need for clarification.

**PART 2**

NEW PROCEDURES TEXT

**PART 2**

**Explanatory Note**

In this part 2 of the proposal of the Task Group of Procedures, a revised Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC Work is proposed.

The new Appendix A includes:

- (i) Revisions that have already been agreed at IPCC-33 (see [http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session33/ipcc\\_p33\\_decisions\\_taken\\_procedures.pdf](http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session33/ipcc_p33_decisions_taken_procedures.pdf)): text blocks of the original Appendix A that are affected by IPCC-33 decisions are highlighted in **green**. These are replaced by the **green texts** below the blocks (within the new blocks the changed sentences are set in **bold**). If no text is replaced, but only new text is added, this text is coloured green and set in bold.
- (ii) Revisions that would follow from the proposed decisions at IPCC-34 (see part 1 of this proposal): text blocks of Appendix A that are affected by the proposed IPCC-34 decisions are highlighted in **red**. These are proposed to be replaced by the **red texts** below the blocks (to be agreed at P-34; within the new blocks the actual changed sentences are set in **bold**). If no text is replaced, but only new text is added, this text is coloured red and set in bold.
- (iii) Editorial changes: inconsistencies have been removed and the text has been editorially improved, mainly through a restructuring of section 4. All editorial changes – which involve no changes in substance – are visible as underlined changes (tracked changes in **red**).

Furthermore, typos have been corrected and section numberings have been adjusted.

Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC Work

**PROCEDURES FOR THE PREPARATION, REVIEW, ACCEPTANCE, ADOPTION, APPROVAL AND PUBLICATION OF IPCC REPORTS**

Adopted at the Fifteenth Session (San Jose, 15-18 April 1999) amended at the Twentieth Session (Paris, 19-21 February 2003), Twenty-First Session (Vienna, 3 and 6-7 November 2003), Twenty-Ninth Session (Geneva, 31 August-4 September 2008), **Thirty-Third Session (Abu Dhabi, 10-13 May 2011) and Thirty-Fourth Session (Kampala, 18-19 November 2011)**

CONTENTS

- 1. INTRODUCTION
- 2. DEFINITIONS
- 3. IPCC MATERIAL
- 4. ASSESSMENT REPORTS, SYNTHESIS REPORTS, SPECIAL REPORTS AND METHODOLOGY REPORTS
  - 4.1 Convening a Scoping Meeting to Prepare Report Outline
  - 4.2 General Procedures for Preparing IPCC Reports
  - 4.3 Preparation of Reports by the Working Groups and the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories
    - 4.3.1 Compilation of Lists of Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, Expert Reviewers, Review Editors and Government Focal Points**
    - 4.3.1 Compilation of Lists of Potential Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, Review Editors and Government Focal Points**

Author  
**Deleted:** Introduction to Review Process

Author  
**Deleted:** Accepted

Author  
**Deleted:** Reports prepared by

Author  
**Deleted:** 4.2.1 - Convening a Scoping Meeting to Prepare Report Outline -

1	4.3.2	<i>Selection of Lead Authors</i>
2	4.3.3	<i>Preparation of Draft Report</i>
3	4.3.4	<i>Review</i>
4	4.3.4.1	<i>First Review (by Experts)</i>
5	4.3.4.2	<i>Second Review (by Governments and Experts)</i>
6	4.3.5	<i>Preparation of Final Draft Report</i>
7		
8	4.4	<u>Preparation</u> , Approval and Acceptance of Summaries for Policymakers and Adoption of Overview
9		Chapters of Methodology Reports
10		
11	4.5	<u>Acceptance of Reports</u>
12		
13	4.6	Reports Approved and/or Adopted by the Panel
14	4.6.1	<i>The Synthesis Report</i>
15		
16	4.7	<b>Addressing Possible Errors in Assessment Reports, Synthesis Reports, Special Reports and</b>
17		<b>Methodology Reports</b>
18		
19	5.	TECHNICAL PAPERS
20		
21	6.	IPCC SUPPORTING MATERIAL
22		
23	6.1	Workshops and Expert Meetings
24		
25	6.2	Co-sponsored Workshops and Expert Meetings
26		
27	6.3	<b>Guidance material</b>
28		
29	ANNEX 1	TASKS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR LEAD AUTHORS, COORDINATING LEAD
30		AUTHORS, CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS, EXPERT REVIEWERS AND REVIEW EDITORS OF IPCC
31		REPORTS AND GOVERNMENT FOCAL POINTS
32		
33	ANNEX 2	<b>PROCEDURE ON THE USE OF LITERATURE IN IPCC REPORTS</b>
34		
35	ANNEX 3	<b>IPCC PROTOCOL FOR ADDRESSING POSSIBLE ERRORS IN IPCC ASSESSMENT</b>
36		<b>REPORTS, SYNTHESIS REPORTS, SPECIAL REPORTS AND METHODOLOGY REPORTS</b>
37		

1 **1. INTRODUCTION**

2  
3 This revised Appendix to the Principles Governing IPCC Work contains the procedures for the  
4 preparation, review, acceptance, adoption, approval and publication of IPCC reports and other materials  
5 relevant to methodologies. These Procedures for the Preparation, Review, Acceptance, Adoption,  
6 Approval and Publication of IPCC Reports were adopted at the Fifteenth Session of the IPCC (San Jose,  
7 15-18 April 1999) and amended at the Twentieth Session (Paris, 19-21 February 2003), Twenty-First  
8 Session (Vienna, 3 and 6-7 November 2003), Twenty-Ninth Session (Geneva, 31 August-4 September  
9 2008), **Thirty-Third Session (Abu Dhabi, 10-13 May 2011) and Thirty-Fourth Session (Kampala,  
10 18-19 November 2011).**

11 **2. DEFINITIONS**

12 The definitions of terms used in this document are as follows:

13  
14 **“acceptance”** of IPCC Reports at a Session of the Working Group or Panel signifies that the material has not  
15 been subject to line by line discussion and agreement, but nevertheless presents a comprehensive, objective  
16 and balanced view of the subject matter.

17  
18 **“adoption”** of IPCC Reports is a process of endorsement section by section (and not line by line) used for  
19 the longer report of the Synthesis Report as described in section 4.4 and for Overview Chapters of  
20 Methodology Reports.

21  
22 **“approval”** of IPCC Summaries for Policymakers signifies that the material has been subject to detailed, line  
23 by line discussion and agreement.

24  
25 **“Assessment Reports”** are published materials composed of the full scientific and technical assessment of  
26 climate change, generally in three volumes, one for each of the Working Groups of the IPCC. Each of the  
27 volumes may be composed of two or more sections including: (a) a Summary for Policymakers (b) an  
28 optional technical summary and (c) individual chapters and their executive summaries.

29 **“Members of the IPCC”** are countries who are Members of WMO and/or UNEP.

30  
31 **“Methodology Reports”** are published materials, which provide practical guidelines for the preparation of  
32 greenhouse gas inventories. Such reports may be composed of two or more sections including: (a) an  
33 Overview Chapter, which broadly describes the background, structure and major features of the report,  
34 (b) individual chapters and (c) technical Annexes.

35  
36 **“Reports”** refer to the main IPCC materials (including Assessment, Synthesis, Methodology and Special  
37 Reports and their Summaries for Policy Makers and Overview Chapters).

38  
39 **“Session of a Working Group”** refers to a series of meetings at the plenary level of the governmental  
40 representatives to a Working Group of the IPCC.

