

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION OF THE IPCC
Berlin, Germany, 7 - 12 April 2014

IPCC-XXXIX/Doc. 7
(17.III.2014)
Agenda Item: 6
ENGLISH ONLY

FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC

Synthesis of Government submissions in response to questionnaire of 9 December 2013

(Submitted by the IPCC Secretariat in support of the process
of the Task Group on the Future Work of the IPCC)

FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC

Synthesis of Government submissions in response to questionnaire of 9 December 2013

(Submitted by the IPCC Secretariat in support of the process
of the Task Group on the Future Work of the IPCC)

A. Future Products

General Overview

Most countries suggested that there is great value in IPCC Reports, including Special Reports (SRs) and Methodology Reports (MRs).

Overall the current focus of IPCC products was seen as adequate towards meeting its objectives, however various suggestions were provided to improve the IPCC process such as working towards more transparent, focused and up-to-date assessments, using more innovative ways of presenting and disseminating information, and other new ideas such as developing an open data facility to further the production of localized integrated decision support information. A better involvement of developing countries in the IPCC activities, improving communications, and involving stakeholders, etc. were also discussed by most countries in the context of discussing future IPCC products. Meanwhile specific proposals on these issues will be reflected under the following sections (see C and D).

One country suggested that the Assessment Reports (ARs) should be rather structured according to policy needs and less according to scientific disciplines. Another believed that the IPCC should concentrate on re-engineering its assessment process rather than add more to its portfolio.

Another country was of the view that the IPCC, while maintaining its current mandate, should develop new products in order to realize its enormous potential while taking into account a number of principles such as complete independence, respect of the highest scientific standards and robustness and transparency.

Assessment Reports

The mandate of the IPCC to produce high quality, policy relevant and policy neutral scientific assessments on climate change remains important and appropriate. The unique value of the IPCC as a scientific assessment body is its comprehensiveness, thoroughness and credibility when delivering ARs.

There was a suggestion that ARs should remain comprehensive in nature and receive three-tiers of review process and to involve more experts, reviewers and authors from different regions and from developing countries in particular.

Some developing countries emphasized that future ARs should focus on regional adaptation and climate change impacts such as health and agriculture, and on the solution side it should focus on best practices, examples of current problems and adaptation in each region should be included. As for the SRs, they felt that they should illustrate extreme climate events occurring during an assessment period, and that there should be reports on the emerging science or policymaker needs such as disaster management to advance climate change adaptation.

Most governments felt that future ARs should be more readable than the current Summaries for Policymakers (SPMs). It was recommended to use communication specialists, and interact with users early in the development of a report. A suggestion was made to use focus groups for figures. Another country noted that the SPM would benefit from the assistance of professional science writers to help craft the text to intended users. However, they indicated

that it is important that the author teams still have the final word on the content of the Final Draft SPM which is submitted to the IPCC for decision and approval.

Methodology Reports

Most governments thought that it is good for the IPCC to continue producing Methodology Reports (MRs) for different types of assessments, but they felt they should be developed with user inputs. One country suggested that an additional MR could be introduced providing guidelines for the assessment process.

One country found the work of the IPCC to prepare MRs for national GHG inventories highly relevant and well aligned with the needs of the UNFCCC and was supportive of continuation of this work, based primarily on requests made to the IPCC by the UNFCCC. The country did not foresee a need for MRs on topics other than national GHG inventories during the sixth assessment period. Decisions to undertake MRs related to other areas should be primarily driven by requests directly from the UNFCCC to the IPCC where the UNFCCC had identified a gap in methodological guidance and where it would be consistent with the role of the IPCC to develop such methodological guidance.

Some developing countries noted MRs for the NGGIP should continue with help from experts from developing countries, and that also another type of MR was needed to unify the vision at least on some basic grounds for the needs of developing and developed countries.

Another country suggested preparing other MRs on relevant topics such as mitigation and adaptation measures.

One country assumed that new guidelines would be required for use under the regime after 2020 in the UNFCCC negotiations and that a comprehensive review and improvement of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for national GHG inventories were necessary.

