

**THIRTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE IPCC  
Abu Dhabi, 10-13 May 2011**

IPCC-XXXIII/INF. 1  
(12.IV.2011)  
Agenda Item: 5  
ENGLISH ONLY

**REVIEW OF THE IPCC PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES**

**Comments from Governments and IPCC Office Holders on the initial  
draft recommendations prepared by the Task Groups**

(Submitted by the IPCC Secretariat)

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

Comments from Governments and IPCC Office Holders on the initial draft recommendations prepared by the Task Groups

In October 2010, the IPCC at its 32<sup>nd</sup> Session welcomed the recommendations of an independent review carried out by the InterAcademy Council (IAC). IPCC member Governments agreed to establish four task groups to take forward the IAC's recommendations on:

- 1) Procedures;
- 2) Governance and Management;
- 3) Conflict of Interest Policy; and
- 4) Communications Strategy.

This document contains in Section 1 the initial draft recommendations prepared by the Task Groups and circulated for comments by Governments and IPCC Office Holders from 9 February to 9 March 2011 and in sections 2 and 3 comments received on the initial draft recommendations. In Sections 2 and 3 the comments received are sorted in the following manner – for Section 2 by country and IPCC Office Holders and for Section 3 by Task Group.

The revised proposals by the Task Groups have taken into consideration comments received from Governments and IPCC Office Holders and are submitted for formal consideration by the Panel at its 33<sup>rd</sup> Session in Abu Dhabi from 10-13 May 2011. They are contained in documents IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.10; IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.11; IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.12; IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.13 and addenda.

**Section 1 -**

First Draft of the Task Groups' Recommendations (Feb. 2011)

## **RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE IPCC TASK GROUP ON PROCEDURES**

Draft for Review according to the terms of reference

Submitted by the Task Group Co-chairs  
Oyvind Christophersen, Norway  
Eduardo Calvo, Peru

Rapporteur  
Leo Meyer, The Netherlands

9 February 2011

## Table of contents

1. Introduction	page 2
2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings	page 3
3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors	page 3
4. Sources of Data and Literature	page 4
5. Handling the Full Range of Views	page 5
6. Report Review	page 6
7. Summary for Policymakers	page 7
8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors	page 7
9. IPCC's Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty	page 8
10. IPCC Guidance material	page 9
11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures	page 10
12. Annex: Terms of Reference for a Task Group on Procedures	page 13

## 1. Introduction

The IPCC Task Group on Procedures<sup>1</sup> met 1-4 February 2011 at WMO Headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland, to implement its mandate given by the 32nd session of the IPCC in Busan, 11-14 October 2010<sup>2</sup> to develop recommendations for decisions to be taken at the 33rd Panel of the IPCC in Abu Dhabi, 10-12 May 2011. To that end, it developed the following proposals for responding to a number of recommendations of the InterAcademy Council (IAC) in their 'Review of the processes and procedures of the IPCC', 30 August 2010 and in consideration of the relevant decisions by the Panel.<sup>3</sup>

The Task Group recommendations relate 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'. The proposals of the Task Group are presented in sections 2 to 10 of this document.

To some extent the Task Group also discussed some suggestions that were related to the IAC report recommendations but may be viewed as being not strictly within the mandate given by the 32nd session of the IPCC. The Task Group considered these suggestions useful for further discussion and includes them in this document under the Addendum "Issues for further discussion on Procedures" (section 11 of this document).. Please note that this addendum does not reflect any consensus by the Task Group.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session32/members\\_task\\_group.pdf](http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session32/members_task_group.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session32/ipcc\\_IACreview\\_decisions.pdf](http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session32/ipcc_IACreview_decisions.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/IAC\\_report/IAC%20Report.pdf](http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/IAC_report/IAC%20Report.pdf)

## **2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings**

### IAC recommendation:

‘The IPCC should make the process and criteria for selecting participants for scoping meetings more transparent’

### Decision IPCC-32:

The Panel agreed with this recommendation. Implementation plan to be determined by the Task Group on Procedures with the view to make a decision at its next Session (IPCC-XXXIII).

### Task Group consideration:

The TG noted that the current procedures do not describe scoping meetings to produce draft outlines for new IPCC reports.

### Task Group recommendation for decision by the Panel:

The Procedures should contain a new step and a new paragraph preceding paragraph 4.2.1 describing the scoping process for an Assessment or Special Report, including the selection of participants and the mandate of a scoping meeting. This paragraph, which also should apply to the Synthesis report, should contain the following elements:

IPCC scoping meetings will be convened to propose an outline and explanatory notes as appropriate for an IPCC report. Nominations will be solicited from government Focal Points, participating organizations, and Bureau members [footnote and in addendum]. Participants should be selected by the IPCC Bureau or the respective Working Group Bureau/Task Force, taking into account scientific expertise, geographical distribution, the range of scientific views, a mixture of experts with and without previous experience in IPCC, gender balance, and expert representatives of different stakeholder/user groups.

## **3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors**

### 3.1. IAC recommendation on criteria:

‘The IPCC should establish a formal set of criteria and processes for selecting Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors’.

### IPCC-32 decision:

The Panel agreed with this recommendation. Formal criteria are included in the existing procedures. Enhanced implementation and transparency as well as potential additional criteria and procedures to be considered by the Task Group on Procedures with the view to make a decision at its next Session (IPCC-XXXIII) for future work.

### Task Group recommendations for decision by the Panel:

- Para 4.2.2 should be amended by including the notion that gender balance, and a balance in the mixture of scientific experts with and without experience in the IPCC process should be taken into account.
- Procedures shall be amended to require a report on the selection process.

### 3.2. IAC Recommendation:

‘The IPCC should make every effort to engage local experts on the author teams of the regional chapters of the Working Group II report, but should also engage experts from countries outside of the region when they can provide an essential contribution to the assessment’.

IPCC-32 decision:

The Panel agreed with this recommendation. This is already implemented for AR5. Further implementation to be considered by the Task Group on Procedures with the view to make a decision at its next Session (IPCC-XXXIII) for future work

Task Group consideration:

The TG notes that the current composition of the regional writing teams of the Working Group II report has already taken this recommendation into account. The IAC recommendation should be reflected in paragraph 4.2.2.

Task Group recommendation for decision by the Panel:

Para 4.2.2 should be amended by including the notion that IPCC should engage regional experts on the author teams of regional chapters of the Working Group reports as appropriate, including experts from countries outside of the region.

#### **4. Sources of Data and Literature**

IAC recommendation:

The IPCC should strengthen and enforce its procedure for the use of unpublished and non-peer-reviewed literature, including providing more specific guidance on how to evaluate such information, adding guidelines on what types of literature are unacceptable, and ensuring that unpublished and non-peer-reviewed literature is appropriately flagged in the report.

IPCC-32 decision:

The Panel agreed with this recommendation. The Panel decided to strengthen the application of its procedures on the use of unpublished and non-peer reviewed literature. It decided to implement this recommendation and further key elements through its procedures and guidance notes. The Panel noted the General Guidance on the Use of Literature in IPCC Reports (contained in IPCC-XXXII/INF.4) as revised in General Guidance on the Use of Literature in IPCC Reports (Appendix 1 of the decision of IPCC-32) which addresses the related aspects in the IAC recommendations and decided to endorse them as a Guidance Note. The Panel urges the Co-Chairs of Working Group I, II, III and TFI to take any necessary steps to ensure that this guidance note is applied in the development of IPCC reports.

Task Group consideration:

The TG notes that changes to the procedures are warranted to respond to this IAC recommendation.

The TG, after consulting the WG /TFI TSUs, found that the implementation of this IAC recommendation regarding the appropriate flagging of unpublished and non-peer reviewed literature would not be practical.

Task Group recommendation for decision by the Panel:

Replace the current Annex 2 of the Procedures ('Procedure for using non-published/non-peer-reviewed sources in IPCC reports') by a new Annex 2 as described below:

**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 be open and transparent. Non-journal-based sources can provide crucial information for an IPCC Report, including information about experience and practice with mitigation and adaptation activities (e.g. reports from governments, industry, and other organisations, reports or working papers of research institutions, workshop proceedings). In principle, newspapers and magazines are not valid sources of

scientific knowledge. Blogs, social networking sites, and broadcast media are not acceptable sources of information for IPCC Reports.

For the above mentioned sources the following additional procedures are needed.

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

Authors are requested to critically assess any information they would like to include from a non-journal-based source. Each chapter team should review the quality and validity of each source before incorporating information from the source into an IPCC Report.

Authors who wish to include information from a non-journal based source that is not commercially available are requested to send the full reference and a copy, preferably electronically, to the Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs who are coordinating the Report.

For any sources written in a language other than English, an executive summary or abstract in English is required.

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

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

### **2. Responsibilities of the Review Editors**

The Review Editors will ensure that these sources are selected and used consistently with the procedures in this Annex.

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

The Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs coordinating the Report will (a) collect these sources received from authors, as well as the accompanying information about each source and (b) make these sources available to reviewers who request them during the review process.

### **4. Responsibilities of the IPCC Secretariat**

The IPCC Secretariat will (a) collect these sources for each IPCC Report not prepared by a Working Group/the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories and (b) make these sources available to reviewers who request them during the review process.

## **5. Handling the Full Range of Views**

### IAC recommendation:

‘Lead Authors should explicitly document that a range of scientific viewpoints has been considered, and Coordinating Lead Authors and Review Editors should satisfy themselves that due consideration was given to properly documented alternative views’.

### IPCC-32 decision:

The Panel agreed with this recommendation. The Panel emphasizes that handling the full range of scientific views is a core principle of the IPCC. Its procedures clearly require the representation of differing scientific viewpoints and encourages rigorous adherence by the CLAs, LAs, and REs. The Panel urges the IPCC Chair, the Co-Chairs of the Working Groups and TFI to take any necessary steps to ensure that this principle continues to be applied in the development of IPCC reports. Further implementation to be considered by the Task Group on Procedures with the view to make a decision at its next Session (IPCC-XXXIII).