41  
42 **“Session of the Bureau”** refers to a series of meetings of the elected members of the IPCC Bureau who may  
43 be accompanied by a representative of their government.

44  
45 **“Task Force Bureau”** refers to the elected members of the Bureau of the Task Force on National  
46 Greenhouse Gas Inventories. It is chaired by two Co-chairs, referred to in the following as Task Force  
47 Bureau Co-chairs.

48  
49 **“Session of the Panel”** refers to a series of meetings at the plenary level of the governmental representatives  
50 to the IPCC.

51  
52 **“Special Report”** is an assessment of a specific issue and generally follows the same structure as a volume  
53 of an Assessment Report.

54  
55 **“Summary for Policymakers”** is a component of a Report, such as an Assessment, Special or Synthesis  
56 Report, which provides a policy-relevant but policy-neutral summary of that Report.

57  
58 **“Supporting Material”** consists of **three categories: (1) Workshop proceedings and material from Expert**  
59 **Meetings which are either commissioned or supported by the IPCC, (2) software or databases to facilitate the**  
60 **use of the IPCC Methodology Reports, and (3) guidance material (guidance notes and guidance**  
61 **documents) to guide and assist authors in the preparation of comprehensive and scientifically sound**  
62 **IPCC Reports and Technical Papers.**

63  
64 **“Synthesis Reports”** synthesise and integrate materials contained within the Assessment Reports and Special  
65 Reports and are written in a non-technical style suitable for policymakers and address a broad-range of

Author  
Deleted: ed

Author  
Deleted: s

Author  
Comment [1]: Proposed P-34 decision (see proposal part 1, under “3. IPCC guidance material”).



1 policyrelevant but policy-neutral questions. They are composed of two sections as follows: (a) a Summary  
2 for Policymakers and (b) a longer report.  
3 **“Technical Papers”** are based on the material already in the Assessment Reports and Special Reports and  
4 are prepared on topics for which an objective international scientific/technical perspective is deemed  
5 essential.

6 **“Working by Co-chairs, referred to as “Working Group Bureau Co-chairs”.** The plural “Bureaux” used in  
7 **this document refer to the three Working Group Bureaux.**

8  
9 **3. IPCC MATERIAL**

10 There are three main classes of IPCC material, each of which is defined in Section 2.

- 11 A. IPCC Reports (which include Assessment, Synthesis and Special Reports and their Summaries for
- 12 Policymakers and Methodology Reports)
- 13 B. Technical Papers
- 14 C. Supporting Material.

15 The different classes of material are subject as appropriate to different levels of formal endorsement. These  
16 levels are described in terms of acceptance, adoption and approval as defined in Section 2.

17 The different levels of endorsement for the different classes of IPCC material are as follows:

- 18 A. In general, IPCC Reports are accepted by the appropriate Working Group. Reports prepared by the  
19 Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories are accepted by the Panel. Summaries for  
20 Policymakers are approved by the appropriate Working Groups (Section 4.2) and subsequently  
21 accepted by the Panel (Section 4.4). Overview chapters of Methodology Reports are adopted,  
22 section by section, by the appropriate Working Group or in case of reports prepared by the Task  
23 Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories by the Panel (Section 4.4). In the case of the  
24 Synthesis Report the Panel adopts the underlying Report, section by section, and approves the  
25 Summary for Policymakers. The definition of the terms “acceptance”, “adoption” and “approval”  
26 will be included in the IPCC published Reports (Section 4.6).
- 27 B. Technical Papers are not accepted, approved or adopted by the Working Groups or the Panel but are  
28 finalised in consultation with the Bureau (Section 5).
- 29 C. Supporting Materials are not accepted, approved or adopted (Section 6).

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 **4. ASSESSMENT REPORTS, SYNTHESIS REPORTS, SPECIAL REPORTS AND**  
39 **METHODOLOGY REPORTS**

40  
41 **4.1 Convening a Scoping Meeting to Prepare Report Outline**

42 **Each IPCC Assessment Report, Special Report, Methodology Report and Synthesis Report, as defined**  
43 **in section 2 of Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC work, should be preceded by a scoping**  
44 **meeting that develops its draft outline (and explanatory notes as appropriate). Nominations for**  
45 **participation will be solicited from governments Focal Points, participating organizations, and Bureau**  
46 **members. Participants should be selected by the relevant respective Working Group Bureau / Task**  
47 **Force Bureau and, in case of the Synthesis Report, by the IPCC Chair in consultation with the**  
48 **Working Group Co-Chairs. In selecting Scoping Meeting participants, consideration should be given**  
49 **to the following criteria: scientific, technical and socio-economic expertise, including the range of**  
50 **views; geographical representation; a mixture of experts with and without previous experience in**  
51 **IPCC; gender balance; experts with a background from relevant stakeholder and user groups,**  
52 **including governments. The Working Group/Task Force Bureau and, in the case of the Synthesis**  
53 **Report, the IPCC Chair will report to the Panel on the selection process including a description of**  
54 **how the selection criteria for participation and any other considerations have been applied, and**  
55 **including a list of participants.**

Author  
**Comment [2]:** While the Task Force Bureau was defined in the original text above, the Working Group Bureau was not. For reasons of consistency, this definition was added.

Author  
Deleted: s

Author  
Deleted: s

Author  
Deleted: s

Author  
**Comment [3]:** The text of this Section has moved to the front of Chapter 4 from the previous Section 4.2 (now Section 4.3), where it was inserted based on an IPCC-33 decision. No track changes are shown for this move, except for the heading.

1 **Based on the report of the scoping meeting the Panel will decide whether to prepare a report and**  
 2 **agree on its scope, outline, and the work plan including schedule and budget.**

3  
 4 **4.2 General Procedures for Preparing IPCC Reports,**

5  
 6 **In Assessment Reports, Synthesis Reports, and Special Reports, Coordinating Lead Authors (CLAs),**  
 7 **Lead Authors (LAs), and Review Editors (REs) of chapter teams are required to consider the range of**  
 8 **scientific, technical and socio-economic views, expressed in balanced assessments. Authors should use**  
 9 **calibrated uncertainty language that expresses the diversity of the scientifically and technically valid**  
 10 **evidence, based mainly on the strength of the evidence and the level of agreement in the scientific,**  
 11 **technical, and socio-economic literature. The IPCC guidance notes on addressing uncertainties are**  
 12 **available on the IPCC website<sup>1</sup> and should be considered as an Addendum to this document.**

13  
 14 The review process generally takes place in three stages: expert review of IPCC Reports, government/expert  
 15 review of IPCC Reports, government review of the Summaries for Policymakers, Overview Chapters and/or  
 16 the Synthesis Report. Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs should aim to avoid (or at least  
 17 minimise) the overlap of government review periods for different IPCC Reports and with Sessions of the  
 18 Conference of Parties of the United Nations Framework Convention of Climate Change and its subsidiary  
 19 bodies.

20  
 21 Expert review should normally be eight weeks, but not less than six weeks, except to the extent decided by  
 22 the Panel. Government and government/expert reviews should not be less than eight weeks, except to the  
 23 extent decided by the Panel.