One country noted that the IPCC should continue to prepare MRs on national GHG inventories, as well as consider other methodological issues such as on how to assess national contributions to the global temperature increase.

Other aspects pertaining to future products of the IPCC

Various innovative ideas were expressed by governments in terms of providing other products, such as less static products in addition to the static products, or 'modernizing' and reforming the style and structure of the ARs, possibly by using modern online dissemination methods and facilities. New products could be developed by the IPCC in response to user's needs and requests.

Some countries suggested that the Synthesis Report (SYR) should be the primary product of the IPCC, prepared on 5 to 7 year timescales; drawing on all material prepared by the IPCC during the period but not constrained to be only based on such material. Updates could be more frequent than the assessment cycle allows.

Technical Papers (TPs) might be a suitable method to deliver updates of the Working Group (WG) contributions for material of a factual nature, like the "observed changes in the climate system" in the WG I SPM but with the crucial modification that they include new material.

Another country proposed to develop a web-based dynamic model that could be frequently updated or updated when the scientific community felt a change was needed. The country felt that this would also generate a high level of transparency, in which it would take much less effort for users to get the sources of statements and data (including data behind the figures). As part of this web-based dynamic model, tailored portals could be added to cater different

user groups. Of course, for ideas like this, further thought has to be put into how the filtering and review process should take place in such a model.

Another country suggested that SPMs of WG reports and the cross-WGs SYR be transformed into top-down documents focused primarily on addressing the questions and issues identified by policymakers during the scoping process. In this model, the SPM and SYR report outlines would be developed based on the questions and issues identified through the scoping with the policymakers, and would be prepared by pulling and synthesizing relevant information from the WG reports. This country also suggested a mechanism be considered whereby IPCC engages experts in science communication to facilitate communicating key results.

One country noted that the overall assessment process needs to be guided by the SYR which should be scoped out at an early stage of the process. This scope can be subject to review and updates as the work on the AR is progressed. The SYR of the AR should be the mechanism by which cross-cutting matters are examined, which role can be developed and expanded for an AR6. This would require earlier communication on cross-cutting matters.

B. Appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these products

Most countries realized that depending on the outcome of the discussions on the products, other items that need to be discussed such as the assessment cycle, structure, and organization of the IPCC will have to be adapted. Some even felt it was unproductive to discuss the size and composition of the Bureau at this time as the products and services that the IPCC will decide to provide in the future need to determine its organization and modus operandi. One country indicated that the current mandate and governance of the IPCC have to be maintained with a Plenary, a Bureau with its current composition, an Executive Committee and as appropriate Technical Support Units (TSUs). Each of the organs has to improve its functioning and cooperation with the other bodies. This is particularly relevant to the Secretariat and TSUs. As a result of the increase of tasks and activities, the Secretariat has probably to be reinforced.

One country suggested that a higher coordination of the TSUs could result from a grouping of three TSUs with or close to the IPCC Secretariat. However, the issue will be raised in terms of budget allocation. In order to divide workload there could also be a TSU designated to SRs working in collaboration with the WGs TSUs.

One submission indicated that an alternative approach to the current organisation of TSUs might be to have a more continuous or permanent organisation structure and decouple the TSUs from the election of Co-Chairs.

One country suggested that before the beginning of the next assessment cycle, there needs to be an assessment by the WG Co-Chairs and Coordinating Lead Authors (CLAs) of the principles and procedures applied in the previous cycles that could be used to revise the IPCC Principles and Procedures.

Timing of delivery of reports

On the whole most governments seemed to wish for quicker delivery for ARs and felt that the 7 years interval is not appropriate in today's quickly changing economic and political environment. For those that wanted a shorter cycle, there were differing opinions about how the cycle can be shortened, what variety of products could be delivered in an assessment cycle, intervals between publications, etc. A few governments wished for more time to review the reports and called for longer intervals between the publication of each reports.