Task Group consideration:

The TG noted that documentation of the range of scientific views is an essential part of the IPCC assessment reports and should be reflected in the assessment process and products

The TG believes that the above decision taken by the Panel adequately reflects IAC recommendation for documenting the range of views including possible differences in opinion. However, the TG feels that the current language concerning the range of views in the procedures should be more precise.

Task Group recommendation for decision by the Panel:

Replace ‘*to aim for a range of views*’ by ‘*to consider the range of scientific views*’ in 4.2.2 Selection of Lead Authors, 4.2.4.1 First Review (by Experts and) 4.4.1 (the Synthesis Report) Annex I of the Procedures should also be reviewed to be consistent with this recommendation.

## **6. Report Review**

6.1. IAC recommendation:

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.

IPCC-32 Panel decision:

The Panel agreed with this recommendation in principle. Implementation options to be considered by the Task Group on Procedures with the view to make a decision at its next Session (IPCC-XXXIII).

6.2. IAC recommendation:

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.

IPCC-32 Panel decision:

The Panel agreed with this recommendation. The Panel decided to strengthen its application of procedures, and amend them where necessary, to enable Review Editors to fully exercise their role. The Panel noted the new Guidance Note on the Role of Review Editors (Appendix 2 of the decision of IPCC-32) which addresses the related aspects in the IAC recommendations. The Panel urges the Co-Chairs of Working Group I, II, III and TFI to take steps to ensure that this guidance note is implemented in the development of its work.

Task Group consideration:

The TG found that a staged response to Recommendations 6.1 and 6.2 is needed, first through the development of additional guidance, and then through subsequent consideration of the relevant section of the Procedures (Section 4.2.4). The guidance document would address all major actions under the review process and consider the various roles and responsibilities of the actors.

Task Group recommendation for decision by the Panel:

The IPCC should develop guidance material for the review process in order to ensure the process is targeted and effective, and that common practices are adopted across the Working Groups/TFI. The Working Group Bureaux will be assigned this task and should use, as an initial basis, the guidance document “Role of Review Editors” that was tabled at IPCC 32,

noting the Panel urged “the Co-Chairs of WGs I, II and III and TFI to take steps to ensure that this guidance note is implemented in the development of its work.

The current Section 4.2.4 in the Procedures may require revision. Any revision should take place subsequent to the development of the guidance document, and take full consideration of Recommendations 6.1 and 6.2.

## **7. Summary for Policymakers**

### IAC recommendation:

‘The IPCC should revise its process for the approval of the Summary for Policymakers so that governments provide written comments prior to the Plenary’.

### IPCC 32 decision:

The Panel acknowledges the importance of both written comments and inputs from the floor, which are current practice. No revision to the process is required.

### Task Group consideration:

The Panel noted and the Task Group reaffirms that current IPCC practice already allows for governments to provide written comments on the Summary for Policymakers prior to the Plenary.

The Panel indicated no revision to the process was required. However, the Task Group suggests the procedures be amended to clarify current practice.

### Task Group recommendation for decision by the Panel:

The existing Procedures should be amended to clarify the current practice.

## **8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors identified after approval of IPCC reports**

IAC discussion and suggestion in the Box analyzing the Himalayan glacier error (IAC Report page 22) and Discussion of time required for a response on Himalayan glacier error (IAC Report page 54).

### IPCC-32 decision:

The Panel agreed on the need to establish a process for evaluating, addressing and correcting, if necessary, potential errors and further developing errata as appropriate. The Panel noted the “Proposed IPCC Protocol for Addressing Errors in Previous Assessment Reports” (Appendix 3) which describes a clear decision tree, based on the nature of the material and the steps necessary to avoid bias, so that potential errors could be addressed as rapidly as practical. The Panel urges the IPCC Chair, the IPCC Vice-Chairs, the Co-Chairs of Working Group I, II, III and TFI to take any necessary steps to ensure that this protocol is finalized and then used for evaluation of potential errors and developing errata as appropriate. Further analysis to be considered by the Task Group on Procedures with the view to submit a proposal for a decision at the next Session (IPCC-XXXIII).

### Task Group consideration:

The TG noted that the proposed Protocol for Addressing Errors in Previous Assessment Reports, considered at the 32nd session of the IPCC, is still to be finalized.

### Task Group recommendation for decision by the Panel:

- The procedures should be updated with a possible new section 4.5 that would specifically address potential errors and develop errata as appropriate
- In publishing a report, the IPCC should prominently display a mechanism for submitting potential errors by the public
- The Panel will implement a system to deal with potential errors
- [ The Executive team will oversee the implementation of the procedures for submission of potential errors]<sup>4</sup>

## **9. IPCC's Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty**

*9.1. IAC recommendation: All Working Groups should use the qualitative level-of-understanding scale in their Summary for Policymakers and Technical Summary, as suggested in IPCC's uncertainty guidance for the Fourth Assessment Report. This scale may be supplemented by a quantitative probability scale, if appropriate.*

*9.2. IAC recommendation: Chapter Lead Authors should provide a traceable account of how they arrived at their ratings for level of scientific understanding and likelihood that an outcome will occur.*

*9.3. IAC recommendation: Quantitative probabilities (as in the likelihood scale) should be used to describe the probability of well-defined outcomes only when there is sufficient evidence. Authors should indicate the basis for assigning a probability to an outcome or event (e.g. based on measurement, expert judgment, and/or model runs).*

*9.4. IAC recommendation: The confidence scale should not be used to assign subjective probabilities to ill-defined outcomes. 13. Recommendation: The likelihood scale should be stated in terms of probabilities (numbers) in addition to words to improve understanding of uncertainty.*

*9.5. IAC recommendation: Where practical, formal expert elicitation procedures should be used to obtain subjective probabilities for key results.*

### IPCC-32 decision:

The Panel decided to improve the IPCC guidance on evaluation of evidence and treatment of uncertainty. It is implementing the six recommendations in the IAC Review as part of a broader package of updates to procedures and guidance notes. The Panel noted with appreciation the Draft Guidance Note for Lead Authors of the Fifth Assessment Report on Consistent Treatment of Uncertainties (Appendix 4 of the decision of IPCC-32) and requested the Co-Chairs of Workings Group I, II and III to present the final document to the Panel at its next Session. The final document should provide more detail on traceable accounts, the evolution of the guidance since AR4 and explain how each of the six recommendations in the IAC review is addressed. The Panel urges the Co-Chairs to take any necessary steps to ensure that the guidance note is implemented in the development of its work

### Task Group consideration:

The TG noted that these recommendations 8.1-8.5 have been addressed by the 32th Session in a draft guidance note by WG Co-chairs, see Appendix 4 to the 32th Panel decisions. This final guidance note will be presented to the 33rd session of the Panel.

### Task Group recommendation for decision by the Panel:

---

<sup>4</sup> The responsible body for handling potential errors will be addressed in the recommendations of the Task Group on Governance and Management

The Panel may wish to consider an addition to paragraph 4.2.3 of the Procedures reflecting the importance of applying a common approach to the treatment of uncertainty in the WGs with reference to the guidance note on uncertainties when completed.

## **10. IPCC Guidance material**

### Task Group consideration:

The Task Group noted that some IPCC guidance material now played a significant role in the processes of IPCC, with the IAC Review further elevating the importance of such guidance.

The Task Group noted that some of this material has until this point not been classed or has been classed as supporting material.

### Task Group recommendation for decision by the Panel

The Panel may wish to give further consideration of this group of guidance materials with the aim of developing appropriate procedures

## **11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures**

### **11.1 Introduction**

The Task Group noted that a number of issues were raised by Task Group members that may be viewed as being not strictly within the mandate given by the 32<sup>nd</sup> session of the IPCC. However, the Task Group considered these issues useful for further discussion as part of an effort to further improving clarity of the Procedures, and the transparency and quality of the assessment process.

Please note that this Addendum does not reflect any consensus from the Task Group discussions at their meeting in Geneva 1-4 February 2011.

The reviewers of this document may wish to give their viewpoints on the issues and thoughts below.

### **11.2 Nomination and selection process (section 4.2 of the Procedures)**

#### *Further elaboration of the scoping process*

In addition to the IAC's recommendation to make scoping meetings more transparent, the Procedures could include descriptions of other stages of the scoping process, such as collecting input by governments prior to the scoping meeting, and requesting comments by governments on the draft report outline after the scoping meeting prior to the subsequent panel session

#### *Nomination process*

The Procedures could include a description of the current by which Focal Points and participating organizations are invited to nominate individuals for IPCC activities and clarifying the responsibilities of Focal Points and participating organizations in making nominations

#### *Participant selection*

Section 4.2.2 (2nd line) appears to have an error: the selection process does not involve a Session of the WG but a Session of the Bureau (or WG Bureaux). The Bureau is responsible for reviewing overall balance, etc.

### **11.3 Review process (sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the Procedures)**

#### *Availability of review comments and responses.*

In section 4.1 it is noted that 'all written expert and government review comments will be made available to reviewers on request during the review process and will be retained in an open archive in a location determined by the IPCC Secretariat on completion of the Report for a period of at least five years.' The authors prepare expert review comment response files in preparation of their next draft. The current procedures do not require the responses to be archived but in AR4 it became the practice to provide these as well in the archive after completion of the report. The transparency of the review process could be improved by making these review comment response files available to the reviewers as soon as possible after their completion, during the assessment process.

#### *Crosscutting issues*

Clearer procedures for the identification and inclusion of crosscutting themes may be needed. Crosscutting issues play an important role in the Assessment. So far, crosscutting issues are only mentioned as a part of tasks of coordinating lead authors, Annex 1 section 2 of the Procedures.