24  
 25 **All written expert, and government review comments will be made available to reviewers on request during**  
 26 **the review process and will be retained in an open archive in a location determined by the IPCC Secretariat**  
 27 **on completion of the Report for a period of at least five years.**

28  
 29 **The drafts of IPCC Reports and Technical Papers which have been submitted for formal expert**  
 30 **and/or government review, the expert and government review comments, and the author responses to**  
 31 **those comments will be made available on the IPCC website as soon as possible after the acceptance**  
 32 **by the Panel and the finalisation of the report. The IPCC considers its draft reports, prior to**  
 33 **acceptance, to be pre-decisional, provided in confidence to reviewers, and not for public distribution,**  
 34 **quotation or citation.**

35  
 36 **4.3 Preparation of Reports Accepted by the Working Groups the Task Force on National**  
 37 **Greenhouse Gas Inventories**

38  
 39 It is essential that Working Group and Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories work  
 40 programmes allow enough time in their schedules, according to procedures, for a full review by experts and  
 41 governments and for the acceptance of the report. The Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs are  
 42 responsible for implementing the work programme and ensuring that proper review of the material occurs in  
 43 a timely manner.

44  
 45 To ensure proper preparation and review, the following steps should be undertaken:

- 46  
 47 **1. Compilation of lists of Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, Expert**  
 48 **Reviewers, Review Editors and Government Focal Points.**  
 49 **1. Compilation of lists of Potential Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing**  
 50 **Authors, Review Editors and Government Focal Points.**  
 51 2. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors and Review Editors.  
 52 3. Preparation of draft Report.  
 53 4. Review.  
 54 a. First review (by experts).  
 55 b. Second review (by governments and experts).

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/supporting-material/uncertainty-guidance-note.pdf>.

Author

**Comment [4]:** P-33 decision under “2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings”.

Author

**Deleted:** Introduction to Review Process

Author

**Comment [5]:** P-33 decisions under “5. Handling the full range of views” and “11. IPCC Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty”.

Author

**Deleted:** and Reports prepared by

Author

**Comment [6]:** Three paragraphs moved to Section 4.5 (not shown with track changes).

Author

**Deleted:** 1. .. Convening a scoping meeting to prepare Report outline. .

- 1 5. Preparation of final draft Report.  
 2 6. Acceptance of Report at a Session of the Working Group(s) or the Panel respectively.

3 | **4.3.1 *Compilation of Lists of Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, Expert Reviewers, Review Editors and Government Focal Points***

7 | **4.3.1 *Compilation of Lists of Potential Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, Review Editors and Government Focal Points***

10 At the request of Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs through their respective Working Group /Task Force Bureau, and the IPCC Secretariat, governments, and participating organisations and the Working Group/Task Force Bureaux should identify appropriate experts for each area in the Report who can act as potential Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, expert reviewers or Review Editors. To facilitate the identification of experts and later review by governments, governments should also designate their respective Focal Points. IPCC Bureau Members and Members of the Task Force Bureau should contribute where necessary to identifying appropriate Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, expert reviewers, and Review Editors in cooperation with the Government Focal Points within their region to ensure an appropriate representation of experts from developing and developed countries and countries with economies in transition. These should be assembled into lists available to all IPCC Members and maintained by the IPCC Secretariat. The tasks and responsibilities of Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, expert reviewers, Review Editors and government Focal Points are outlined in Annex 1.

24 At the request of Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs through their respective Working Group /Task Force Bureau, and the IPCC Secretariat, governments, and participating organisations and the Working Group/Task Force Bureaux should identify appropriate experts for each area in the Report who can act as potential Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors or Review Editors. To facilitate the identification of experts and later review by governments, governments should also designate their respective Focal Points. IPCC Bureau Members and Members of the Task Force Bureau should contribute where necessary to identifying appropriate Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, and Review Editors in cooperation with the Government Focal Points within their region to ensure an appropriate representation of experts from developing and developed countries and countries with economies in transition. These should be assembled into lists available to all IPCC Members and maintained by the IPCC Secretariat. The tasks and responsibilities of Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, Review Editors and government Focal Points are outlined in Annex 1.

38 | **4.3.2 *Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors and Review Editors***

40 Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors are selected by the relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureau, under general guidance and review provided by the Session of the Working Group or, in case of reports prepared by the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, the Panel, from those experts cited in the lists provided by governments and participating organisations, and other experts as appropriate, known through their publications and works. The composition of the group of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors for a section or chapter of a report shall reflect the need to aim for a range of views, expertise and geographical representation (ensuring appropriate representation of experts from developing and developed countries and countries with economies in transition). There should be at least one and normally two or more from developing countries.

50 Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors and Review Editors are selected by the relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureau, under general guidance and review provided by the Session of the Working Group or, in case of reports prepared by the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, the Panel, from those experts cited in the lists provided by governments and participating organisations, and other experts as appropriate, known through their publications and works. **The composition of the group of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors for a chapter, a report or its summary shall aim to reflect:**

- the range of scientific, technical and socio-economic views and expertise;

Author  
**Deleted:** 4.2.1 . Convening a Scoping Meeting to Prepare Report Outline .

Author  
**Comment [7]:** Proposed P-34 decision (see proposal part 1, under "5. Matters relating to the transparency, quality and efficiency of the review process"). (No government nomination of expert reviewers, "expert reviewers" have been deleted from the text here.)

Author  
**Deleted:** and

- 1 • **geographical representation (ensuring appropriate representation of experts from developing**
- 2 **and developed countries and countries with economies in transition); there should be at least**
- 3 **one and normally two or more from developing countries;**
- 4 • **A mixture of experts with and without previous experience in IPCC;**
- 5 • **Gender balance.**

6 **The Working Group/Task Force Bureau will report to the Panel on the selection process and the**  
 7 **extent to which the aims were achieved. The IPCC should make every effort to engage experts from**  
 8 **the region on the author teams of chapters addressing specific regions, but should also engage experts**  
 9 **from countries outside of the region when they can provide an essential contribution to the**  
 10 **assessment.**

11  
 12 The Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors selected by the Working Group/Task Force Bureau may  
 13 enlist other experts as Contributing Authors to assist with the work.

14  
 15 At the earliest opportunity, the IPCC Secretariat should inform all governments and participating  
 16 organisations who the Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors and Review Editors are for different  
 17 chapters and indicate the general content area that the person will contribute to the chapter.

18  
 19 **4.3.3 Preparation of Draft Report**

20  
 21 Preparation of the first draft of a Report should be undertaken by Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead  
 22 Authors. Experts who wish to contribute material for consideration in the first draft should submit it directly  
 23 to the Lead Authors. Contributions should be supported as far as possible with references from the peer-  
 24 reviewed and internationally available literature, and with copies of any unpublished material cited. Clear  
 25 indications of how to access the latter should be included in the contributions. For material available in  
 26 electronic format only, a hard copy should be archived and the location where such material may be accessed  
 27 should be cited.

28  
 29 Lead Authors will work on the basis of these contributions, the peer-reviewed and internationally-available  
 30 literature, including manuscripts that can be made available for IPCC review and selected non-peer review  
 31 literature according to Annex 2 and IPCC Supporting Material (see section 6). Material which is not  
 32 published but which is available to experts and reviewers may be included provided that its inclusion is fully  
 33 justified in the context of the IPCC assessment process (see Annex 2).

34  
 35 In preparing the first draft, and at subsequent stages of revision after review, Lead Authors should clearly  
 36 identify disparate views for which there is significant scientific or technical support, together with the  
 37 relevant arguments. Technical summaries provided will be prepared under the leadership of the Working  
 38 Group/Task Force Bureaux.