As for the assessment cycle for future IPCC products, various ideas were expressed including:

- An AR every 4 years, with fast track products to respond to emerging science, especially when there are new trends to observe, and SRs at the beginning of the cycle.
- 4-6 year assessment cycle, with science updates (ARs) every 2-3 years, and SRs on request of the UNFCCC.
- Full assessment cycle i.e. 5 years, as this will ensure three-tier independent reviews in order to be verified for being reliable and comprehensive; with emphasis on the comprehensive AR supplemented with occasional SRs.
- 5-7 year assessment cycle, and as far as possible aligned to the major events of UNFCCC.
- A 5 year assessment cycle and in addition to the AR emphasis should be put on shorter and more frequent reports, focused on specific issues, based on the demands from countries. The Panel should be responsive to such demands whether the request comes from the UNFCCC or from IPCC member countries.
- Comprehensive reports every 6 to 7 (or more) years and regular updated information with respect to material of a factual nature and the needs of the policy community, taking into account short-term trends.
- 'State of the Science' report every approx. 7 years (focusing on historic and projected impacts on physical systems with the physical science basis information contained in WG I); with all relevant regional information in one report including vulnerability; and a "solution space" report on a 5-7 year cycle.
- The current structure and model of operation, including the development of IPCC reports at intervals of 7 years.
- Regional reports should be developed to identify current situations and adaptation in specific countries, in particular in high vulnerability regions.

In terms of fast-track products, while some countries found them a high priority for the IPCC to respond to urgent needs at the policy level, without undermining the high quality of IPCC products and were therefore very enthusiastic about such products, others were not convinced, mentioning that it may jeopardize IPCC's unique position in preparing comprehensive ARs that conform to a three-tier review process. Another view was that SRs remain the most appropriate tool for the IPCC to assess emerging and cross-WG issues, as these reports adhere to the IPCC's rigorous review process, but that TPs provide a way for the IPCC to quickly address targeted questions or topics based on the IPCC's carefully assessed materials. Another submission also suggested using a format similar to TPs for emerging issues that are of high relevance to or demanded by the UNFCCC and for issues not addressed sufficiently in the current AR and which require treatment in a relatively short time, e.g. within 1 year.

A similar idea expressed by another government submission was that in the next assessment period, outstanding issues in the AR5, which could be addressed in a shorter time period, should be first examined and be published as an SR. They also noted that exceptions could be made in urgent cases, for example with regard to issues with high expectations of rapid changes and risks which should be addressed before detection of changes, and more frequent reporting on observational data that should be considered in order to avoid delay in taking necessary actions.

There was basically broad support for continued SRs as countries noted the growing demand for targeted information. A number of topics for possible future SRs were raised in the government submissions. For example one country provided a wide variety of ideas for future SRs such as on food security, arctic change, non-CO₂ gases, etc., and this country felt that SRs should be issued every 1-2 years.

It was noted that the transparency of the IPCC working procedures should be enhanced and a secure and sustainable funding framework should be put in place to ensure scientific excellence and sufficient professionalism in preparation of reports and allow for meeting future challenges.

On intervals between reports

As for intervals between reports, one country felt that the current schedule under which governments are required to review all of the reports within only one or two years does not necessarily provide sufficient time to examine the reports and they felt that longer intervals between publications of each report would be desirable. Another challenge noted by some governments relates to the simultaneity of the reports. One government submission pointed out that as WGs II and III are largely based on information from WG I, and as the three reports are produced at the same time, this implies constraints for WG II and III relative to the timeline for completing their reports. They also noted that this also adds pressure on governments for the review process. A suggestion put forward by this government to solve both problems is that the reports could be released with about one year (at least) between each other, while taking into account timeline requirements and decisions of the UNFCCC process.