#### *Anonymous expert review*

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. Useful experience may be drawn from the anonymous expert review applied during the reviews of the IPCC special report on Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage (2005) and by the Task Force on Inventories. Names were converted by numbers by the TSU during the lead author meetings. The Government comments were not treated anonymously. All expert reviewers were acknowledged by name in the final publication. Possible disadvantages related to such a process need to be evaluated.

#### *Improving quality and completeness of review*

During the AR4, some parts of the WG II reports have not been sufficiently reviewed by experts. The review process could be organized in a way to ensure complete coverage of the report. ‘Crowd sourcing’ techniques may be explored. The expert reviews could also include cross checking by lead authors of other Working groups where relevant (for instance glaciologists of WG I reviewing relevant parts dealing with glaciers in WG II)

#### *Range of scientific views*

In order to achieve consistency with the Task Group recommendations on the range of views (section 5 page 5 of this document), the following amendment is suggested in the Procedures under Annex I section I , tasks and responsibilities of Lead Authors, paragraph 3: Lead Authors are required to consider the range of scientific views and document in the Report views which cannot be reconciled with a consensus view but which are nonetheless scientifically or technically valid

#### *Confidentiality*

Clear guidance may be needed on what the rules are for citation/publication of draft reports and other documentation during drafting and review and how the draft report need to be kept confidential without contradicting the needed transparency and openness, while different versions of the draft should be accessible after the completion of the report.

#### *Repository*

To enhance transparency and traceability during the review process and later it was suggested to create a repository with all sources used by authors during the assessment reports, this repository will include non journal based literature, journal based articles and peer reviewed book chapters

### **11.4 Approval and Acceptance of Summaries for Policymakers (section 4.3 of the Procedures)**

#### *Role of Coordinating Lead Authors at the SPM approval session*

The Procedures state that ‘Coordinating lead authors may be asked to provide technical assistance in ensuring that consistency has been achieved’. In practice, the CLAs play a much stronger role: generally changes in the SPM text are adopted only if the relevant CLAs can ensure that these changes are consistent with the scientific findings in the underlying report. This is perceived as an important safeguard against unjustified policy influence on scientific findings. It should be considered to reflect the common practice in the procedures.

### **11.5 Preparation of Synthesis report (section 4.4 of the Procedures)**

The procedures could better clarify and specify the Synthesis Report review process, including rules about governments receiving a final draft of the entire document well in advance of the approval Plenary (4.4.1, the Synthesis report)

### **11.6 Workshops and Expert Meetings (section 6.1 of the Procedures)**

The Procedures could better clarify the distinction between ‘expert meetings’ and ‘workshops’ by describing the processes for nominating and selecting participants for these meetings. In practice, nominations for workshops are usually done through government focal points and selection by the Chair, Co-chairs and WG Bureaux, as appropriate. For expert meetings there is no clear nomination process described in the procedures. Selection is usually done by the Chair, Co-chairs and WG Bureaux, as appropriate, based on the recommendations of the Scientific Steering Group of that meeting.

### **11. 7. Guidance documents**

In section 10 of this document, the Task Group recommends that the Panel may wish to give further consideration of this group of guidance materials with the aim of developing appropriate procedures.

In the following, some more thoughts are given on this matter:

- “*Guidance Documents*” are published materials which provide guidance on the practical implementation of IPCC policy and/or procedures. Guidance documents support the work of the IPCC and facilitate consistent approaches and treatments by participants in the IPCC process within the context of IPCC Policy and Procedures, in particular in the development of an Assessment. Guidance Documents are generally applicable at a high level and relevant to all Working Groups and, as appropriate, the Task Force. The Documents are intended to guide and shape actions and approaches and are not prescriptive or binding. The application of the guidance material is the responsibility of CLAs and the Working Group Bureaux.
- Interim or initial ‘*guidance notes*’ will often originate from within a Work Group, or as the outcome from an expert workshop, with the purpose of assisting LAs in the production of a comprehensive and scientifically sound assessment. These may be elevated to a ‘*Guidance Document*’ if the Working Group Bureaux or the Bureau as a whole decides guidance is needed across IPCC work to aid consistency, integration or transparency, among other things. The Bureau may commission a ‘*Guidance Document*’.
- “*Guidance Documents*” should be added as a specific new class of IPCC Material, or as a subclass of IPCC Supporting Material within Section 3 of the Procedures. A definition should be added to Section 2 and a small additional section added at 5bis or as a sub-section in Section 6, describing the role of *Guidance Documents* and the methods for preparation, endorsement and revision.
- Appropriate procedures for IPCC *Guidance* material should aim to enhance transparency and support common rules. The needs for efficiency and flexibility of these instruments should be maintained.
- The preparation of *Guidance Documents* will be the responsibility of the Working Group Bureaux and will be finalized and endorsed at the level of the Bureau. The Bureau may elect to delegate this responsibility.
- *Guidance Documents* should be reviewed at the start of an assessment cycle, and more often if required.

## **Annex: Terms of reference for a Task Group on Procedures**

---

The Panel welcomed and acknowledged the recommendations and suggestions by the IAC on the IPCC's assessment process (Chapters 2 and 3 of the IAC Report) and decided to establish an inter-sessional Task Group on Procedures to develop proposals on further implementation of the recommendations. The Task Group is specifically requested to address, inter alia, the issues listed in Annex I to this decision and propose amendments, including Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC work and relevant Guidance Documents, if necessary, by *31 January 2011*. Governments will then be invited to provide comments on the proposals by *28 February 2011* to allow preparation of a revised draft for consideration and decisions by the Panel at its next Session (IPCC-XXXIII).

The Task Group on Procedures is open to participation by the members of the IPCC and consists of Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Germany, India, Iran, Maldives, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Peru, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Swaziland, Switzerland, Thailand, and USA. The Task Group will elect Co-Chairs to coordinate its work.

The Task Group will seek the advice of the IPCC Chair, the IPCC Vice-Chairs, Working Group and TFI Co-Chairs and the Secretary. The duration of the Task Group is until the IPCC's 33<sup>rd</sup> Session unless decided otherwise.

The Task Group should address the issues listed below as mentioned in the IAC recommendations (Chapters 2 and 3), IPCC responses at its 32<sup>nd</sup> Session and IPCC-XXXII/Doc. 22. For each of the issues the Task Group should establish a timetable for action, consider resource implications and identify responsibilities for implementation. It should propose amendments to the Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC Work and relevant guidance documents if needed taking into account decisions made at IPCC-XXXII.

### **IAC recommendations**

#### **Scoping**

1. Recommendation: The IPCC should make the process and criteria for selecting participants for scoping meetings more transparent.

#### **Author Selection**

2. Recommendation: The IPCC should establish a formal set of criteria and processes for selecting Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors.

3. Recommendation: The IPCC should make every effort to engage local experts on the author teams of the regional chapters of the Working Group II report, but should also engage experts from countries outside of the region when they can provide an essential contribution to the assessment.

#### **Sources of Data and Literature**

4. Recommendation: The IPCC should strengthen and enforce its procedure for the use of unpublished and non-peer-reviewed literature, including providing more specific guidance on how to evaluate such information, adding guidelines on what types of literature are unacceptable, and ensuring that unpublished and non-peer-reviewed literature is appropriately flagged in the report.

#### **Handling the Full Range of Views**

5. Recommendation: Lead Authors should explicitly document that a range of scientific viewpoints has been considered, and Coordinating Lead Authors and Review Editors should satisfy themselves that due consideration was given to properly documented alternative views.



### **Report Review**

6. Recommendation: 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.

7. Recommendation: 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.

### **Summary for Policymakers**

8. Recommendation: The IPCC should revise its process for the approval of the Summary for Policymakers so that governments provide written comments prior to the Plenary.

### **Procedure for the handling of potential errors identified after approval of IPCC reports**

IAC discussion and suggestion: Box analyzing of Himalayan glacier error (IAC Report page 22). Discussion of time required for a response on Himalayan glacier error (IAC Report page 54).

### **IPCC's Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty**

9. Recommendation: All Working Groups should use the qualitative level-of-understanding scale in their Summary for Policymakers and Technical Summary, as suggested in IPCC's uncertainty guidance for the Fourth Assessment Report. This scale may be supplemented by a quantitative probability scale, if appropriate.

10. Recommendation: Chapter Lead Authors should provide a traceable account of how they arrived at their ratings for level of scientific understanding and likelihood that an outcome will occur.

11. Recommendation: Quantitative probabilities (as in the likelihood scale) should be used to describe the probability of well-defined outcomes only when there is sufficient evidence. Authors should indicate the basis for assigning a probability to an outcome or event (e.g. based on measurement, expert judgment, and/or model runs).

12. Recommendation: The confidence scale should not be used to assign subjective probabilities to ill-defined outcomes.

13. Recommendation: The likelihood scale should be stated in terms of probabilities (numbers) in addition to words to improve understanding of uncertainty.

14. Recommendation: Where practical, formal expert elicitation procedures should be used to obtain subjective probabilities for key results.

## Governance and Management Task Group

Geneva Workshop output, Friday, 4 February 2011

**Subject: Establish an Executive Committee (EC)**

### **IAC Recommendation:**

- *IAC recommendation: The IPCC should establish an Executive Committee to act on its behalf between Plenary sessions. The membership of the Committee should include the IPCC Chair, the Working Group Co-chairs, the senior member of the Secretariat, and 3 independent members, including some from outside of the climate community. Members would be elected by the Plenary and serve until their successors are in place.*

### **TG Mandate from the Panel:**

- *Panel agreed to work toward establishing a formal body to provide governance functions that are necessary between sessions of the panel, strengthen coordination activities, and have oversight of the organisation's administration and communications; according to the mandate to be agreed in the 33rd Session. (from decision at IPCC 32).*
- *The Task Group should consider options for the implementation of the decision concerning the recommendation mentioning the establishment of an Executive Committee. These options include those for the **mandate, size, composition, functions and reporting** of the body referred to in this recommendation.*
- *The Task Group shall make recommendations on the options mentioned in decision II to the 33rd Session of the Panel, with a view to taking a decision.*

### **TG commentary/rationale:**

### **TG Proposal:**

The Task Group on Governance and Management invites the Panel to consider the following proposals:

1. The Panel should establish an Executive Committee.
2. The purpose of the Executive Committee would be to provide a formal coordination mechanism to ensure timely and effective implementation of IPCC Panel decisions, in particular with respect to the production of IPCC reports, and to act on behalf of the IPCC between sessions.
3. The Terms of Reference for the Executive Committee should be as follows:
  - a. Ensure effective coordination between Working Groups and Task Forces on activities and issues pertaining to the production of assessments and other relevant IPCC products, and on relevant decisions of the Panel.