39  
 40 **4.3.4 Review**

41  
 42 Three principles governing the review should be borne in mind. First, the best possible scientific and  
 43 technical advice should be included so that the IPCC Reports represent the latest scientific, technical and  
 44 socio-economic findings and are as comprehensive as possible. Secondly, a wide circulation process,  
 45 ensuring representation of independent experts (i.e. experts not involved in the preparation of that particular  
 46 chapter) from developing and developed countries and countries with economies in transition should aim to  
 47 involve as many experts as possible in the IPCC process. **The WG/TFI Bureaux actively promote**  
 48 **involvement of experts in both expert review stages of reports, by making the reports available to**  
 49 **experts that wish to comment and undertaking to invite as wide a group of experts as possible.** Thirdly,  
 50 the review process should be objective, open and transparent.

51  
 52 **Working Group/TFI Co-chairs should arrange a comprehensive review of reports in each review**  
 53 **phase, seeking to ensure complete coverage of all content. Those parts of a Working Group report that**  
 54 **are crosscutting with other Working Group reports should be crosschecked through the relevant**  
 55 **Authors and Co-chairs of that other working Group.**

56

Author  
**Comment [8]:** P-33 decision under “3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors (CLAs) and Lead Authors (LAs)”.

Author  
**Deleted:** and

Author  
**Comment [9]:** Proposed P-34 decision (see proposal part 1, under “5. Matters relating to the transparency, quality and efficiency of the review process”).

Author  
**Comment [10]:** P-33 decision under “7. Further assuring quality of the review”.

1 To help ensure that Reports provide a balanced and complete assessment of current information, each  
2 Working Group/Task Force Bureau should normally select two **to four** Review Editors per chapter  
3 (including the executive summaries) and per technical summary of each Report.

4  
5 To help ensure that Reports provide a balanced and complete assessment of current information, each  
6 Working Group/Task Force Bureau should normally select two Review Editors per chapter (including the  
7 executive summaries) and per technical summary of each Report.

8  
9 Review Editors should normally consist of a member of the Working Group/Task Force Bureau, and an  
10 independent expert based on the lists provided by governments and participating organisations. Review  
11 Editors should not be involved in the preparation or review of material for which they are an editor. In  
12 selecting Review Editors, the Bureaux should select from developed and developing countries and from  
13 countries with economies in transition, and should aim for a balanced representation of scientific, technical,  
14 and socio-economic views.

#### 15 16 4.3.4.1 First Review (by Experts)

17  
18 First draft Reports should be circulated by Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs for review by  
19 experts selected by the Working Group/Task Force Bureaux and, in addition, those on the lists provided by  
20 governments and participating organisations, noting the need to aim for a range of views, expertise, and  
21 geographical representation. The review circulation should include:

22  
23 **First draft Reports should be circulated by Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs for review.  
24 The review shall be undertaken by experts nominated by governments and participating  
25 organisations. In addition, the Working Group/Task Force Bureaux shall seek the participation of the  
26 range of scientific, technical and socio-economic views, expertise, and geographical representation.  
27 The review circulation should include:**

28  
29 First draft Reports should be circulated by Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs for review. **The  
30 Working Group/Task Force Bureaux shall seek the participation of reviewers encompassing the range  
31 of scientific, technical and socio-economic views, expertise, and geographical representation and shall  
32 undertake to invite as wide a group of experts as possible. The review should be open to:**

- 33  
34
- Experts who have significant expertise and/or publications in particular areas covered by the Report.
  - Experts nominated by governments as Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, contributing authors or expert reviewers as included in lists maintained by the IPCC Secretariat.
  - Expert reviewers nominated by appropriate organisations.
- 35  
36  
37
- **Experts who have relevant expertise in the areas covered by the Report.**
  - **Experts nominated by governments as Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors or contributing authors as included in lists maintained by the IPCC Secretariat.**
- 38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 The first draft Reports should be sent to Government Focal Points, for information, along with a list of those  
44 to whom the Report has been sent for review in that country.

45  
46 The Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs should make available to reviewers on request during the  
47 review process specific material referenced in the document being reviewed, which is not available in the  
48 international published literature.

49  
50 Expert reviewers should provide the comments to the appropriate Lead Authors through the relevant  
51 Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs with a copy, if required, to their Government Focal Point.

52  
53 Coordinating Lead Authors, in consultation with the Review Editors and in coordination with the respective  
54 Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs and the IPCC Secretariat, are encouraged to supplement the  
55 draft revision process by organising a wider meeting with principal Contributing Authors and expert  
56 reviewers, if time and funding permit, in order to pay special attention to particular points of assessment or  
57 areas of major differences.

Author

**Comment [11]:** Proposed P-34 decision (see proposal part 1, under "5. Matters relating to the transparency, quality and efficiency of the review process").

Author

**Comment [12]:** P-33 decision under "5. Handling the full range of views".

Author

**Comment [13]:** Proposed P-34 decision (see proposal part 1, under "5. Matters relating to the transparency, quality and efficiency of the review process"). **This text would replace the green P-33 decision text immediately above.**

Author

**Comment [14]:** Proposed P-34 decision (see proposal part 1, under "5. Matters relating to the transparency, quality and efficiency of the review process").

1  
2 4.3.4.2 *Second Review (by Governments and Experts)*  
3

4 A revised draft should be distributed by the appropriate Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-chairs or  
5 through the IPCC Secretariat to governments through the designated Government Focal Points, and to all the  
6 coordinating lead authors, lead authors and contributing authors and expert reviewers.

7  
8 Governments should send one integrated set of comments for each Report to the appropriate Working  
9 Group/Task Force Bureau Co-chairs through their Government Focal Points.

10 Non-government reviewers should send their further comments to the appropriate Working Group/Task  
11 Force Bureau Co-Chairs with a copy to their appropriate Government Focal Point.  
12  
13

14 4.3.5 *Preparation of Final Draft Report*  
15

16 Preparation of a final draft Report taking into account government and expert comments for submission to a  
17 Session of a Working Group or, in case of a report prepared by the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas  
18 Inventories, of the Panel for acceptance should be undertaken by Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead  
19 Authors in consultation with the Review Editors. If necessary, and timing and funding permitting, a wider  
20 meeting with principal Contributing Authors and expert and government reviewers is encouraged in order to  
21 pay special attention to particular points of assessment or areas of major differences. It is important that  
22 Reports describe different (possibly controversial) scientific, technical, and socio-economic views on a  
23 subject, particularly if they are relevant to the policy debate. The final draft should credit all Coordinating  
24 Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, reviewers and Review Editors by name and affiliation  
25 (at the end of the Report).  
26

27 4.4 **Preparation, Approval and Acceptance of Summaries for Policymakers and Adoption of**  
28 **Overview Chapters of Methodology Reports Related to National Greenhouse Gas Inventories**  
29

30 Summary sections of Reports approved by the Working Groups and accepted by the Panel will principally be  
31 the Summaries for Policymakers, prepared by the respective Working Groups of their full scientific,  
32 technical and socio-economic assessments, and Summaries for Policymakers of Special Reports prepared by  
33 the Working Groups. The Summaries for Policymakers should be subject to simultaneous review by both  
34 experts and governments, **a government round of comments of the revised draft before the approval**  
35 **Session** and to a final line by line approval by a Session of the Working Group. Responsibility for preparing  
36 first drafts and revised drafts of Summaries for Policymakers, lies with the respective Working Group Co-  
37 Chairs. The Summaries for Policymakers should be prepared concurrently with the preparation of the main  
38 Reports.  
39