Other ideas expressed regarding IPCC deliverables:

- To ensure updates over shorter time-periods, the full digitalization of the reports and complementary use of a web-based 'wiki-type' approach, to provide an 'interim (advanced) version of the AR (which will simply incorporate only the important policy-relevant new findings) approx. three years after the publication of the assessment report.
- Consider taking advantage of the significant advances in IT by providing the full content of the reports online in an interactive format that hyperlinks in-text citations to the abstracts/articles/reports they reference, as well as links to underlying data and research, where available.
- To set up an ad-hoc cross WG to enhance coordination and cooperation among WGs or to have ways for authors to cross the WGs.
- It appeared that a few countries supported a TP, or other IPCC report, using the outputs of the three AR5 reports to address the topic of food security, agriculture and climate before the UNFCCC COP-21 in Paris in 2015.
- The need for easy and accessible information and the idea that the IPCC could be a catalyzer in identifying 'easy, accessible products' and provider of those.
- As more people are searching for information on the internet than reading large printed books, the fact that reports and assessment procedures should be extended to include, where appropriate, interactive graphics, animations, and simple models and formulae.
- People will want to access IPCC products in a variety of ways, not only through different electronic modalities, such as through mobile phone applications and interactive internet, but also through different presentations of the same data, such as data files, text files, static figures, tables, info graphics and cinematographic material.
- Another possible product considered by one submission was a comprehensive and structured inventory of climate change bibliographies which would be permanently updated and with a search engine could become a reference base to consult, identifying which references have been assessed in previous ARs and which ones are pending for next IPCC products.
- Many countries pointed out that there is a growing need for information that can support local decisions. One country pointed out that there is a great opportunity for the IPCC to further the production of localized integrated decision support information and one idea to make this happen was that the IPCC could work to create an easy to use and open access data facility, that includes all that is used in making IPCC ARs, creating and allowing users to develop and apply data selection and integration tools, describing methodologies and best-practices for doing assessments, including in relation to risk, and training and accrediting persons and institutions performing climate assessments. Finally consulting with UN and other organizations on how to make available necessary information not from the IPCC.
- Another country felt that the IPCC can provide pilot projects that illustrate using climate change management and technologies in order to cope with situations related to climate change.

- One country noted that the IPCC has not been able yet to provide clear guidance on the level of dangerous climate change, a core need of the UNFCCC parties, the regional distribution of this threat, and the potential for adaptation. They mentioned the IPCC should focus far more strongly on encouraging advancing the technologies and tools of impacts and adaptation assessment, especially through quantified modeling approaches, including the economics of this area of endeavor.
- Another country suggested support and development of more specific models for regions to strengthen simulations and data availability.
- Several countries called for better collaboration between WGs, with one stating for example that cooperation and collaboration between WG I and III will become of increasing importance especially for analyzing and setting emission pathways until the temperature peaks and reaches equilibrium in other scenarios than RCP 2.6.
- In WG III, one country noted the need to improve practical knowledge towards construction of a low carbon society as it is becoming important, such as the need to analyze the feasibility to develop renewable energy sources in developing countries.

The options proposed by governments for the future ARs also depend on what other products governments expect to be available in the future. For example, one country felt that if a data facility, and data selection and integration tools, were available then there would be limited use of comprehensive ARs. In such a case, a short SYR and updates on climate science could be produced every 2-3 years, or on request by the UNFCCC, as opposed to comprehensive reports every 6-7 years.

Appropriate number of Working Groups

Many governments thought that the current IPCC structure and modus operandi are adequate. However, it was also suggested to have a balance between developing and developed countries and regional groups. Several governments also recognized that there is a need to improve cooperation, consistency, and integration among WGs, and several thought about other options. Many countries mentioned that it would be rational to merge the three WGs into two thematic groups: Group I - climate change and its impacts and Group II – mitigation, adaptation and vulnerability. Some felt that the two groups could produce reports at different timing and that they could be uncoupled. One submission explained that this would help avoid duplication of effort and would make it easier to have coherence in the ARs and simplify coordination.

Other countries thought it would be appropriate to evaluate the following option: Group I addressing the scientific basis, specifically climatic aspects; Group II addressing impacts and vulnerability and Group III evaluating adaptation strategies and mitigation, enabling, at the same time the analysis of synergies.

