

REPORT OF THE 43rd SESSION OF THE IPCC BUREAU
Geneva, 18-19 April 2011

1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

Mr Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chair, IPCC opened the Session at 10 a.m. on 18 April 2011. He welcomed Mr Michel Jarraud, Secretary-General of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), and invited him to say a few words. He also welcomed Mr Gaetano Leone, the recently appointed Deputy Secretary of IPCC, who then addressed the session on behalf of Mr Achim Steiner, Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

The provisional agenda (BUR-XLIII/Doc. 1) was approved without change and is attached as **Annex 1**. The list of participants is attached as **Annex 2**.

2. APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE 42nd SESSION

The draft report of the 42nd Bureau Session (BUR-XLIII/Doc. 2) was approved without change.

3. ADMISSION OF OBSERVER ORGANIZATIONS

The Deputy Secretary, IPCC introduced document BUR-XLIII/Doc. 3 containing the applications from seven organizations soliciting observer status with the IPCC. New applications were received on time from the following six organizations: the Environmental Quality Authority (EQA) of the Palestinian National Authority (PNA); the African Union Commission (AUC); the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD); Many Strong Voices (MSV); the Organization of Development and Human Rights of Cameroon (GICAR-CAM), and the Institute of Energy Policy and Research, Universiti Tenaga Nasional (UNITEN) of Malaysia. The Nature Conservancy (TNC) had applied for observer status as well and, although the application letter was not received four months before the next Panel Session, as is required in Rule II.2 of the IPCC Policy and Process for Admitting Observer Organizations, the Secretariat recommended the Bureau to consider the request of TNC as well.

The Bureau endorsed the proposal of the Secretariat and recommended acceptance of the seven organizations by the next IPCC Plenary Session in Abu Dhabi, to be held from 10-13 May 2011. The Bureau furthermore noted that the application for observer status of the Industrial Technology Research Institute (ITRI) was still pending.

Several members stressed that it was beneficial to IPCC to develop an inclusive network of partner organizations. It was suggested, however, that the observer status of organizations should be reviewed periodically to ensure that the organizations are still active and relevant to the mandate of IPCC. The Chair concluded that it would be worthwhile and in accordance with Rule II.11 of the IPCC Policy for Admitting Observer Organizations to carry out a periodic review of the list of accepted observer organizations to see if they still meet the criteria of the IPCC Policy. The Secretariat was requested to report to the Bureau at its next session on this matter.

4. COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

Ms Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC introduced documents BUR-XLIII/Doc. 9 and IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 13.

Bureau members complimented the Secretariat for the Press Review that is compiled and distributed daily. Some Bureau members requested that the Press Review be sent also to IPCC Focal Points. Bureau members also provided comments and questions on the IPCC media

coverage statistics provided in Annex I of BUR-XLIII/Doc.9, including with regards to the methodology used and the analysis of the findings. The delegate of China objected to the inclusion of "Taiwan" in the statistics.

In general, Bureau members complimented the Task Group (TG) on Communications Strategy for its work as reflected in IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 13.

In the ensuing discussion on this item, the following points and suggestions were raised:

- Government Focal Points (FPs) needed to be mobilized for communication activities.
- Engaging with the media and providing rapid responses to their enquiries was very important.
- Creating capacity within IPCC to deal with information and communication requirements, including during peak periods, was necessary.
- The option of having future IPCC reports only available in electronic versions rather than hard copies was proposed by Mr Christopher Field, Working Group II Co-Chair, as a more efficient way (for example for error correction) and might be worth looking at in the context of the Communications Strategy.

Some criticisms or concerns were expressed as follows:

- The Task Group (TG) proposal was too media-focused; there were other ways to communicate with governments and other audiences (e.g. web presence).
- The reason why the Senior Communications Manager should be a spokesperson rather than simply identifying the right person to whom queries would be relayed was not convincing for some delegations.
- In general, there was a need for more clarity regarding the role and functions of IPCC spokespersons.

Finally, one Bureau member noted that at times there might be a conflict of interest when IPCC affiliation was used by authors or others in their activities not related to IPCC. It was suggested that the TG explore what the Panel thinks about appropriate and inappropriate activities in this regard.

5. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND AARHUS CONVENTION

The Secretary of the IPCC, Ms Renate Christ, introduced the topic indicating that over the past year the IPCC constituency was confronted with requests for access to information, including IPCC drafts and correspondence among authors. On some of these occasions, reference was made to the UNECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention). Since this Convention provides an international legal framework (although it is only a regional legal instrument), the Secretary had asked the Secretariat of the Aarhus Convention to provide an advisory opinion as to the extent in which the IPCC Principles and Procedures respond to the spirit of the Aarhus Convention. At the Bureau session, a representative of the Secretariat of the Aarhus Convention, Ms Aphrodite Smagadi, presented the advisory opinion and replied to questions of Bureau members.

The discussion focused on the appropriateness of public access to, and review of draft IPCC reports. Some participants noted that making publicly available a draft scientific report which may contain inaccuracies did not serve the public interest and that IPCC reports should be kept as confidential "pre-decision material" until the acceptance of the full report. Other participants stressed the importance of finding a way to enhance public participation in the IPCC scoping and report review process. Some Bureau members noted that the scientists involved in report-writing were volunteers and that their work load should not be unnecessarily increased by review comments from the public at large.

After different opinions were expressed, the IPCC Chair proposed to deal with the issue of transparency and disclosure of information at the 33rd Plenary Session (P-33) in Abu Dhabi under the umbrella of the Task Groups on Procedures and on Communications Strategy, noting that P-33

might well consider to postpone the full discussion on the possible development of an IPCC policy or roadmap for access to, and disclosure of information to the 34th Session of the IPCC (P-34).

6. TASK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO THE INTERACADEMY COUNCIL (IAC) REVIEW OF THE IPCC

6.1 Task Group on Procedures

The Co-Chair of the Task Group on Procedures asked the Rapporteur of the task group to present document IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 12.

In general, the Bureau expressed appreciation for the work completed so far by the task group some members raised questions on the structure and clarity of the proposal. The discussion touched upon the following points:

- Role of the Bureau in reviewing this task group's proposals and providing comments on matters affecting its operations.
- Invitation to scientific organizations (e.g. World Climate Research programme (WCRP) and International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP), or Academies of Science) to suggest potential Lead Authors with excellent scientific credentials.
- Importance of qualifying draft IPCC reports as "pre-decisional" material when developing procedures on confidentiality.
- Possible anonymity of expert reviews and possible provision of responses to review comments to individual reviewers on a reviewer-specific basis.

Mr Christopher Field, Co-Chair, Working Group II, presented the proposed "IPCC Protocol for Addressing Possible Errors in IPCC Assessment Reports, Special Reports or Methodology Reports". Some Bureau members felt that the "Error Protocol" was too complex and more thinking would be needed before approval of such a document in order to enhance its clarity, for instance in relation to the way IPCC selects external experts to review a given question.

6.2 Task Group on Conflict of Interest Policy

The Rapporteur of the Task Group on Conflict of Interest Policy (Col) introduced documents IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 11 and IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 11, Add. 1. He noted that on the basis of a number of very useful comments received from governments and Bureau members, the task group had substantially revised its initial proposal to better reflect existing Col policies, in particular for scientific and technical assessments, and to develop proposals for the implementation of the policy. The task group had also drawn on the experience of Working Groups I and II in implementing interim Col policies. During the ensuing discussion, it was noted that the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI) had also developed an interim Col policy.

The discussion touched upon the following points:

- Concern that smaller developing countries could have problems with the implementation of the Col policy as drafted, since they have often found it necessary to include one or more of their scientists contributing to the work of the IPCC on national delegations.
- Correct balance of topics for IPCC situation; current draft overemphasizes financial Col.
- Col disclosure did not mean disqualification.
- The composition and selection of the proposed Col Committee was to be clarified and discussed.
- The Col policy was to be finalized as soon as possible, so that it could still apply to the Fifth Assessment (AR5) period.
- Disclosure forms: annual periodicity would be too frequent; it would be better to only resubmit a form when somebody's situation had changed and could be cause a Col.

The Chair thanked the Task Group Co-Chairs and Rapporteur for their good work and expressed the wish that a Col policy could be adopted in Abu Dhabi during P-33.

6.3 Task Group on Governance and Management

The Co-Chair of Task Group Governance and Management introduced documents IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 10 and IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 10, Add.1. He focused in particular on four main subjects, namely: (i) Establishment of an Executive Committee; (ii) Term of office of the IPCC Chair and Working Group and Task Group Co-Chairs; (iii) Issues associated with the potential creation of an Executive Director; and (iv) Terms of Reference (TOR) of the Bureau. The Co-Chair explained that the majority of the text was agreed upon, and some cross-cutting issues had been reviewed with the relevant task groups. However, there remained square brackets in the text of the document, showing options and diverging issues still to be ironed out.