40 **The first review of the Summaries for Policymakers will take place during the same time period as the**  
41 **Expert Government Review of the Second Order Draft of the full report. The final draft of the**  
42 **Summaries for Policymakers prepared by the respective Working Groups and Overview Chapters of**  
43 **Methodology Report related to National Greenhouse Gas Inventories will be circulated for a final**  
44 **government round of comments in preparation of the Session of the Working Group(s) that approves**  
45 **it or Session of the Panel that adopts it.**  
46

47 Approval of the Summary for Policymakers at the Session of the Working Group, signifies that it is  
48 consistent with the factual material contained in the full scientific, technical and socioeconomic assessment  
49 or Special Report accepted by the Working Group. Coordinating lead authors may be asked to provide  
50 technical assistance in ensuring that consistency has been achieved. These Summaries for Policymakers  
51 should be formally and prominently described as:  
52

53 Approval of the Summary for Policymakers at the Session of the Working Group, signifies that it is  
54 consistent with the factual material contained in the full scientific, technical and socioeconomic assessment  
55 or Special Report accepted by the Working Group. **Coordinating Lead Authors should be consulted in**  
56 **order to ensure that the Summary for Policymakers is fully consistent with the findings in the main**  
57 **report.** These Summaries for Policymakers should be formally and prominently described as:

Author  
**Comment [15]:** Proposed P-34 decision (see proposal part 1, under “7. Summary for Policymakers Approval Sessions”).

Author  
**Comment [16]:** Proposed P-34 decision (see proposal part 1, under “7. Summary for Policymakers Approval Sessions”).

Author  
**Comment [17]:** P-33 decision under “9. Summary for Policymakers (SPM)”.



1  
2 "A Report of (Working Group X of) the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change."  
3

4 For a Summary for Policymakers approved by a Working Group to be endorsed as an IPCC Report, it must  
5 be accepted at a Session of the Panel. Because the Working Group approval process is open to all  
6 governments, Working Group approval of a Summary for Policymakers means that the Panel cannot change  
7 it. However, it is necessary for the Panel to review the Report at a Session, note any substantial  
8 disagreements, (in accordance with Principle 10 of the Principles Governing IPCC Work) and formally  
9 accept it.

10  
11 Overview Chapters of Methodology Reports related to National Greenhouse Gas Inventories will be adopted  
12 section by section by the Panel. The Overview Chapters should be subject to simultaneous review by both  
13 experts and governments. Responsibility for preparing first drafts and revised drafts lies with the respective  
14 Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs. The Overview Chapters should be prepared concurrently with the preparation  
15 of the main Reports.

16  
17 **4.5 Acceptance of Reports**

18  
19 Reports presented for acceptance at Sessions of the Working Groups, or in case of reports prepared by the  
20 Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories reports presented for acceptance by the Panel, are the  
21 full scientific, technical and socio-economic Assessment Reports of the Working Groups, Special Reports  
22 and Methodology Reports, that is, the IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories or the  
23 IPCC Technical Guidelines for Assessing Climate Change Impacts and Adaptations.  
24 The subject matter of these Reports shall conform to the terms of reference of the relevant Working Groups,  
25 or the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories and to the work plan approved by the Panel.

26  
27 Reports to be accepted by the Working Groups, and reports prepared by the Task Force on National  
28 Greenhouse Gas Inventories will undergo expert and government/expert reviews. The purpose of these  
29 reviews is to ensure that the Reports present a comprehensive, objective, and balanced view of the areas they  
30 cover. While the large volume and technical detail of this material places practical limitations upon the  
31 extent to which changes to these Reports will normally be made at Sessions of Working Groups or the Panel,  
32 "acceptance" signifies the view of the Working Group or the Panel that this purpose has been achieved. The  
33 content of the authored chapters is the responsibility of the Lead Authors, subject to Working Group or Panel  
34 acceptance. Changes (other than grammatical or minor editorial changes) made after acceptance by the  
35 Working Group or the Panel shall be those necessary to ensure consistency with the Summary for  
36 Policymakers or the Overview Chapter. These changes shall be identified by the Lead Authors in writing and  
37 made available to the Panel at the time it is asked to accept the Summary for Policymakers, in case of reports  
38 prepared by the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories by the end of the session of the Panel  
39 which adopts/accepts the report.

40  
41 Reports accepted by Working Groups, or prepared by the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas  
42 Inventories should be formally and prominently described on the front and other introductory covers as:

43  
44 "A report accepted by Working Group X of the IPCC (OR, a report prepared by the Task Force on  
45 National Greenhouse Gas Inventories of the IPCC and accepted by the Panel) but not approved in  
46 detail."  
47

48 **4.6 Reports Approved and Adopted by the Panel**

49  
50 Reports approved and adopted by the Panel will be the Synthesis Report of the Assessment Reports and  
51 other Reports as decided by the Panel whereby Section 4.4 applies *mutatis mutandis*.

52  
53 **4.6.1 The Synthesis Report**

54  
55 The Synthesis Report will synthesise and integrate materials contained within the Assessment Reports and  
56 Special Reports and should be written in a non-technical style suitable for policymakers and address a broad  
57 range of policy-relevant but policy-neutral questions approved by the Panel. The Synthesis Report is

Author  
**Comment [18]:** This Section was moved here from the old Section 4.2, now Section 4.3 (no track changes were used for the insertion here).

Author  
Deleted: /or

Author  
Deleted: /or

1 composed of two sections as follows: (a) a Summary for Policymakers and (b) a longer report. The IPCC  
 2 Chair will lead a writing team whose composition is agreed by the Bureau, noting the need to aim for a range  
 3 of views, expertise and geographical representation. An approval and adoption procedure will allow Sessions  
 4 of the Panel to approve the SPM line by line and to ensure that the SPM and the longer report of the  
 5 Synthesis Report are consistent, and the Synthesis Report is consistent with the underlying Assessment  
 6 Reports and Special Reports from which the information has been synthesised and integrated. This approach  
 7 will take 5-7 working days of a Session of the Panel.  
 8

9 The Synthesis Report will synthesise and integrate materials contained within the Assessment Reports and  
 10 Special Reports and should be written in a non-technical style suitable for policymakers and address a broad  
 11 range of policy-relevant but policy-neutral questions approved by the Panel. The Synthesis Report is  
 12 composed of two sections as follows: (a) a Summary for Policymakers and (b) a longer report. **The IPCC**  
 13 **Chair will lead a writing team whose composition is agreed by the Bureau, noting the need to aim for**  
 14 **the range of scientific, technical and socio-economic views, expertise and geographical representation.**  
 15 An approval and adoption procedure will allow Sessions of the Panel to approve the SPM line by line and to  
 16 ensure that the SPM and the longer report of the Synthesis Report are consistent, and the Synthesis Report is  
 17 consistent with the underlying Assessment Reports and Special Reports from which the information has  
 18 been synthesised and integrated. This approach will take 5-7 working days of a Session of the Panel.  
 19

20 Step 1: The longer report (30-50 pages) and the SPM (5-10 pages) of the Synthesis Report are prepared  
 21 by the writing team.  
 22

23 Step 2: The longer report and the SPM of the Synthesis Report undergo simultaneous expert/government  
 24 review.  
 25

26 Step 3: The longer report and the SPM of the Synthesis Report are then revised by Lead Authors, with the  
 27 assistance of the Review Editors.  
 28

29 Step 4: The revised drafts of the longer report and the SPM of the Synthesis Report are submitted to  
 30 Governments and participating organisations eight weeks before the Session of the Panel.  
 31