A third solution was a 'State of the Science' report every approx. 7 years (focusing on historic and projected impacts on physical systems with the physical science basis information contained in WG I); with all relevant regional information in one report including vulnerability; and a "solution space" report on a 5-7 year cycle which would include the substance on adaptation and mitigation options currently contained in WG II and WG III. In this option it was noted that the latter should be sufficiently staggered from the WG I report so that the WG I communities have sufficient time to digest and publish the results from the WG I literature. In this proposal between the regular assessments the IPCC authors could add relevant publications to the web site to yield a "living document". Such an approach would need to ensure high standards of scientific integrity (i.e. review) and a possible solution cited in this submission was the kinds of modalities used in various moderated list serves and wiki's – which can have thorough reviews. It noted that chapter authors could constitute a review team for some set period for a given topic.

One country noted that there may be a need to amend the current structure of the WGs to consider proposals submitted to the Panel by countries or groups of countries for specific products.

Changes regarding Lead Authors and Experts

As for the Lead Authors (LAs), one country mentioned that there should be consideration of the possibility of setting-up incentives for the Coordinating Lead Authors (CLAs) of the reports based on the workload and responsibility they have. Another wanted the responsibilities and authorities of the CLAs and LAs further clarified to guarantee quality and excellence of products. Several other suggestions were expressed by governments regarding LAs, as governments recognize the ever increasing literature that authors must assess. Another point was that in the process of author nomination and selection, it is vital to ensure that authors understand the task that they are up to in order to play a full role in report preparation. Finally, it was pointed out that when authors move on after an assessment, the TSUs should hand-over all the documents and other material of their WG to the Secretariat and that the Secretariat has an important task thereafter in archiving the material.

Another country suggested that a study could be undertaken on how to assist the LAs in their tasks concerning the use of the most recent information technology, or that a higher coordination of the TSUs could be achieved by grouping the three TSUs with – or close to – the IPCC Secretariat in Geneva, or that a review of Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian and Spanish literature could be done for the AR by a number of specifically targeted authors.

On the selection of experts, some countries wanted a fairer process in terms of experts from developing countries, while others focused on increasing the inclusiveness and transparency of the process. For example, high quality experts beyond those nominated through the official procedure, should, if they fulfill all necessary requirements, be eligible for consideration. One option noted was an open (online) expression of interest (in addition to the official government-led current practice of nominations by the IPCC). It was also suggested to reduce the burden on voluntary authors by appointing more full time specialists and allow the editors more flexibility in order to maximize their contribution.

It was suggested that the selection of experts could further benefit from actions that will increase inclusiveness and transparency of the process. An open (online) expression of interest (in addition to the official government-led current practice of nominations by the IPCC) could be initiated.

Finally, another suggestion to improve the current reports in terms of citation was to increase that of non-English literature, national assessment reports and other assessment products. A related point from another submission was to consider ways to reduce the ever increasing pressure on scientists and make the preparation cycle more efficient by: appointing full time research assistants to support the work of the TSUs and/or the CLAs, expanding the list of contributing authors, and exploring ways to collaborate with other relevant international organizations and assessment bodies (UNEP, IPBES, IEA, etc.) in producing SRs or TPs in partnership with those bodies.

Appropriate Bureau structure

While, as mentioned above, many governments felt such issues should be looked at after considering future products, several governments mentioned that the current Bureau structure, size and model of operation were suitable overall.

Main comments however concerning the structure of the Bureau were that of the terms of reference (ToR) of the Bureau, including the IPCC Vice-Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the WG Bureaux, which needed better definition, or that a better balance was needed between developing and developed countries and regional groups.

While one developing country noted that a clearer role and mandate has already been given to the current Bureau with the establishment of the recent rules of procedure of the IPCC, other submissions noted dissatisfaction with the current situation. For example, one country felt the selection procedure of the IPCC Bureau and WGs should be just and transparent. Another country believed the structure and mandates of the IPCC WGs and Bureau should be modified to give wider opportunity for the representation of developing countries, with relevant modifications on the ToR or mandates. Another submission argued that the current WG structure should be kept the same. This country also felt that WGs II and III should provide training of young scientists in developing countries on undertaking reviews and full assessments in the future assessment cycle.