- b. Act on behalf of the Panel on issues that require prompt attention by the IPCC between Panel sessions.
- c. Ensure effective and timely implementation of communication and outreach activities.
- d. Address issues that arise, including handling of errata, in the context of the assessments and other relevant IPCC products.
- e. Support and provide guidance to the Chair, other members of the Bureau and the Secretariat on matters pertaining to the implementation of IPCC decisions, and on work of the Panel.
- f. [Select participants for scoping meetings, workshops, expert meetings involving all working groups, including for the Synthesis Report, from the nominees in accordance with IPCC procedures and decisions of the panel and the Bureau.] raise with TGPP.
- g. Undertake other activities at the request of the Panel.

**Size and Composition:**

4. The Executive Committee must include:
  - IPCC Chair
  - Working Group and Task Force Co-Chairs
  - Head of Secretariat (ex-officio)
5. The Executive Committee may also include one or more of the following options:
  - One or more IPCC Vice Chairs [possibly as ex-officio members?]
  - The Heads of the TSU as ex-officio members
  - Ex-officio members external to the IPCC

**Mode of operation:**

6. The Executive Committee should operate according to the following rules:
  - a. The authority provided to the Executive Committee is vested in the body as a whole, and any member of the Executive Committee who acts/speaks on its behalf must represent the views of the entire body.

- b. The Executive Committee will take every effort to reach decisions by consensus; if consensus is not possible, decisions may be adopted by a simple majority of the voting members<sup>1</sup>.
- c. Members with the right to vote should be the Chair, Co-chairs [and vice chairs]. Ex-officio members do not have the right to vote.
- d. A quorum consists of two thirds of the members, other than ex-officio members.
- e. If the Chair cannot be present he/she may nominate a chair from the members.
- f. The Deputy Head of Secretariat or another senior secretariat member may substitute for the Head of Secretariat with the agreement of the Chair, if the Head of Secretariat cannot be present.
- g. The Executive Committee may invite additional individuals to participate in a meeting of the Committee by a formal invitation signed by the Head of the Secretariat.
- h. The Secretariat will prepare a draft agenda in consultation with the members of the Executive Committee and normally make it available for information to IPCC members in advance of those meetings.
- i. The Secretariat will prepare and make available the conclusions and decisions of the Executive Committee to its members and to IPCC members as soon as possible but not later than two weeks after the meeting.
- j. The Executive Committee meets at least four times per year and, in addition, on request of at least three elected members of the Committee within two weeks of the request. Meetings should be conducted by electronic means or back-to-back with Bureau meetings whenever possible.
- k. The Executive Committee is accountable to the Panel, and the Chair of the IPCC should report annually on the activities of the Executive Committee to the Panel and Bureau.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Footnote:**

**WMO general regulations - Regulation 64 Decisions in any of the committees, sub-committees, working groups, joint working groups and panels of a constituent body shall be determined by a simple majority of the votes cast for and against. If an equal number of votes is cast for and against a proposal, the proposal shall be regarded as lost.**

# IPCC CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY TASK GROUP

## Draft Report

This report has been produced by members of the TG Conflict of Interest Policy for the sole purpose of discussion among government members of the Panel. This document has no status within IPCC, nor is it endorsed by the IPCC or the member governments of the Panel. It is not intended for circulation beyond the member governments of the Panel, the “E-team” of the IPCC, and the IPCC Secretariat.

**Do not cite/Do not circulate**

4 February 2011

## **IAC Recommendation**

The IAC review of the processes and procedures of the IPCC (2010) recommended that:

“The IPCC should develop and adopt a rigorous conflict-of-interest policy that applies to all individuals directly involved in the preparation of IPCC reports, including senior IPCC leadership (IPCC Chair and Vice Chair), authors with responsibilities for report content (i.e., Working Group Co-chairs, Coordinating Lead Authors, and Lead Authors), Review Editors, and technical staff directly involved in report preparation (e.g., staff of Technical Support Units and the IPCC Secretariat).”

## **Task Group Mandate from the Panel**

The IPCC at its 32nd Session:

- I. Agreed with this IAC recommendation.
- II. Decided to implement a rigorous conflict of interest policy, taking into consideration the specific circumstances related to participation in IPCC activities.
- III. Established a Task Group on Conflict of Interest Policy to propose options for such a policy, consulting with relevant organizations, for its decision at the 33<sup>rd</sup> Session.

## Task Group Commentary on the Proposals

### Background and Key Considerations

1. The Task Group was conscious of the fact that the work of IPCC is largely undertaken by volunteers and their right to privacy and willingness to participate is key.
2. Well qualified individuals are likely to have relevant interests and the challenge is to manage these interests rather than to demand that all conflicts are avoided. The policy is intended to encourage the participation of individuals from developing countries.
3. While the Policy and its implementation need to be as transparent as possible in order to underpin the credibility of IPCC, specific information needs to remain confidential.
4. The policy should promote wider public trust in IPCC as well as trust between those who participate in IPCC.

### Key points of the proposals

1. The TG proposes a package of documentation comprising: the Management of Interests Policy; a Disclosure of Relevant Interests Form; and an Explanatory Note. The Explanatory Note would not form part of the Policy and could be updated as experience is gained.
2. *Work on the Explanatory Note was not completed in Geneva and it is not therefore included in this report.* It would provide: a) guidance on completing the Disclosure of Relevant Interests Form; b) guidance on interpreting and implementing the Management of Interests Policy; c) examples of situations that could constitute a conflict of interest and guidance on how they might be dealt with; and d) examples of situations that would not constitute a conflict of interest.
3. The TG proposes that the policy is entitled a *Management of Interests Policy* to signal that interests are inevitable and conflicts have to be managed rather than completely avoided.
4. The Policy is principles-based and does not attempt to provide an exhaustive approach for dealing with all possible interests and situations.
5. The implementation of the Policy for Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Review Editors and the staff of Technical Support Units is best located with the Bureau of the Working Group with which people are associated.
6. The implementation of the Policy for people in senior positions (Bureau members including the Chair and Vice-Chairs) will require a new body to manage the process. We have tentatively called this body the *Management of Interests Panel* and proposed four options for its composition.
7. The *Disclosure of Relevant Interests Form* has been designed to be as simple as possible while meeting the basic needs of the policy. It has been strongly emphasised that only relevant interests need be disclosed.
8. The TG proposes a confidential *Register of Interests* accessible only to those who need to implement the *Management of Interests Policy*.
9. We acknowledge the work of WGs I and II in establishing interim management of interests policies. We have drawn on their experience. However, our proposals have yet to reflect transitional issues.

## **Cross-cutting issues**

1. Any *Management of Interests Panel* has implications for governance and management arrangements.
2. The management of the *Register of Interests* has links with *communications*.
3. The disclosure of interests relates to the election of Bureau members (including the Chair and Vice-Chairs) and hence links to *procedures*.
4. The implementation of the policy and compliance with appropriate mitigation measures links to *procedures* and *governance and management*.
5. The assigning of responsibility for administrative support for the policy has implications for *governance and management*.
6. The problem of individuals who allow inappropriate associations to be made between their non-IPCC activities and those of the IPCC is an over-arching issue that has implications for the implementation of the *Management of Interests Policy*.



## IPCC MANAGEMENT OF INTERESTS POLICY

This policy should be read in conjunction with the IPCC Explanatory Note on Management of Interests.

### 1) Purpose

- a. The role of the IPCC is to assess on a comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis the scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant to understanding the scientific basis of risk of human-induced climate change, its potential impacts and options for adaptation and mitigation. IPCC reports should be neutral with respect to policy, although they may need to deal objectively with scientific, technical and socio-economic factors relevant to the application of particular policies.
- b. The role of IPCC demands that it pays special attention to issues of independence and bias to maintain the integrity of, and public confidence in, its products and processes. For this reason, it is essential that the work of IPCC is not compromised by any conflict of interest for those who execute it.
- c. The overall purpose of this policy is to protect the integrity, trust, and credibility of the IPCC, its members, and those directly involved in the preparation of reports, and its activities. This policy is principles-based and does not provide an exhaustive list of criteria for the identification of such conflicts.
- d. The IPCC's Management of Interest Policy is designed to eliminate certain specific, potentially compromising situations from arising, and thereby protecting the individual, the IPCC, and the public interest. The individual and the institution should not be placed in a situation where others could reasonably question, and perhaps discount or dismiss, the work of the IPCC simply because of the existence of conflicting interests.

### 2) Definitions

- a. **Conflict of interest.** A "conflict of interest" refers to any current financial or other interest which could: i) significantly impair, or could be seen to impair, the individual's objectivity in carrying out his or her duties and responsibilities for the IPCC, or ii) create an unfair advantage for any person or organization. Conflicts of interest may be real, perceived, or potential. Financial conflicts may be direct or indirect.
- a. **Disclosure:** Disclosure in the context of this policy means making known any interests which might conflict with the capacity of IPCC to fulfil its role or undermine its credibility. Interests are declared via a Declaration of Interest form and recorded on an IPCC Register of Interests.
- b. **Relevance.** An interest is relevant in the context of this policy if it could have, or could be perceived to have, an impact on IPCC's fulfilment of its role, or the credibility of its products or advice. An interest that does not have a bearing on IPCC's role or credibility, such as general share holdings or property ownership, is not relevant and need not be declared.