32 Step 5: The longer report and the SPM of the Synthesis Report are both tabled for discussion in the  
 33 Session of the Panel:  
 34

- 35 • The Session of the Panel will first provisionally approve the SPM line by line.
- 36
- 37 • The Session of the Panel will review and adopt the longer report of the Synthesis Report, section by  
 38 section, i.e. roughly one page or less at a time. The review and adoption process for the longer report of  
 39 the Synthesis Report should be accomplished in the following manner:  
 40
  - 41 - When changes in the longer report of the Synthesis Report are required either to conform it to  
 42 the SPM or to ensure consistency with the underlying Assessment Reports, the Panel and  
 43 authors will note where changes are required in the longer report of the Synthesis Report to  
 44 ensure consistency in tone and content. The authors of the longer report of the Synthesis  
 45 Report will then make changes in the longer report of the Synthesis Report. Those Bureau  
 46 members who are not authors will act as Review Editors to ensure that these documents are  
 47 consistent and follow the directions of the Session of the Panel.  
 48
  - 49 - The longer report of the Synthesis Report is then brought back to the Session of the Panel for  
 50 the review and adoption of the revised sections, section by section. If inconsistencies are still  
 51 identified by the Panel, the longer report of the Synthesis Report is further refined by the  
 52 Authors with the Assistance of the Review Editors for review and adoption by the Panel. This  
 53 process is conducted section by section, not line by line.  
 54
- 55 • The final text of the longer report of the Synthesis Report will be adopted and the SPM approved by the  
 56 Session of the Panel.  
 57

Author  
**Comment [19]:** P-33 decision under "5.  
 Handling the full range of views".



1 The Report consisting of the longer report and the SPM of the Synthesis Report is an IPCC Report and  
2 should be formally and prominently described as:

3  
4 "A Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change."  
5

6 **4.7 Addressing Possible Errors in Assessments Reports, Synthesis Reports, Special Reports and**  
7 **Methodology Reports**

8  
9 **The procedures to be followed for investigating possible errors in an Assessment Report, Synthesis**  
10 **Report, Special Report or Methodology Report and, if appropriate, implementing its correction are**  
11 **defined in the IPCC Protocol for Addressing Possible Errors in IPCC Assessment Reports, Synthesis**  
12 **Reports, Special Reports or Methodology reports (see Annex 3).**

13  
14 **5. TECHNICAL PAPERS**

15  
16 IPCC Technical Papers are prepared on topics for which an objective, international scientific/technical  
17 perspective is deemed essential. They:

- 18  
19 a. are based on the material already in the IPCC Assessment Reports, Special Reports or Methodology  
20 Reports;  
21  
22 b. are initiated: (i) in response to a formal request from the Conference of the Parties to the UN  
23 Framework Convention on Climate Change or its subsidiary bodies and agreed by the IPCC Bureau; or  
24 (ii) as decided by the Panel;  
25  
26 c. are prepared by a team of Lead Authors, including a Coordinating Lead Author, selected by the  
27 Working Group/Task Force Bureaux in accordance with the provisions of Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 for  
28 the selection of Lead Authors and Coordinating Lead Authors;  
29  
30 d. are submitted in draft form for simultaneous expert and government review with circulation to expert  
31 reviewers and Government Focal Points in accordance with Section 4.3.4.1 at least four weeks before  
32 the comments are due;  
33  
34 e. are revised by the Lead Authors based upon the comments received in the step above, and with  
35 assistance from at least two Review Editors per entire technical paper who are selected as per the  
36 procedures for selecting Review Editors for Assessment Reports, Synthesis Reports, Special Reports  
37 and Methodology Reports in section 4.3.2 of this Appendix and carry out the roles listed in section 5 of  
38 Annex 1;  
39  
40 f. are submitted for final government review at least four weeks before the comments are due;  
41  
42 g. are finalised by the Lead Authors, in consultation with the IPCC Bureau which functions in the role of  
43 an Editorial Board, based on the comments received; and,  
44  
45 h. if necessary, as determined by the IPCC Bureau, would include in a footnote differing views, based on  
46 comments made during final government review, not otherwise adequately reflected in the paper.  
47

48 The following Guidelines should be used in interpreting requirement (a) above: The scientific, technical and  
49 socio-economic information in Technical Papers must be derived from:

- 50  
51 (a) The text of IPCC Assessment Reports and Special Reports and the portions of material in cited studies  
52 that were relied upon in these Reports.  
53  
54 (b) Relevant models with their assumptions, and scenarios based on socio-economic assumptions, as they  
55 were used to provide information in those IPCC Reports, as well as emission profiles for sensitivity studies,  
56 if the basis of their construction and use is fully explained in the Technical Paper.  
57

58 The Technical Papers must reflect the balance and objectivity of those Reports and support and/or  
59 explain the conclusions contained in those Reports.

60  
61 Information in the Technical Papers should be referenced as far as possible to the subsection of the

Author

**Comment [20]:** P-33 decision under "10. Procedure for handling possible errors identified after approval of IPCC reports".

1 relevant IPCC Reports and related material.

2  
3 Such Technical Papers are then made available to the Conference of the Parties or its subsidiary bodies, in  
4 response to its request, and thereafter publicly. If initiated by the Panel, Technical Papers are made available  
5 publicly. In either case, IPCC Technical Papers prominently should state in the beginning:

6  
7 "This is a Technical Paper of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change prepared in response to  
8 a request from (the Conference of the Parties to) / (a subsidiary body of) the United Nations  
9 Framework Convention on Climate Change / (decision of the Panel). The material herein has  
10 undergone expert and government review but has not been considered by the Panel for formal  
11 acceptance or approval."

## 12 13 **6. IPCC SUPPORTING MATERIAL**

14 Supporting material consists of (i) published reports and proceedings from workshops and expert meetings  
15 within the scope of the IPCC work programme that have IPCC recognition, and (ii) material, including  
16 databases and software, commissioned by Working Groups, or by the Bureau of the Task Force on National  
17 Greenhouse Gas Inventories in support of the assessment or methodology development process which IPCC  
18 decides should have wide dissemination. Procedures for the recognition of workshops and expert meetings  
19 are given in Sections 6.1 and 6.2. Arrangements for publication of supporting material should be agreed as  
20 part of the process of IPCC recognition or commissioned by Working Groups/the Task Force Bureau to  
21 prepare specific supporting material. All supporting material should be formally and prominently described  
22 on the front and other introductory covers as:

23  
24  
25 **Supporting material consists of three categories:**

- 26  
27 (i) published reports and proceedings from Workshops and Expert Meetings within the scope  
28 of the IPCC work programme that have IPCC recognition,  
29 (ii) material, including databases and software, commissioned by Working Groups, or by the  
30 Bureau of the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories in support of the  
31 assessment or methodology development process which IPCC decides should have wide  
32 dissemination, and  
33 (iii) guidance material (guidance notes and guidance documents) that guides and assists authors  
34 in the preparation of comprehensive and scientifically sound IPCC Reports and Technical  
35 Papers.

36  
37 **Procedures for the recognition of Workshops and Expert Meetings are given in Sections 6.1 and 6.2;**  
38 **procedures for guidance material are given in Section 6.3.** Arrangements for publication of supporting  
39 material should be agreed as part of the process of IPCC recognition or commissioned by Working  
40 Groups/the Task Force Bureau to prepare specific supporting material. **All supporting material of**  
41 **categories (i) and (ii) should be formally and prominently described on the front and other**  
42 **introductory covers as:**

43  
44 "Supporting material prepared for consideration by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.  
45 This supporting material has not been subject to formal IPCC review processes."