C. Ways to ensure enhancement of the participation and contribution of developing countries in the future work of the IPCC

Various ideas were expressed on this topic. For example one idea expressed in a few submissions was that the IPCC could produce methodological reports helping the production of regional assessments of e.g. impacts, vulnerabilities, and adaptation or other regional assessments. Links with the WMO's GFCS and with GEO could also be explored as means to further increase the quality of such regional assessments, according to one submission which saw a clear added value from the IPCC providing methodological guidance on conducting regional assessments. Additionally, IPCC should encourage stronger relationships with multilateral and international organizations as recommended by the InterAcademy Council (IAC).

Another idea expressed on the side of developing countries was that the IPCC should render better support to Co-Chairs from developing countries. It was furthermore suggested that a balanced participation of experts and authors from developing countries should ensure a mixture of experts with and without previous IPCC experience and equal opportunity.

Regarding the TSUs, several countries proposed that a larger number of developing countries should have a more active role in these units, since they are mostly led by developed countries. One suggestion supported by many countries, is employing more experts from developing countries in the TSUs and/or exploring the possibility of TSUs being hosted by developing countries.

Another suggestion was to clarify the mandate of the Secretariat and the TSUs in support of the scientific assessment, to ensure the leading role of authors throughout the process. There should be stronger TSU support as well to Co-Chairs from developing countries and a greater number of TSU members recruited from these countries. One country suggested that the cooperation across and between the TSUs and the Secretariat should be institutionalized to secure professional support of the scientific assessment process, increase efficiency and effectiveness and exploit synergies.

There also seemed to be support from some developed countries to enhance the limited capacity of TSUs by having a TSU hosted in more than one country, mentioning that in this context a broader involvement of and support by institutions in developing countries, which are in a position to do so, would be useful. Another country noted the option to move the TSUs to the developing countries, and if this is not possible then the same TSU should be based in both the developing and developed countries, to help developing countries avoid brain drainage particularly in Africa. Finally, another country felt that capacity building for scientists from developing countries could happen by way of secondments at the TSUs.

Another country explained why it is crucial to set up TSUs in developing countries, as this would help developing countries in avoiding brain drainage and catalyzing research outputs.

This would also address data challenges currently experienced in developing countries and the need for an adequate balance of scientists from the developing countries and small island states. It was recalled that there are well established and world renowned research institutions and universities in developing countries and small island states.

One submission suggested that a centralized database should be maintained by the IPCC. The IPCC should coordinate with national governments and international agencies to help creating centralized inventory systems. Gaps in data should be identified as part of IPCC's database management. In this connection, the IPCC should acknowledge government reports and literature published in other than the English language from developing countries. Authors of such literature could be approached to provide expert opinion or specific inputs on relevant topics. One country suggested that IPCC/TFI could support developing countries by developing software and other tools/products specific to them.

Another country suggested that IPCC Bureau members should be 50% from developing countries and that it should very well represent regions' vulnerabilities and needs. Co-Chairs could be given a definite responsibility to engage developing countries in TSUs, author teams and as reviewers. Other suggestions were hosting a TSU in North Africa or in the Middle East, to be financed by the IPCC Trust Fund, and in other developing regions, supporting scientists and experts from developing countries with all means (financially and academically), and activating the IPCC translation unit to translate academic reports, studies and official government studies and reports.

Another country proposed that a TSU be comprised of both developing and developed country institutes and be managed by the Secretariat and under the IPCC Chair. The direct management should be with the two Co-Chairs. Financing should be sourced from several countries and be managed and coordinated by the Secretariat. The developing country institution, as part of the TSU, should be sponsored by developed countries.

One submission suggested that nominations of developing country authors and experts could be sought from National Academies for Science or The World Academy of Sciences (TWAS), professional societies and international organizations and research centers in cooperation with the relevant IPCC Focal Point.

Another idea expressed from a developing country was to set up regional committees to enhance involvement of developing countries and to access literature in several languages other than English. Representatives of countries and regions of these committees can facilitate assessment of literature and engagement of developing country scientists and experts at the same time. Furthermore, the submission noted that IPCC could provide support for developing country scientists and experts to enhance regional research and knowledge, and that the outcome can be shared for IPCC regional reports. The support mentioned in this submission included holding conferences, workshops and meetings for sharing knowledge and enhance capacity building, and partnering with academic institutions in developing countries to provide training in climate assessment. Another idea expressed was to set up networks by setting up contact points or centers in each region, to open opportunities to access government reports and other papers in several languages other than English.