### 3) Principles

- a. It is acknowledged that highly qualified people may have interests. This policy is intended to encourage the participation of these individuals. This policy sets a

framework for the management of interests so that IPCC can best meet its goals as set forth in the purpose of this policy.

- b. The policy should be applied in a way that encourages the participation of individuals from developing countries.
- c. This policy applies to all individuals directly involved in the preparation of IPCC reports. The implementation of the policy will be commensurate with the level of responsibility held by individuals in the preparation of IPCC reports. To engender public trust, those who hold higher office, especially those who represent IPCC publicly, should exhibit the highest standards of adherence to the policy.
- d. This policy allows for flexibility in individual instances of conflict of interest in the work of the IPCC in certain cases where an individual's of particular expertise is required, so long as this conflict is transparent and managed.
- e. The responsibility for the disclosure of interests lies with the individual.
- f. This policy is intended to be straightforward and easy to administer and comply with so that the efficient operation of IPCC is not impeded.
- g. The confidentiality of information disclosed will be observed. Information will be used only for the purpose for which it was collected.
- h. [Compliance with the policy is obligatory.][Compliance with the policy is voluntary but non-compliance could result in individuals not being able to participate in the full range of assessment activities.]

#### 4) Scope

- a. This policy applies to senior IPCC leadership (the IPCC Chair, Vice Chairs, Working Group Co-chairs and other members of the IPCC Bureau), authors with responsibilities for report content (Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors), Review Editors, the technical staff directly involved in report preparation (the staff of Technical Support Units and the IPCC Secretariat) and any other individuals directly involved in the development of IPCC products or advice.
- b. The policy applies to the development of all IPCC products and advice including but not limited to: assessment reports; special reports; and technical papers.
- c. The policy applies to the disclosure of interests, the registration of interests, the identification and mitigation of conflicts of interest and compliance.

#### 5) Disclosure

- a. Individuals covered by this policy will need to disclose their interests in writing using the approved IPCC Disclosure of Interest form. The form should be submitted to the relevant Working Group Bureau or to the Management of Interests panel via the IPCC Secretariat as set out in section [7].
- b. Individuals may find the Explanatory Note helpful in completing the form.<sup>1</sup>
- c. Newly elected Bureau members should submit a Disclosure of Interest form within [one month] of their election. Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors and Review Editors should submit a Disclosure of Interest form within [one month] of being invited to serve. Any appropriate mitigating measures should be identified and implemented before duties are taken up.

---

<sup>1</sup> Transition issue for those who have already completed forms

- d. Individuals are responsible for keeping their interests updated. Any changes should be notified as soon as practicable.
- 6) Register of interests
- a. Information about interests will be held and used by the IPCC in order to implement this policy. Interests will be recorded on a Register of Interests. Interests may be disclosed to individuals authorised by the [Management of Interest panel] . Information about interests will be treated as confidential.
- 7) Management of interests
- a. Arrangements for Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Review Editors and members of Technical Support Units will be managed by the Bureau of the Working Group to which they are attached. It is the responsibility of each Bureau [to maintain the Register of Interests for these individuals and] to facilitate a process by which conflicts of interest are identified and mitigating measures are implemented.
  - b. Arrangements for the Chair, Vice-Chairs, Working Group Co-Chairs, Working Group Vice-Chairs and the Secretariat,<sup>2</sup> will be managed by a [Management of Interest panel] constituted specifically for that purpose. This [panel] will be comprised of:
    - i. Option 1: Representatives of the parent organizations
    - ii. Option 2: Representatives from the IPCC plenary
    - iii. Option 3: External representatives from, for example, other UN organizations, the private sector or credible scientific organizations
    - iv. Option 4: a mix of representatives from options 1) – 3)
  - c. It is the responsibility of this [panel] [to maintain the Register of Interests for these individuals and] to facilitate a process by which conflicts of interest are identified and mitigating measures are implemented.
  - d. The IPCC Secretariat will have responsibility for assisting the Working Group Bureaux and the [Management of Interests panel] and providing administrative support for, inter alia, maintaining the Register of Interests.
- 8) [Failure to make a disclosure or a failure to undertake an appropriate mitigating measure may result in an individual being excluded from certain activities or processes or, in extreme circumstances, being asked to step down.][If a conflict of interest is identified and an individual fails to take appropriate mitigating measures they may be excluded from certain activities or processes or, in extreme circumstances, asked to step down.]<sup>3</sup>
- 9) This Management of Interest Policy will be reviewed after each assessment cycle.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Secretariat is already subject to [WMO conflict of interest policies].

<sup>3</sup> Depends If the policy is obligatory or voluntary

## IPCC Disclosure of Relevant Interests Form

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS FORM:** For the purposes of this form, and in the context of the IPCC Management of Interests Policy, a conflict of interest is defined as: *any current financial or other interest which could: i) significantly impair, or could be seen to impair, the individual's objectivity in carrying out his or her duties and responsibilities for the IPCC, or ii) create an unfair advantage for any person or organization. Conflicts of interest may be real, perceived, or potential. Financial conflicts may be direct or indirect.* This term and others of relevance to this form are explained in more detail in the Explanatory Note for IPCC Management of Interests Policy.

The information called for relates only to making known any current interests which might conflict with the capacity of IPCC to fulfil its role or undermine its credibility. *The IPCC is not asking individuals for comprehensive lists of activities under each heading below, only those that are relevant to his or her role within the IPCC.* The disclosure of an interest on this form does not automatically mean that a conflict is present or that an individual will be unable to properly perform their designated role with the IPCC.

For further clarification, please refer to the IPCC Explanatory Note for Management of Interests.

**I, \_\_\_\_\_ in my role as \_\_\_\_\_ for the IPCC, confirm that I have read and understand the IPCC's Management of Interests policy.**

**In submitting this form, I submit my relevant interests, understanding that, in doing so, I will need to abide by the policy and its related processes.**

**I disclose all of my current and relevant interests, to the best of my knowledge, as follows:**

- I. RELEVANT ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATIONS (please list remunerated and voluntary current and recent affiliations, which may include, eg. employment, relationships with for-profit organizations, relationships with not-for-profit organizations)
- II. RELEVANT PUBLIC AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE (which may include eg. current elected positions, advisory bodies and boards, government representation including membership of international delegations, posts in professional organizations, or journal editorships).
- III. RELEVANT FINANCIAL INTERESTS (which may include eg. Direct and/or indirect sources of financial support for research or consultancy from private and public organizations, current ownership of intellectual property, investments in property, stocks, shares or other financial interests).
- IV. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (any other current relevant interest not disclosed elsewhere)

I understand that information about my interests as outlined above will be held and used by the IPCC in order to implement the *Management of Interests* policy. I further understand that my

interests will be recorded on a Register of Interests, and that my interests may be disclosed to individuals authorised by the [Management of Interest panel] to have such access, should such access be considered necessary for proper implementation of the policy. I understand that information about interests will be treated as confidential, unless required to be disclosed by law, will not be released more widely except with my authorization.

I certify that the above information has been completed truthfully and honestly to the best of my knowledge

Signed:

Print Name:

Contact Email/phone:

Date:

DRAFT

**DRAFT**

**RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE IPCC TASK GROUP ON  
COMMUNICATIONS**

Draft for Review by Governments and International Organisations

Submitted by the Co-Chairs  
Dr. Antonina Ivanova, Mexico  
Dr. Darren Goetze, Canada

Rapporteur  
Mr. Christoffer Grønstad, Norway

9 February 2011

**DRAFT**

### **Mandate of the Task Group on Communications**

The Task Group on the IPCC Communications Strategy will, taking into account the core scientific review and assessment role of the IPCC and its scientific and intergovernmental nature, guide the development of a comprehensive and concise communications strategy that:

1. Defines the scope of IPCC communications, including about (a) the results and products of assessments, (b) errors, corrections and other issues arising from the work of IPCC, and (c) improving understanding of the processes and governance of IPCC;
2. Provides guidance regarding whether balanced communications materials derived from IPCC products that have been approved or accepted by the Panel should be developed, and under what circumstances;
3. Articulates a set of general objectives for IPCC communications, including its website, emphasizing transparency, rapid and thoughtful responses, political neutrality, and relevance to stakeholders;
4. Identifies targeted audiences and stakeholders, recognizing their diversity of languages;
5. Includes guidelines on who can speak on behalf of IPCC and how and when authorized spokespersons should represent the organization appropriately, as well as how communication materials will be authorized; and
6. Addresses any potential conflicts of interest regarding communications.

The Task Group will seek the advice of the IPCC Chair, the IPCC Vice-Chairs, Working Group and TFI Co-Chairs and the Secretary. The Task Group membership is open to representatives of governments that are members of the IPCC.

The Task Group consists of Belgium, Canada, France, Gambia, Germany, Iran, Japan, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, UK, USA, and Zambia. The Task Group will elect its Co-Chairs to coordinate its work.

The work of the Task Group will be supported by the Communications team within the Secretariat.

The Task Group will produce a first draft of the Strategy for consideration at the first Bureau meeting in 2011, with a view to the Panel adopting the Strategy at its 33rd Session.

*- from the Record of Decisions, IPCC-32*

## DRAFT

### Preamble

This document was produced to address the IAC recommendation on communications:

*The IPCC should complete and implement a communications strategy that emphasizes transparency, rapid and thoughtful responses, and relevance to stakeholders, and which includes guidelines about who can speak on behalf of IPCC and how to represent the organization appropriately.*

Communication is a key issue in IPCC activities and has been subject to discussions during several IPCC plenary meetings.

In 2005, a consulting firm developed a Framework Communications Strategy for Release and Dissemination of the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4)<sup>1</sup>. In 2008, the panel established a working group on ‘the future of IPCC’, in anticipation of the 5<sup>th</sup> Assessment Report (AR5). The working group presented its findings<sup>2</sup>, including recommendations on communications, during the 28th session of the Panel.