### 46 47 **6.1 Workshops and Expert Meetings**

48  
49 IPCC Workshops and Expert Meetings are those that have been agreed upon in advance by an IPCC  
50 Working Group, or by the Panel as useful or necessary for the completion of the work plan of a Working  
51 Group, the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories or a task of the IPCC. Only such activities  
52 may be designated as "IPCC" Workshops or Expert Meetings. Their funding should include full and  
53 complete provision for participation of experts from developing countries and countries with economies in  
54 transition.  
55

Author

**Comment [21]:** Proposed P-34 decision (see proposal part 1, under "3. IPCC guidance material").

1 **An IPCC Expert Meeting focuses on a specific topic bringing together a limited number of relevant**  
2 **experts. The relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureaux, or the IPCC Chair, will nominate and**  
3 **select participants to Expert Meetings.**

4  
5 **An IPCC Workshop considers cross-cutting or complex topics requiring input from a broad**  
6 **community of experts. It requires nominations by Government Focal Points and, as appropriate,**  
7 **participating organizations. The relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureaux, or the IPCC Chair,**  
8 **will also nominate experts and will select the participants to Workshop.**

9  
10 **Proposals for IPCC Workshops or Expert Meetings will be submitted to the Panel for its decision**  
11 **through the relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureaux, or the IPCC Chair. The proposals will**  
12 **include descriptions of the topic, and clarify the choice for an Expert meeting or a Workshop.**

13 **The composition of participants to Expert Meetings and Workshops shall aim to reflect:**

- 14 - **The relevant range of scientific, technical and socio-economic views and expertise,**
- 15 - **Geographical representation as appropriate,**
- 16 - **A mixture of experts with and without previous experience in IPCC,**
- 17 - **Gender balance.**

18  
19  
20 **The relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureaux, or the IPCC Chair, may install a Scientific**  
21 **Steering Committee to assist them in organizing these meetings, taking into account the criteria**  
22 **mentioned above.**

23  
24 **Government Focal Points should be notified of the list of invited participants of an Expert Meeting or**  
25 **Workshop at the earliest opportunity after the selection has taken place.**

26  
27 **The relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureaux, or the IPCC Chair, will convene the Expert**  
28 **Meeting or Workshop and report to the IPCC Bureau and Panel on the selection process, including a**  
29 **description of how the selection criteria for participation and any other considerations have been**  
30 **applied.**

31  
32 The proceedings of IPCC Workshops and Expert Meetings should normally be published summarising the  
33 range of views presented at the meeting. Such proceedings should:

- 34 - include a full list of participants;
- 35 - indicate when and by whom they were prepared;
- 36 - indicate whether and by whom they were reviewed prior to publication;
- 37 - acknowledge all sources of funding and other support;
- 38 - indicate prominently at the beginning of the document that the activity was held pursuant to a decision of
- 39 the relevant Working Group or the Panel but that such decision does not imply Working Group or Panel
- 40 endorsement or approval of the proceedings or any recommendations or conclusions contained therein.

## 41 **6.2 Co-sponsored Workshops and Expert Meetings**

42  
43 IPCC co-sponsorship may be extended to other Workshops or Expert Meetings if the IPCC Chair, as well as  
44 the Co-Chairs of the relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureau determine in advance that the activity will  
45 be useful to the work of the IPCC. IPCC co-sponsorship of such an activity does not convey any obligation  
46 by the IPCC to provide financial or other support. In considering whether to extend IPCC co-sponsorship,  
47 the following factors should be taken into account:

- 48 - whether full funding for the activity will be available from sources other than the IPCC;
- 49 - whether the activity will be open to government experts as well as experts from nongovernmental
- 50 organisations participating in the work of the IPCC;
- 51 - whether provision will be made for participation of experts from developing countries and countries with
- 52 economies in transition;
- 53 - whether the proceedings will be published and made available to the IPCC in a time frame relevant to its
- 54 work;
- 55
- 56
- 57

Author

**Comment [22]:** Proposed P-34 decision (see proposal part 1, under "4. Selection of participants to IPCC workshops and expert meetings").

- 1 - whether the proceedings will:  
2 - include a full list of participants;  
3 - indicate when and by whom they were prepared;  
4 - indicate whether and by whom they were reviewed prior to publication;  
5 - specify all sources of funding and other support;  
6 - prominently display the following disclaimer at the beginning of the document:  
7  
8 "IPCC co-sponsorship does not imply IPCC endorsement or approval of these proceedings or  
9 any recommendations or conclusions contained herein. Neither the papers presented at the  
10 Workshop/Expert Meeting nor the report of its proceedings have been subjected to IPCC  
11 review."  
12

### 13 **6.3 Guidance material**

14 **Guidance material (guidance notes and guidance documents) is material to guide and assist authors in**  
15 **the preparation of comprehensive and scientifically sound IPCC Reports and Technical Papers.**  
16 **Guidance notes and documents are usually the responsibility of Working Group Bureaux, TF Bureau**  
17 **or Chair as appropriate, but may also be commissioned by the Panel, the IPCC Executive Committee**  
18 **or the IPCC Bureau. Guidance notes and documents are developed by the relevant Working Group**  
19 **Bureaux, Task Force Bureau or the IPCC Chair. The Executive Committee will oversee the**  
20 **consistency of these materials. Guidance notes and documents should be accessible together with other**  
21 **principles and procedures and published.**  
22  
23

Author

**Comment [23]:** Proposed P-34 decision (see proposal part 1, under "3. IPCC guidance material").

1 **ANNEX 1**

2  
3 **TASKS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR LEAD AUTHORS, COORDINATING LEAD AUTHORS,**  
4 **CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS, EXPERT REVIEWERS AND REVIEW EDITORS OF IPCC**  
5 **REPORTS AND GOVERNMENT FOCAL POINTS**

6  
7 **1. LEAD AUTHORS**

8  
9 **Function:**

10 To be responsible for the production of designated sections addressing items of the work  
11 programme on the basis of the best scientific, technical and socio-economic information available.

12  
13 **Comment:**

14 Lead Authors will typically work as small groups which have responsibility for ensuring that the  
15 various components of their sections are brought together on time, are of uniformly high quality and  
16 conform to any overall standards of style set for the document as a whole.

17  
18 The task of Lead Authors is a demanding one and in recognition of this the names of Lead Authors  
19 will appear prominently in the final Report. During the final stages of Report preparation, when the  
20 workload is often particularly heavy and when Lead Authors are heavily dependent upon each other  
21 to read and edit material, and to agree to changes promptly, it is essential that the work should be  
22 accorded the highest priority.

23  
24 The essence of the Lead Authors' task is synthesis of material drawn from available literature as  
25 defined in Section 4.2. Lead Authors, in conjunction with Review Editors, are also required to take  
26 account of expert and government review comments when revising text. Lead Authors may not  
27 necessarily write original text themselves, but they must have the proven ability to develop text that  
28 is scientifically, technically and socio-economically sound and that faithfully represents, to the  
29 extent that this is possible, contributions by a wide variety of experts. The ability to work to  
30 deadlines is also a necessary practical requirement. Lead Authors are required to record in the  
31 Report views which cannot be reconciled with a consensus view but which are nonetheless  
32 scientifically or technically valid.