The discussion touched upon the following points:

- Inclusion of the IPCC Vice-Chairs in the membership of the Executive Committee. Different views were expressed on whether the Vice-Chairs should have voting rights in the Executive Committee.
- Inclusion of the Technical Support Unit (TSU) Heads in the Executive Committee. The majority of the Members who spoke said that they should be included as advisory members but would not have voting rights.
- Opportunity of having external experts as members of the Executive Committee. Several Members were against this suggestion, although it was said by some that such outsiders could be invited in an ad hoc capacity, on the basis of clear criteria, and fully respecting the membership's geographical balance.
- Main function of the Executive Committee would be one of coordination – while the authority on organizational and financial matters rested with the Panel.
- Need to decide whether the Executive Committee should make decisions on the basis of consensus or majority.
- Term of office of the Chair, with one member stating that he was not fully convinced of the benefits deriving from the overlap of Chair and “Chair-elect”, as proposed by the task group.
- Need for a clear distinction of the responsibilities of the Bureau (scientific body), Executive Committee (coordinating body, also dealing with inter-sessional implementation of Panel decision and with contingencies, but without financial responsibility), and Secretariat (organization and communication body).
- Development of clear Terms of Reference for the Bureau, Secretariat and TSUs, which was called for by some members. One delegate specified that the term of office of the Head of the Secretariat had to be based on renewable contracts. Another member called for a 6-year renewable term.

One member felt that the sections of the document had reached varying degrees of maturity. Another one hoped that the debate would not get entangled in too many details. Some members stated the need for reporting to both WMO and UNEP.

Overall Conclusions on the Task Group Recommendations

The Chair stated that the Task Groups' Co-Chairs should take note of the main issues discussed at the Bureau, which would inform the discussion at the upcoming P-33 in Abu Dhabi. The Bureau discussed ways to organize the work at that session.

Several members stated the need to clearly prioritize the issues for discussion. In general, it was felt that the item on task groups' recommendations should be allocated plenty of time at P-33. No more than two task groups would work in parallel at any given time. It was suggested that the

Secretariat, in consultation with the task Group Co-Chairs, would come up with a “straw man” timetable in advance of the session in Abu Dhabi.

The possibility of extending the task groups’ mandate after P-33 was raised, in case the work was not completed at the Abu Dhabi session of the IPCC.

Members recalled that Governments, who wished to submit further comments on the current draft recommendations prepared by the task Groups, could do so by 5 May 2011. Comments by IPCC office holders (as decided at P-32) would also be welcome.

7. OTHER OUTCOMES OF COP-16 AND IMPLICATIONS FOR IPCC WORK

Under this item, the Bureau received a statement by a representative of the UNFCCC Secretariat. He explained that the Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation (SRREN) could provide Parties with useful information in developing their NAMAs (Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions) and she noted that the IPCC may present the SRREN’s key findings to Parties of the UNFCCC as actions in this area were relevant to the appropriate agenda item (agenda as approved in Bangkok).

8. PROGRESS REPORTS

8.1 IPCC Scholarship Programme

The Secretary of the IPCC introduced document BUR-XLIII/Doc.11, containing the progress report on the IPCC Scholarship Programme. She explained that the Science Board’s selection for the first round of the Scholarship Programme focused on Ph.D. candidates and post-doctorate applications because there was an unexpectedly high response to the Call for Proposals. She reported that the Secretariat has contacted all selected candidates and they are all available. She provided information on the sources of funding for the first round of scholars and explained that the Secretariat is entering into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Prince Albert Foundation, which would cover seven scholarships. This MOU was currently being checked by the legal department of WMO. She explained that the Secretariat would be requiring more human resources to manage the Scholarship Programme in the future. Some Bureau members commented that management of the Scholarship Programme is not core business of the IPCC Secretariat.

The Chairman promised to explore further a possible partnership with the UN Foundation to help to manage the programme and raise resources for it. He said when there is a clear perspective on this option he will come back to the Panel with such an option.

Bureau members expressed satisfaction at the results of the selection of scholars by the Science Board and in particular their decision to prioritize African developing countries.