The IPCC addressed some of the recommendations made in these reports, such as recruiting a communications officer, and discussed how to strengthen internal communication and enhance transparent dissemination of IPCC products.

At the time of drafting this document, the IPCC is in the process of recruiting a senior communications manager. This document provides guidance to the senior communications manager, who is expected to develop and deliver a holistic communications strategy that reflects the expectations of the Panel in respect of outreach and media communications.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/session24/inf3.pdf>: This report was intended to be a framework proposal for an AR4 communications strategy but not the final communications strategy for the IPCC. With this report, the Secretariat invited the Panel to consider the observations and recommendations contained in the report and provide guidance to the IPCC Secretariat on next steps. Then, at the next Panel Session (25th Session) in 2006 the Secretariat submitted a strategy (Document entitled: "IPCC Communications Strategy and Outreach ") <http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session25/doc6.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> At the 29th Session (August – Sept 2008) the Task Group that was set up at P-28 presented its findings: <http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session29/inf5.pdf>



## DRAFT

### 1. Principles

Communications are an important aspect of the work of the IPCC, essential to its mission of providing rigorous and balanced scientific information on climate change and its impacts to decision makers. The following set of principles should guide the IPCC's approach:

- **Objective and transparent.** The Panel's communications approach and activities should, at all times, be consistent with the IPCC's overarching principles of objectivity, openness and transparency.
- **Policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive.** It is an essential quality of the IPCC's work that it is policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive. The presentation of its findings and conclusions should remain policy-neutral and maintain scientific balance. The IPCC's communications approach and activities should be consistent with these qualities.
- **Drawn from IPCC's Reports.** While the IPCC's work and process of preparing reports aim to reflect a range of views and expertise, its communications should reflect the language and supporting material that has been subject to the IPCC's review process and has been accepted, adopted and approved by the members of the Panel.
- **Recognizing IPCC as a unique organization.** IPCC's unique process of international assessment and review is central to the authority and quality of IPCC's reports. The IPCC should always seek to be clear in its communications about what the organization is and what it does – providing up to date assessments of the latest authoritative science – to give a context to guide the interpretation of IPCC's reports.
- **Timely and audience-appropriate.** In order to be effective, the IPCC's communications approach and activities should be aimed at ensuring that timely and appropriate information enters the public domain – both proactively to communicate reports, and reactively in response to questions or criticism.

### 2. Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC and report-specific)

The scope of IPCC's expertise is diverse and multi-disciplinary, spanning physical science, impacts, adaptation, and mitigation. The overall picture of IPCC's communication should fully represent this range of knowledge.

The IPCC's primary communication outputs are its Assessment Reports, Special Reports and Technical Reports, which authors should make as comprehensible as possible without sacrificing scientific accuracy.

The scope of wider communications activities is to support good understanding of these reports, and the processes that generated them, among IPCC's primary audience of policy-makers. Specifically, the communications activities of the IPCC should include:

- Raising awareness of new reports among IPCC's primary audiences.

## **DRAFT**

- Ensuring that the content of IPCC's reports is readily available to interested parties – including those who will use these reports as a basis for their own communications with wider audiences.
- Clearly communicating how IPCC functions, how IPCC is governed, and how IPCC reports are produced. Working Groups are encouraged to continue their ongoing efforts to explore engagement with wider audiences as they develop their reports. These efforts are an important way of communicating the work of the IPCC and increasing transparency.
- Responding to media queries – including at short notice – about IPCC's activities and processes, and the content of published IPCC reports.

### **Global engagement**

To ensure that information produced by the IPCC is widely distributed, the senior communications manager should engage government focal points and consider capacity-building relating to the role of focal points in communications and outreach activities.

Focal points should be sent all relevant information and supportive materials around the release of reports. Equally, when the IPCC Secretariat issues a statement, press release or other materials intended for a wide audience, this should be shared with the focal points so that they are informed of the IPCC's central positions.

By engaging the focal points, important two-way relationships will be built, which deepen reciprocal understanding and ultimately help the IPCC achieve its wider communication objectives.

### **Web presence**

The IPCC's website should effectively communicate the organization's nature and mandate. For the purposes of outreach efforts, it is important that a strong web presence be maintained. Special attention should be dedicated to up-to-date information and reports, a well designed search function, content in the six official UN languages, user-friendly navigation and accessibility features. Up-to-date leaflets and FAQs should be prominent.

The senior communications manager should have the authority to use appropriate technologies to implement the agreed communications strategy.

## **3. Target audiences**

The major target audiences of the communications efforts of the IPCC are governments and policy-makers. Engaging with the Media is an important way in which the IPCC can communicate its findings, processes and procedures.

Broader audiences, such as the education sector, NGOs, the business sector and the wider public, also have an interest in the work and assessments of the IPCC. While these are not primary audiences of the IPCC's communications efforts, the IPCC should ensure that information is available and accessible for these audiences. This may include engaging

## **DRAFT**

with organizations that take elements of IPCC assessments and communicate them in more audience-specific formats.

### **4. Languages of communications, and translation**

The working language of the IPCC is English but, consistent with its status as a UN institution, its full reports must be made available in the six UN languages: Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish. IPCC communication practices must follow this model in general, and high-quality multilingual accessibility of IPCC communications products should be guaranteed.

A number of countries have undertaken translation of IPCC reports into languages, which are not official UN languages. The IPCC will continue to welcome these initiatives while noting that the translations have been prepared under the responsibility of the respective country or institutions.

### **5. Guidelines**

#### **How authorized spokesperson should represent the IPCC**

Authorized spokespersons must act in accordance with the guiding principles that have been set out for IPCC communications, most notably maintaining policy neutrality, scientific balance, and refraining from advocating or communicating personal views on climate policy while speaking in their official capacity.

#### **Selecting authorized spokespersons for the organization as a whole, and for individual reports**

The objective of these guidelines is to identify a group of authorized spokespersons allowing the IPCC to speak credibly to its products and processes. The primary spokespersons have a mandate from and accountability to the Panel by virtue of the election process.

- The Chair, Vice-Chairs, or their designate, are authorized to speak for the organization as a whole. This applies to topics including IPCC operations, proceedings of IPCC Bureau Meetings, principles governing IPCC work, IPCC rules of procedures, etc.
- Co-Chairs are the lead spokespersons for the activities and content of their Working Group or TFI. The Co-Chairs may also engage spokespersons from among the authors and contributors to the reports with the best knowledge of the subject matter and the best media/presentation skills. Other factors could include meeting language requirements and timing/availability.
- Effective communications can only be assured if there is centralized coordination of the message. Therefore, the senior communications manager should always be involved.

#### **Rapid response**

The IPCC sometimes needs to respond rapidly. This is often to reply to inquiries from the

## **DRAFT**

Media. These responses will often require inputs of both scientific and communications expertise.

To communicate in these exceptional circumstances, the senior communications manager needs to be able to rely on members of the IPCC leadership. Depending on the nature of the inquiry, the judgment of the senior communications manager will be used to determine whether the Chair, Vice-Chairs, the Secretary, the Deputy Secretary, relevant Working Group Co-Chairs, TFI Co-Chairs or a combination of this group should be approached for approval. This group has a responsibility to respond to urgent inquiries in a timely manner. The senior communications manager requires sign-off/approval from at least two of these individuals before issuing a response. Before and after the response, the senior communications manager should maintain open channels of communication with the full Executive Committee and provide updates as appropriate.

The arrangement must ensure that real-time demands of the media are taken into consideration while remaining robust enough to guarantee accuracy and consistency with IPCC reports.

### **Errors**

The IPCC is in the process of developing a formal procedure for acknowledging errors of fact in reports. In the case of addressing an error of fact, authorized spokespersons should work closely with the senior communications manager on a timely and cogent response. If an error is identified, it should be addressed in a forthright manner, corrected, and formally acknowledged. However, a full response is likely to take more time than allowed by the media cycle. Nevertheless, it is important to quickly communicate to the Media, as well as national focal points, that the issue is being examined.

### **Planned communications materials**

Planned communications materials (i.e., those associated with a planned report release) will be approved by the Co-Chairs of the applicable Working Group and/or Task Force and the Secretariat.

Spokespeople will play a key role in the communication of IPCC reports. For the release of each report, the senior communications manager will engage with the Working Groups and/or the TFI, as appropriate, to identify content-specific spokespeople to work on outreach.

Press-releases prepared for IPCC communications should be disseminated to all relevant people, including the IPCC Bureau, Task Force Bureau, the Secretariat, the TSUs and national focal points.

### **Media and presentation training**

The senior communications manager in conjunction with the Working Groups and/or the Task Force, as appropriate, should strongly consider media and presentation training to enhance the ability and effectiveness of spokespersons in communicating the messages of

## **DRAFT**

the IPCC to the Media and presenting the findings of the IPCC as part of general outreach activities.

### **6. Addressing potential conflicts of interest**

The unique value of the IPCC is that its reports are policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive. When speaking on behalf of the IPCC, individuals should take care to stay within this mandate – and not to express views beyond the scope of the IPCC reports, or to advocate specific policies.

All those associated with the IPCC should be clear to distinguish when they are speaking in an official IPCC capacity, and when they are speaking personally or on behalf of other organizations. Those holding the most senior positions within the IPCC are most readily associated with it. It is expected that those working at the highest levels take the most care in avoiding confusion or misinterpretation in their public statements. The senior leadership should be mindful that publicly advocating or expressing personal opinions about climate policies may jeopardize the reputation of the IPCC, even if unintended. It is important that the IPCC leadership not be perceived as taking positions or making statements that would have the appearance of reflecting bias in the work of the IPCC.

While recognizing that the scientific content of reports remains private until they are released, IPCC participants are encouraged to respond to interest in emerging reports, as an opportunity to communicate how the IPCC works. The IPCC encourages the science community, including those involved in producing its reports, to engage with wide audiences. When doing so, those involved with the IPCC should be mindful to make clear the distinction between their roles inside and outside the IPCC.