The use of workshops and the use of networks in developing countries were addressed in several submissions. In particular one idea expressed was that workshops in developing countries would facilitate engagement of developing countries' scientists and experts, and this could be done on a sub-regional basis utilizing existing networks. A suggestion from a different country was that when devising an AR outreach campaign, IPCC may consider how to maximize the role of LAs and national Focal Points (FPs), and that training events can be offered to young scientists from developing countries to share information on the latest IPCC assessment. Another idea in order to disseminate IPCC results and to build capacity in developing countries was that the IPCC could enhance the dissemination of reports using a network of national FPs and national science academies. One submission suggested holding

increasing numbers of Lead Author Meetings, expert meetings and workshops in developing countries, in order to increase the visibility of the IPCC.

Finally, on the selection of authors, one country noted that most authors involved in the IPCC author teams are either from developed countries or are authors from developing countries residing in developed countries, and noted that to avoid this we need to select CLAs and LAs from developed and developing countries and Small Island states in a more balanced manner, taking into account regional, gender and young scientists.

Overall, several submissions proposed possible changes regarding either the location of the TSUs or the hiring of developing country experts by existing TSUs, or noted that various steps could be taken to ensure a better balance in the IPCC, such as further access to literature and facilitation of assessment of literature in languages other than English, as well as various ways to contribute to capacity building and knowledge sharing in developing countries. One country mentioned also the expansion of the IPCC Scholarship Programme. Another country also mentioned the IPCC should seek additional funding from prospective donors so as to be able to support interested scientists from developing countries to undertake their IPCC activities. One country suggested possible support from the UN and other organizations to facilitate participation of developing countries' scientists. Another country noted that increased participation of expertise and countries had to be fostered, particularly from developing countries.

D. Other matters

Most countries mentioned that it was key to enhance cooperation with UN bodies and other relevant international organizations, such as IPBES, CBD and UNCCD.

Furthermore many countries emphasized the need for enhanced communication and outreach programmes, especially in developing countries. One country noted that the IPCC should create and maintain a system to make it easier to share communication materials that are based on its material but produced by other parties. This country also indicated that it is necessary to strengthen the IPCC Secretariat and also ensure that the TSUs have available resources with skills on how to edit reports.

One country proposed that the IPCC could also identify gaps in the knowledge base, for example on the issue of loss and damage, and on transitions. It was also suggested that the IPCC should set up a Task Group responsible for analyzing, assessing and evaluating the impact of data gaps in the assessment reports.

Another country noted that the work of the IPCC as a whole depends strongly on the scientific excellence of its Bureau members. An active role of members of the IPCC leadership (IPCC Chair, Vice Chairs, Working Groups and Task Force Co-Chairs, and other members of the IPCC Bureau) in official government functions might affect the scientific integrity of the IPCC since it could be perceived as a conflict of interest. This issue should therefore be properly reflected in the IPCC Conflict of Interest Policy.

Many new ideas came under this heading that could be further considered by the Task Group. For example one country felt that the IPCC should capitalize on its experience and strength in scientific assessment by introducing more tailored products. Meanwhile another country thought that there may be value in having a pan-report author team that identifies overlaps, links, knowledge/research gaps, etc. which would be distinct from an SPM or TS author team. The idea of the IPCC raising research requirements was supported by many country submissions. Another country noted the increasing role of social media and thought the IPCC should engage a broader community in preparing its reports, but be informed by a scoping study so the Plenary has a good understanding about the scope, the goal, and the resource implications of such an activity.

Some countries noted that IPCC communication and outreach activities should be given more emphasis, and consideration given to use electronic media.

Finally, others pointed out in this section that the IPCC must remain focused on assessing the state of climate science in a robust, thorough manner that maintains scientific integrity throughout the process.

Comments received from: Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, USA and EU.