8.2 Other progress reports

- **Working Group I Progress Report**

The Co-Chair of Working Group I, Mr Thomas Stocker, presented document BUR-XLIII/Doc. 14. He referred to the First Lead Author Meeting held in Kunming, China and explained that a media briefing was held at the beginning of that meeting to present the details of the process of preparing an IPCC report. He also noted that the editorial team was now appointed for the AR5 Working Group I Report’s Annex I: Atlas of Global and Regional Climate Projections. He then noted that

WGI's interim policy to deal with potential conflict of interest (Col) was implemented in October 2010. He stressed that this was a record of disclosure and that the intent was not to exclude. The experience so far with Working Group I's interim Col policy had been positive. He hoped that the TGs could find it possible to agree on general guidelines on Col and Procedures, leaving room for additional guidelines by the Working Groups and TFI, relevant to their specific needs. He concluded in saying that the Second Lead Author Meeting would be held in Brest, France, in July 2011, where the Working Group I Lead Authors will address informal review comments from invited experts on the Zero Order Draft (ZOD).

- **Working Group II Progress Report**

The Co-Chair of Working Group II, Mr Christopher Field, introduced document BUR-XLIII/Doc. 5 containing the progress report of Working Group II on the AR5 contribution. He described the planning and implementation of Working Group II meetings. Two regional expert meetings were held respectively in Dhaka, Bangladesh (16-18 March 2011) and Sao José dos Campos, Brazil (11-13 April 2011) to provide formal mentoring of developing country authors to enable them to more fully contribute to the AR5. Furthermore two regional expert meetings would be held in Belize City, Belize (27-29 April 2011) and Accra, Ghana (9-11 August 2011). The First Lead Authors Meeting took place in Tsukuba, Japan, from 11-14 January 2011. During this meeting Working Group II Bureau members conducted bias and conflict of interest discussions with each chapter team. The Second Lead Authors Meeting will take place in San Francisco, California, USA, from 11-15 December 2011. The Third and Fourth Lead Authors Meetings were planned, but venues were yet to be formalized. Mr Field was pleased to note that the Working Group II Co-Chairs and the Technical Support Unit (TSU) had worked closely with the other Working Groups to plan and execute the ambitious work programme for the AR5 development.

- **Working Group III Progress Report**

The Vice-Chair of Working Group III, Ms. Antonina Ivanova, gave an oral progress report on the Working Group III contribution to the AR5. She noted that work was well underway, but that most activities of the Co-Chairs and the Technical Support Unit were focused on the preparation and organization of the 11th Session of Working Group III, to be held in Abu Dhabi, UAE, from 5-8 May 2011, to approve the Summary for Policymakers and accept the underlying scientific and technical assessment of the Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation (SRREN).

- **SRREN**

The Co-Chair of Working Group III, Mr Youba Sokona, presented document BUR-XLIII/Doc. 7 containing the Progress Report on the Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation (SRREN).

During the discussion, there was a question about observers' rights to obtain a copy of the Summary for Policymakers (SPM). The IPCC Secretary explained that indeed the procedures were not clear in this respect. The Chair noted there was need for clarification in the procedures on the matter of comments on the SPM from others. Another question was about the availability of all government comments on the SPM before Abu Dhabi. The IPCC Secretary said the TSU must manage the compilation of government comments in time for P-33.

- **SREX**

The Co-Chairs of Working Groups I and II presented document BUR-XLIII/Doc.4 containing the progress report on the Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation (SREX). The Second Order Draft (SOD) was produced in January and experts/governments were invited to review it. Mr Christopher Field mentioned that not as many comments had been received during the review of the SOD as hoped or expected, and then invited other Working Group I & II Co-Chairs to add further information. Mr Vicente Barros noted that 3 sub-meetings and a series of teleconferences were held to prepare a First Draft of the SPM.

Mr Thomas Stocker noted that Working Group I contributes to one chapter of the report and highlighted the need to ensure consistency in messages across chapters. He noted in particular that the synthesized SPM statements require traceability to the relevant paragraphs in the chapters of the report. He emphasized the importance of this also because the report does not have a Technical Summary.

The Chair noted that the SREX also required an outreach plan taking into consideration that it would be released just before the next UNFCCC Conference of the Parties. He also thanked Norway for its support.

- **Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)**

The Co-Chairs of TFI presented document BUR-XLIII/Doc. 10. Ms Thelma Krug presented the proposal for a 2013 supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories on Wetlands. The proposed 2013 supplement was only intended to fill in gaps and not to amend the 2006 guidelines. TFI had also embarked on a Col policy requiring experts to complete disclosure forms which were kept under the Co-Chairs' responsibility. Mr Hiraishi explained that if the Panel approved the 2013 supplement, there would be a need for additional authors meetings and contingency budget.