### **7. Implementing the new strategy**

Executing external communications effectively will require coordination of an extensive network within the IPCC. Successful internal coordination is central to the success of external communication, and should be considered a priority by IPCC's leaders.

There are significant resource implications in communicating IPCC's work effectively, and the Panel will require regular updates on the financial implications of meeting the strategy.

IPCC's communication load varies greatly – depending both on the cycle of its Reports, and the level of external interest in the IPCC. The IPCC senior communications manager will need to have the flexibility to respond to this changing cycle of activity, including by engaging additional temporary staff, including consultants, when necessary. All such temporary staff representing the IPCC – or representing individuals in their IPCC capacities – must have a clearly defined, and centrally-coordinated mandate and be under the authority of the senior communications manager.

### **8. Evaluation of IPCC Communications**

## **DRAFT**

The objectives set out in this document should be used as a guide to evaluating the IPCC's communications.

The senior communications manager should provide appropriate evaluation about IPCC communications, including the type and extent of outreach and media coverage, to plenary meetings. Evaluation reports should also be made to the Executive Committee at regular intervals. These reports should be informed by feedback from the focal points where possible.

Specific metrics for evaluation might be used so that the Panel is clear about the overall effectiveness and impact of communication efforts.

## **Section 2 -**

Comments Organized by Countries and IPCC Office Holders  
as decided by P-32

# **Austria**

## **General Comments on Overall Procedure**

### **[General Comments]**

Austria thanks the TGs for their great effort to produce in such short time on quite sensitive topics such clear and helpful texts. This is definitely a strong signal to develop the IPCC further which is very much appreciated.

## **Governance: Executive Committee**

### **[3b]**

Austria suggests identifying possible issues that could require prompt attention. Such examples could facilitate decisions by the Executive Committee to this end.

### **[4]**

Austria supports that the Executive Committee currently has a size of 10 persons with voting rights. The vice chairs of the IPCC should not be members of the Executive Committee, even not ex-officio members in order to facilitate communication and speedy decision making. The identified 10 persons should allow for a fair and balanced representation of the various groups/regions.

### **[6c]**

Austria supports that the Executive Committee currently has a size of 10 persons with voting rights. The vice chairs of the IPCC should not be members of the Executive Committee, even not ex-officio members in order to facilitate communication and speedy decision making. The identified 10 persons should allow for a fair and balanced representation of the various groups/regions.

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[General Comments]**

Austria fully supports the rationals 1, 2 and 3.

### **[Rational 4]**

With regard to rational 4 Austria prefers option b) because this would allow not renewing the contract of the secretary every 2 years, which could be a vital option in case of substantial communication problems between the secretary and the chair. In addition Austria suggests that the IPCC head of Secretariat should not only be appointed by WMO and UNEP but also by the IPCC chair. This construct allows that the IPCC head of Secretariat might change with the IPCC chair if a new IPCC chair has been elected.

### **[Proposal 4a]**



Austria suggests that the term of office of the IPCC chair should be limited to 5 years as the maximum. Austria also sees some merits in more focused thematic reports instead of primarily preparing overall assessments. The "Chair Elect" process is fully supported in order to give smooth transfer from one chair to the next.

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

In general those recommendations are welcome by Austria. However, given the importance of the IPCC and its high profile in the media some suggestions should be further strengthened.

### **[Guidelines]**

The last sentence of para 1 of clause 5 should read: .., and refraining from advocating or communicating personal views on climate policy.

Explanation: Past experiences show that media and the public are not willing/or able to differentiate what a person says in different functions. This has a high risk that the reputation of the IPCC will be damaged also in the future.

### **[Addressing potential conflicts of interest]**

This clause 6 should read as follows:

Addressing potential conflicts of interest

One central pillar of the IPCC is that its reports are policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive. When speaking on behalf of the IPCC, individuals shall take care to stay within this mandate and not express views beyond the scope of the IPCC reports, or advocate specific policies.

Individuals speaking on behalf of the IPCC must avoid coming into conflict with the above guideline when communicating to media in a different function, as the public/the media usually do not differentiate among the various functions a person might have.

It is expected that persons working at the highest levels take the utmost care in avoiding confusion or misinterpretation in their public statements. The senior leadership should be mindful that publicly advocating or expressing personal opinions about climate policies may jeopardize the reputation of the IPCC, even if unintended. It is important that the IPCC leadership is not perceived as taking positions or making statements that would have the appearance of reflecting bias in the work of the IPCC.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[Policy Statement]**

Para 8)

Consistent with a mandatory compliance with the conflict of interest policy, para 8 should include the requirement that any candidate for the executive committee shall deposit his/her filled in and signed IPCC Disclosure of Relevant Interests Form somewhere before elections and that the election becomes only operational in case that after the election the existence of a valid form has been confirmed by a [Management of Interest panel].

If a member of the Executive Committee fails to adhere to the conflict of interest policy the election is not valid according to the rules of procedure.

In order to avoid any conflicts of interests for the IPCC chair Austria suggests that in the future (after the termination of the current IPCC bureau) the IPCC chair should be a well paid full-time job located in Geneva, corresponding to the qualification appropriate for an IPCC chair. Such amendment would probably even better correspond to the intentions of the IAC related to the suggestion to introduce an Executive Director.

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

Annex 2, para 4

There is some contradiction with the suggestion under para 11.3 / Repository. It is suggested by Austria to establish such repository at the IPCC secretariat in Geneva. This would add a corresponding additional responsibility of the IPCC Secretariat.

### **[7. Summary for Policymakers]**

Austria supports to clarify the current practice. Such clarification should clearly state that all the amendments agreed by the Panel need also be fully supported by the authors (Lead Authors). Any disagreement by those shall be documented in the SPM.

### **[10. IPCC Guidance material]**

Austria supports the additional suggestions included in para 11.7 related to guidance documents.

### **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

Austria supports all additional suggestions, except those related to cross-cutting issues as that topic should be individually handled in every deliverable of the IPCC, as appropriate.

# Belgium

## General Comments on Overall Procedure

### [General Comments]

We welcome the opportunity to comment upon the reports of the 4 TGs. The outcome of the TG meetings is an important step in responding to the IAC report. We believe now is the occasion for the IPCC to adapt to the ever increasing demand upon the IPCC and high expectations as well as to evolving requirements regarding quality control in management. However it will not be possible to decide upon everything at once the next plenary but adapting procedures, processes, management should be a continuous effort. Some attention will have to be devoted to crosscutting issues in the different TG which require a coherent approach. Those will have to be identified and it would be nice to have some indications on a way of handling these. We are ready to work and cooperate more on this, in a good spirit.

## Governance: Executive Committee

### [3f]

should be coherent with 2. of the recommendations of the TG on procedures

### [4]

We would like to see the IPCC Vice Chairs as members of the E.C. According to the current rules, the IPCC Vice Chairs should assist the chair in performing all his tasks (that are described in the rules of procedures. Since the IPCC chair cannot always be 'full time chair', the support and help by Vice Chairs is very important. In the past some Vice Chairs played an active and constructive role in particular focusing e.g. on cross cutting issues, which are not a priority for Co- chairs since their main responsibility is the work in their working group and this is a very heavy workload. Vice-chairs have been elected by the Plenary. We do not see any reason why they would not be full members of the EC and with the same voting rights as other elected members. Until now, a more specific description (beside 'to assist' the chair) has been lacking, and would be very helpful, as also a specific description of the roles of the other Bureau members.

A definition of the tasks of the Vice Chairs could include: (1) To assist the Chair in performing his duties: in (a) advising him, (b) representing him, (c) performing specific tasks that the Chair delegated to the them, e.g. in the past such as Co chairing of the Task group on the Future of IPCC which produced a dozen draft decisions building on the government submissions at the start of AR5; Producing a report on how to increase the participation of Developing country/EIT scientists in the IPCC. This report provided the background in which the AR5 author selection was made. Help the secretariat survey the views on these before the Venice scoping meeting - Supporting and promoting the reflection on cross-cutting issues in the AR5. Among those cross-cutting issues, the Belgian Vice-Chair invested significant energy to improve the treatment of regional information in AR5. This contributed to split the AR5 WGII contribution in two parts, with the second (regional) part benefiting from WGI and WGIII contributions. (5) to help to build bridges across the Working groups. Their knowledge of the IPCC "across the board" can often help the Chair to find consensus or compromises when there are diverging views, or to advise Co-chairs in a friendly and discrete manner on issues related to the overall coherence of

the IPCC, or on difficulties they meet in their WG. VCs may help to "put oil between the cogs" when needed, and it may be particularly useful in times of crisis. - (6) to contribute to the representation of IPCC in front of public audiences, and communication about IPCC in a cross-cutting manner, complementing the Chair by providing sometimes a different, even if coherent, voice to communicate about the IPCC as a whole. (7) to sit in the Science board of the IPCC Scholarship programme, to contribute to the steering of the programme and help selecting the applications that will benefit from a grant.

## **[5]**

These members are usually appointed because of the position they hold and not because they have expressed particular interest in the IPCC. It seems however useful to better define what additional expertise would be needed for the day to day management of the IPCC and to set a framework and limits for this possible external intervention.

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[General Comments]**

The IAC Panel specified that the ED should be able to act on behalf of the Chair if needed. Some members of the TG saw in the activities of the head of the secretariat the potential for greater emphasis on communication and maintaining external relations as well as overall management. These responsibilities are way beyond the normal management of the Secretariat. If the head of secretariat is to keep his/her current role as now proposed by the TG, we suggest that these other tasks identified by the IAC be attributed to elected senior scientists such as the Vice-Chairs in particular for the following tasks: (1) fostering cooperation and information exchange between Working Groups (2) assisting the Chair regarding communication and external relations, and representing the Chair when he is not available

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[Proposal 1]**

On the decision to limit the mandate of the Chair to one with 'the provision of possible extension for individual cases if the Panel so decides' it should be clear that an extension would be an exception rather than the norm and thus allowed only in very specific situations that need to be defined

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

We appreciate the work done by the TG, which will contribute to provide clarifications and useful guidelines regarding communication.