33  
34 Lead Authors may convene meetings with Contributing Authors, as appropriate, in the preparations  
35 of their sections or to discuss expert or government review comments and to suggest any  
36 Workshops or Expert Meetings in their relevant areas to the Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-  
37 Chairs. The names of all Lead Authors will be acknowledged in the Reports.

38  
39 **2. COORDINATING LEAD AUTHORS**

40  
41 **Function:**

42 To take overall responsibility for coordinating major sections of a Report.

43  
44 **Comment:**

45 Coordinating Lead Authors will be Lead Authors with the added responsibility of ensuring that  
46 major sections of the Report are completed to a high standard, are collated and delivered to the  
47 Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs in a timely manner and conform to any overall  
48 standards of style set for the document.

49  
50 Coordinating Lead Authors will play a leading role in ensuring that any crosscutting scientific or  
51 technical issues which may involve several sections of a Report are addressed in a complete and  
52 coherent manner and reflect the latest information available.

53  
54 The skills and resources required of Coordinating Lead Authors are those required of Lead Authors  
55 with the additional organisational skills needed to coordinate a section of a Report. The names of all  
56 Coordinating Lead Authors will be acknowledged in the Reports.

57

3. CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS

Function:

To prepare technical information in the form of text, graphs or data for assimilation by the Lead Authors into the draft section.

Comment:

Input from a wide range of contributors is a key element in the success of IPCC assessments, and the names of all contributors will be acknowledged in the Reports. Contributions are sometimes solicited by Lead Authors but unprompted contributions are encouraged.

Contributions should be supported as far as possible with references from the peer reviewed and internationally available literature, and with copies of any unpublished material cited; clear indications of how to access the latter should be included in the contributions. For material available in electronic format only, the location where such material may be accessed should be cited.

Contributed material may be edited, merged and if necessary, amended, in the course of developing the overall draft text.

4. EXPERT REVIEWERS

Function:

To comment on the accuracy and completeness of the scientific/technical/socio-economic content and the overall scientific/technical/socio-economic balance of the drafts.

Comment:

Expert reviewers will comment on the text according to their own knowledge and experience. They may be nominated by Governments, national and international organisations, Working Group/Task Force Bureaux, Lead Authors and Contributing Authors.

5. REVIEW EDITORS

Function:

Review Editors will assist the Working Group/Task Force Bureaux in identifying reviewers for the expert review process, ensure that all substantive expert and government review comments are afforded appropriate consideration, advise lead authors on how to handle contentious/controversial issues and ensure genuine controversies are reflected adequately in the text of the Report.

Comment:

There will be ~~at most four~~ Review Editors per chapter (including their executive summaries) and per technical summary. In order to carry out these tasks, Review Editors will need to have a broad understanding of the wider scientific and technical issues being addressed. The workload will be particularly heavy during the final stages of the Report preparation. This includes attending those meetings where writing teams are considering the results of the two review rounds. Review Editors are not actively engaged in drafting Reports and cannot serve as reviewers of those chapters of which they are Authors. Review Editors can be members of a Working Group/Task Force Bureau or outside experts agreed by the Working Group/Task Force Bureau.

Although responsibility for the final text remains with the Lead Authors, Review Editors will need to ensure that where significant differences of opinion on scientific issues remain, such differences are described in an annex to the Report. Review Editors must submit a written report to the Working Group Sessions or the Panel and where appropriate, will be requested to attend Sessions of the Working Group and of the IPCC to communicate their findings from the review process and to assist in finalising the Summary for Policymakers, Overview Chapters of Methodology Reports and Synthesis Reports. The names of all Review Editors will be acknowledged in the Reports.

Author  
Comment [24]: To be updated based on new guidance document to be noted at P-34.

Author  
Deleted: one or two

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

**6. GOVERNMENT FOCAL POINTS**

Function:

To prepare and update the list of national experts as required to help implement the IPCC work programme, and to arrange the provision of integrated comments on the accuracy and completeness of the scientific and/or technical content and the overall scientific and/or technical balance of the drafts.

Comment:

Government review will typically be carried out within and between a number of Departments and Ministries. For administrative convenience, each government and participating organisation should designate one Focal Point for all IPCC activities, provide full information on this Focal Point to the IPCC Secretariat and notify the Secretariat of any changes in this information. The Focal Point should liaise with the IPCC Secretariat regarding the logistics of the review process(es) of particular importance is the full exchange of information.

**ANNEX 2****PROCEDURE ON THE USE OF LITERATURE IN IPCC REPORTS**

This annex is provided to ensure that the IPCC process for the use of literature is open and transparent. In the assessment process, emphasis is to be placed on the assurance of the quality of all cited literature. Priority should be given to peer-reviewed scientific, technical and socio-economic literature if available.

It is recognized that other sources provide crucial information for IPCC Reports. These sources may include reports from governments, industry, and research institutions, international and other organizations, or conference proceedings. Use of this literature brings with it an extra responsibility for the author teams to ensure the quality and validity of cited sources and information<sup>2</sup>. In general, newspapers and magazines are not valid sources of scientific information. Blogs, social networking sites, and broadcast media are not acceptable sources of information for IPCC Reports. Personal communications of scientific results are also not acceptable sources.

The following additional procedures are specified:

**1. Responsibilities of Coordinating, Lead and Contributing Authors**

The Coordinating Lead Authors will ensure that all sources are selected and used in accordance with the procedures in this Annex.

The author team is required to critically assess information they would like to include from any source. Each chapter team should review the quality and validity of each source before incorporating information into an IPCC Report. Authors who wish to include information that is not publicly or commercially available are required to send the full reference and a copy, preferably electronically, to the relevant Technical Support Unit. For any source written in a language other than English, an executive summary or abstract in English is required.

These procedures also apply to papers undergoing the publication process in peer-reviewed journals at the time of the government or expert review.

All sources will be integrated into the reference section of the IPCC Report.

**2. Responsibilities of the Review Editors**

The Review Editors will support and provide guidance to the author team in ensuring the consistent application of the procedures in this Annex.

**3. Responsibilities of the Working Group /Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs**

For sources that are not publicly or commercially available, the Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs coordinating the Report will make these sources available to reviewers who request them during the review process.

**4. Responsibilities of the IPCC Secretariat**

For sources that are not publicly or commercially available, the IPCC Secretariat will store these sources after publication of an IPCC report, in order to support the “IPCC Protocol for Addressing Possible Errors in IPCC Assessment Reports, Synthesis Reports, Special Reports or Methodology Reports”.

<sup>2</sup> see IPCC-XXII/INF.4, Notes on the Informal Task Group on Procedures, containing general guidance on the use of literature in IPCC, page 7, section 2.

Author

**Comment [25]:** P-33 decision under “4. Sources of data and literature”.



1 **ANNEX 3**

2  
3 **IPCC PROTOCOL FOR ADDRESSING POSSIBLE ERRORS IN IPCC ASSESSMENT REPORTS,**  
4 **SYNTHESIS REPORTS, SPECIAL REPORTS AND METHODOLOGY REPORTS**

5  
6 For the text we refer to [http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/ipcc-principles/ipcc\\_error\\_protocol.pdf](http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/ipcc-principles/ipcc_error_protocol.pdf). The  
7 Secretariat can include it here in the final stages of formatting, after IPCC-34.

Author

**Comment [26]:** P-33 decision under “10. Procedure for handling possible errors identified after approval of IPCC reports”.