The Bureau members provided various comments, with some focusing on the issue of uncertainty and how it affected the guidelines. Mr Hiraishi explained that IPCC-XXXIII/ Doc. 7 contained guidance to authors also on uncertainty issues.

- **Scenarios**

Mr Christopher Field provided a brief summary of activities related to work on scenarios, as in document BUR-XLIII/Doc.6 submitted by the Co-Chairs of the IPCC Working Groups I, II and III. Mr Field noted that the progress was slower than had been hoped for, however still on-track. He said this meant that the Working Group II assessment would have a smaller fraction of literature based on the representative concentration pathways (RCPs).

One Bureau member suggested that scenarios were also discussed in the context of the needs of the UNFCCC. Bureau members expressed concern about the slow progress being made. Mr Thomas Stocker noted that this was one consequence of not having an IPCC-led process, resulting in the process being less easy to manage. However, he noted that Working Group I will deliver its report in the time frame allocated despite the delays.

- **Task Group on Data and Scenario Support for Impact and Climate Analysis (TGICA)**

This progress report was available in document BUR-XLIII/Doc. 12. It was noted by Mr Christopher Field that urgent action was required on the nomination of new Co-Chairs of TGICA. He noted that the current leadership gap was also an opportunity to renew the TGICA mandate. He had

extended conversations with TGICA members and two of the most experienced members had expressed interest in assuming Co-Chair responsibilities on an interim basis, namely Tim Carter and Bruce Hewitson.

The Working Group Co-Chairs sought the guidance of the Bureau on this option. With the Chair's endorsement, and no objections expressed, the Bureau decided to go ahead and requested the Working Group Co-Chairs to ask both experts if they would accept the offer to Co-Chair TGICA for a 2-year interim appointment.

9. OTHER BUSINESS

A delegate spoke of the need to arrange for the 34th Session of the IPCC to last more than one day. The Chair stated that this matter was being looked into with the Secretariat.

Mr Christopher Field suggested that future Bureau sessions should be organized to take place electronically, i.e. without participants' travel, thus reducing the negative impact on the environment. This suggestion was welcome and the delegate would work with the Secretariat in looking for options.

The Chair informed the meeting that he was holding consultations on the implementation of P-30 decision to allocate specific responsibility for cross-cutting issues to Vice-Chairs. He would report to the Plenary on this matter.

10. TIME AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION

It was agreed that this issue would be discussed after P-33.

11. CLOSING OF THE SESSION

The 43rd Session of the IPCC Bureau was closed by the IPCC Chair at 2.30 p.m. on 19 April 2011.

ANNEX 1

**IPCC BUREAU – FORTY-THIRD SESSION
Geneva, 18-19 April 2011**

BUR-XLIII/Doc. 1
(17.II.2011)
Agenda Item: 1
ENGLISH ONLY

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

(Submitted by the IPCC Secretariat)

- 1. OPENING OF THE SESSION**
- 2. APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE 42nd SESSION**
- 3. ADMISSION OF OBSERVER ORGANIZATIONS**
- 4. COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY**
- 5. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND AARHUS CONVENTION**
- 6. TASK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO THE INTER ACADEMY COUNCIL (IAC) REVIEW OF THE IPCC**
- 7. OTHER OUTCOMES OF COP-16 AND IMPLICATIONS FOR IPCC WORK**
- 8. PROGRESS REPORTS**
 - 8.1 IPCC scholarship programme
 - 8.2 Other progress reports
- 9. OTHER BUSINESS**
- 10. TIME AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION**
- 11. CLOSING OF THE SESSION**

**List of Participants 43rd Session of the IPCC Bureau
Geneva, 18 – 19 May 2011**

Rajendra K. PACHAURI Chairman of the IPCC INDIA	B	Amjad ABDULLA Ministry of Housing & Environment, MALDIVES	B
Vicente Ricardo BARROS Co-Chair WG II CIMA-FCEN ARGENTINA	B	Youba SOKONA Co-Chair WG III Economic Commission for Africa ETHIOPIA	B
Neville SMITH Bureau of Meteorology AUSTRALIA	B	Antonina IVANOVA BONCHEVA Autonomous University of Southern Baja California MEXICO	B
Jean-Pascal van YPERSELE Vice-Chair Institut d'Astronomie et de Géophysique G. Lemaître (ASTR) BELGIUM	B	Abdalah MOKSSIT Direction de la Météorologie Nationale MOROCCO	B
Thelma KRUG Co-Chair TFI Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais BRAZIL	B	David WRATT National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research (NIWA) NEW ZEALAND	B
Francis William ZWIERS Pacific Climate Impacts Consortium CANADA	B	Eduardo CALVO UNMSM PERU	B
Carlo CARRARO University of Venice ITALY	B	Hoesung LEE Vice-Chair Keimyung University, College of Environment REPUBLIC OF KOREA	B
Taka HIRAISHI Co-Chair TFI c/o Institute for Global Environmental Strategies JAPAN	B	Sergey M. SEMENOV Institute of Global Climate & Ecology RUSSIAN FEDERATION	B
Nirivololona RAHOLIJAO National Meteorological Service MADAGASCAR	B	Taha ZATARI Presidency of Meteorology and Environment SAUDI ARABIA	B
Fredolin T. TANGANG School of Environmental and Natural Resource Sciences Faculty of Science and Technology MALAYSIA	B	José Manuel MORENO Facultad de Ciencias Ambientales Universidad de Castilla - la Mancha SPAIN	B

Thomas F. STOCKER
Co-Chair WG I
Climate and Environmental Physics Institute
University of Bern
SWITZERLAND

B

Wan Azli Wan HASSAN
Malaysian Meteorological Department
MALAYSIA

Jim SKEA
UK Energy Research Centre
UNITED KINGDOM

B

Ali SHAREEF
Ministry of Housing and Environment
MALDIVES

Christopher FIELD
Co-Chair WG II
Department of Global Ecology,
Carnegie Institution for Science
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

B

Birama DIARRA
Direction Nationale de la Meteorologie
MALI

Francis YAMBA
Centre for Energy Environment and
Engineering
ZAMBIA

B

Andrés FLORES MONTALVO
Instituto Nacional de Ecología
MEXICO

Maria del Pilar CASTRO BARREDA
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru
PERU

GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES

Martine VANDERSTRAETEN
Belgian Federal Public Planning Service
for Science Policy
BELGIUM

Byoung-Cheol KIM
Korea Meteorological Administration (KMA)
REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Darren GOETZE
International Affairs Branch
Environment Canada
CANADA

Abdullah K. TAWLAH
Saudi Aramco
SAUDI ARABIA

Yun GAO
China Meteorological Administration
CHINA

Concepción MARTINEZ LOPE
Gabinete Secretaría de Estado
de Cambio Climático
SPAIN

Nicolas BERIOT
MEDDTL
DGEC-ONERC
FRANCE

José ROMERO
Federal Department of the Environment,
Transport, Energy and Communications
SWITZERLAND

Christiane TEXTOR
Project Management Agency,
Part of the German Aerospace Center,
Environment, Culture, Sustainability,
GERMANY

David A. WARRILOW
Climate and Energy: Science and
Analysis (CESA)
UNITED KINGDOM

Trigg TALLEY
U.S. Department of State
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ORGANIZATIONS

Subodh Kumar SHARMA
Ministry of Environment and Forests
INDIA

Florin VLADU
UNFCCC
GERMANY

Matsuzawa YUTAKA
Ministry of the Environment
JAPAN

Michel JARRAUD
WMO
SWITZERLAND

TECHNICAL SUPPORT UNIT

Pauline MIDGLEY
Head, IPCC WG I Technical Support Unit
SWITZERLAND

Kristie EBI
Executive Director, IPCC WG II Technical
Support Unit,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Simon EGGLESTON
Head, Technical Support Unit
Task Force on Inventories
JAPAN

IPCC SECRETARIAT

Renate CHRIST
Secretary of the IPCC

Gaetano LEONE
Deputy Secretary of the IPCC

Mary-Jean BURER
Programme Officer

Sophie SCHLINGEMANN
Legal and Outreach Officer

Rockaya AIDARA
Press Officer

TASK GROUP REPRESENTATIVES

Leo MEYER
Co-chair TG Procedures

Oyvind CHRISTOPHERSEN
Rapporteur TG Communications

Christoffer GRØNSTAD
Rapporteur TG Procedures

AARTHUS CONVENTION

Monika LINN
Aphrodite SMAGADI