### **[Principles]**

Bullet 1 Objective and transparent

Comment: Transparency is indeed very important, but most meetings of the IPCC are closed to the media. This document does not address that point. We think that the IPCC needs to reflect on how to increase the transparency of its work, being inspired by the practices of other international bodies, such as the UNFCCC.

Bullet 2 Recognizing IPCC as a unique organization we suggest to replace assessment and review is central by assessment by scientists and review by the scientific community, governments and stakeholders, is central . Explanation: To make clear that the assessment itself is a process led by scientists, with a separate reviewing role for stakeholders and governments.

## **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

(1) We feel that the manner by which content is divided between Sections 2 and 3 is unclear. In addition, Section 2 suggests a target audience that is more limited than in section 3. We think that the structure could be made clearer, perhaps by merging Sections 2 and 3 under the title Scope and audience of the IPCC communications, and including the current section 3 as a subtitle above the bold subtitle Global engagement.

(2) Technical Reports: Please correct to Technical Papers

(3) The wording engagement with wider audiences as they develop their reports requires clarification: what is the wider audience in connection with reports development?

## **[Languages of communications, and translation]**

(1) Up to now, only the SPM and Technical summaries are translated. Translating the full reports would probably have major budget implications. Rather than translating full reports, we suggest that some effort could be spent on helping those countries that translate reports in non-UN languages to adapt the key graphics (diagrams etc.) from the summaries to their languages (such help could perhaps be provided in a generic manner to all countries). Accessibility of IPCC communications products should be guaranteed.

(2) As an example everybody can check: the French version of the glossary of the AR4 SYR is not usable, because the order of the paragraphs follows the alphabetical order of the English original. Therefore we suggest to add to the text: The quality control of all translations needs to be substantially improved

## **[Guidelines]**

(1) About selecting authorized spokespersons etc. We suggest to replace : The Chair, Vice-Chairs, or their designate by The Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs, or their designate. Rationale: this is to avoid confusion with the WORKING GROUP Vice-chairs and to add to Co-Chairs are the lead spokespersons for the activities and content of their Working Group or TFI: Working Group Vice-Chairs may assist the Co-chairs this task.

(2) Rapid response. The text stated : The senior communications manager requires sign-off/approval from at least two of these individuals. We suggest to replace this by : Apart from very simple cases for which the answer is copied from existing text, the answer needs to be approved by at least one elected member of the Executive Committee.

(3) Errors. The last word in the para : examined seems too weak. In some cases, this could cause problems as the journalists may conclude that the IPCC has no immediate answer at all. A preliminary response on the content may be desirable as soon as feasible.

(4) Planned communications materials. Regarding the spokespeople we suggest to add to the text: The general or common spokes people for the IPCC (IPCC Chair and

Vice-chairs, in particular) should be kept well informed about the planned communications materials, so that all spokes people are on the same wavelength. An additional comment: WG Vice-Chairs might also be relevant as spokespeople, especially for communicating with media from their country.

### **[Addressing potential conflicts of interest]**

(1) We suggest to add: When speaking on behalf of the IPCC, any reasonable effort has to be made to avoid that this person be presented as the sole recipient of the collective Nobel Peace Prize attributed jointly in 2007 to Al Gore and to the IPCC. Justification: Some members of the IPCC seem to have no problem having such announcements made when they speak on behalf of IPCC. This seems to us inappropriate as it was the collective work of thousands of scientists over the years which has justified the fraction of the Nobel Peace prize attributed to IPCC.

### **[Implementing the new strategy]**

(1) It is not clear to us to whom the senior communications manager will reports: the head of the Secretariat, or Executive Committee? It cannot act under any responsibility, as said in the specific case of rapid response above. This needs to be clarified also here

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

The general effort behind this policy must be welcomed and encouraged. Indeed, it is sound to seek for a better transparency and a clear management of conflicts of interests in the functioning of the IPCC, without pretending to avoid them. That being said, this policy must be real and effective and must not serve as screen or an alibi to deny legitimate transparency through a too restrictive application or implementation of its principles. It must not be ignored that the fact that the review of the relevance of the interest as well as its declaration, rests with the individual is as such a source of conflict of interest. In other systems, individuals are expected to provide all information requested by their employing organisation which remains the sole responsible for identifying conflicts of interest.

There are two issues we would like TG to consider (1) Confidentiality of the interests: Should (and can) the information related to "interests" of IPCC Bureau members and CLA / LAs be "confidential"? We suggest that at least the direct (personal) interests are made public. We think that this would be very useful for enhancing public perception of the independency of the key individuals that contribute to the work of the IPCC. Even if not entirely comparable with the IPCC, some organisations make such declarations available to the public. (2) Membership of the Management of interest Panel: Who should be member of the "Management of Interests Panel", and should this panel be in charge of the Conflict-of- Interests - process.

### **[Policy Statement]**

#### 1. Section (2) - Definitions

Paragraph "a": "Conflict of Interests" - last sentence: As other kinds of conflict can be direct or indirect (for instance family involvement), it would be better to remove the word "Financial". The last sentence would then read: "Conflicts may be related to direct or indirect interests ".

It might also be useful to add a definition of what direct and indirect means e.g.

A direct interest is an interest which affects the IPCC member in his/her own patrimony (income, access to higher position, recognition, etc.) An indirect interest is an interest which may affect the IPCC member by affecting one of his/her family members or another person with whom he/she has economic dependence (a customer, etc.), or which may have an impact the relationship that he/she has with this family member or other person and the possible influence that can be exercised on the IPCC member due to this relationship.

Paragraph "c" on Relevance (after correction of the numbering): last sentence: It is not clear what is meant by "general share holdings or property ownership". The relevance of the interest is not only determined by reference to the nature of the interest but also by the context, the circumstances and the surrounding facts. Mentioning these two kinds of interest as non-relevant per se would exclude them from the relevance review without even considering potential conflict due to the circumstances. We would therefore suggest amending the sentence the following way: "An interest that does not have a bearing on IPCC's role or credibility is not relevant and need not be declared".

## 2. Section (3) - Principles

Paragraph "b": Although we understand that this principle (the involvement of individuals from developing countries) constitutes a very important basis of the work of the IPCC, such a statement seems a little bit odd in the context of the interest policy. It gives the impression that this policy should not be applied with the same degree of adherence and compliance to individuals from developing countries. This would be a very unfortunate understanding of the text. Therefore, we suggest either to remove paragraph "b" or to rephrase it in a manner that it doesn't appear in contradiction with the other principles and the objectives of the policy. There is a need to clarify what "encouraging" means in this context, otherwise this "principle" could be confusing

Paragraph "h": As the credibility of each and every individual working for the IPCC is a condition for the credibility of IPCC as a whole, it seems preferable to avoid statement such as "compliance with the policy is voluntary". We suggest either to opt for the first proposal (obligatory nature), or simply to remove the entire paragraph since the effect of the non-compliance is already dealt with in Section (8). A sentence that is compatible with section 8 may also be used in these general principles, such as e.g. non-compliance could result in individuals not being able to participate in the full range of assessment activities (deleting the first part of the second proposition)

## 3. Section (6) - Register of Interests

It is not clear who may request access to the Register of Interests and to whom this information may be disclosed, as Section (6) uses the same term "individuals" for both parties (the one that is due to provide the information and the one that requests the information). We suggest using the term "third parties" ("Interests may be disclosed to any third party authorized by the [Management of Interests Panel]"). As stated in our general comments we would prefer that at least the declarations of direct interests of participating individuals are made available to the public, for reasons of public perception and transparency of the process.

## 4. Section (7) - Management of Interests

paragraph "a": Since it is provided for in Section (6) that disclosure to third parties of information related to interests is under the responsibility of the Management of Interests Panel (MIP) and since no mention of disclosure is made in Section (7), paragraph "a", it may be deducted that MIP is responsible for the disclosure of information related to interests declared by individuals

mentioned under paragraph "a" (Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Review Authors, members of Technical Support Units). If it is indeed the case, this should be made explicit. A suggested phrasing could be to add at the end of Section (7), paragraph "a" the following sentence: "In accordance with Section (6), any disclosure of interests will be requested to and authorized by the Management of Interests Panel". Another option could be to establish a double degree mechanism applicable to request for disclosure concerning individuals mentioned in paragraph "a". At the first degree, the request would be addressed to the Bureau of the Working Group. Appeal of its decision could be submitted to the MIP. In addition, we think that it would be more efficient to have only one centralised register for all declarations of interests (for practical and continuity reasons, e.g. managed by the secretariat under the supervision of the MIP).

Paragraph "b": In order to establish a proper mechanism of management and disclosure of interests, it is essential that the MIP itself would be exempt from any conflict of interests, while protecting the general interest of IPCC. Therefore, we would like to suggest as a fifth option in addition to those presented, a mix of Option 1 en Option 2. Also, all potential interests from members of the MIP should also be declared and registered.

5. Section (8) - We prefer the first proposal. Since the notion of Conflict of Interests is defined as including potential or perceived conflicts, it doesn't appear coherent to require its realisation for sanctions. Harm to IPCC is done from the very moment the conflict of interests (as defined) is revealed. Moreover, the credibility of IPCC's work through this Interests Management Policy is directly connected to its mandatory nature. Should the second proposal be taken into consideration, some editing might be useful for grammatical purposes.

## **[Disclosure Form]**

Comments on the Form:

The Form should be modified accordingly our remarks on 2) a. Replace 'Financial conflicts may be direct or indirect' by 'Conflicts may be related to direct or indirect interests' and add a definition of what direct and indirect is e.g.:

A direct interest is an interest which affects the IPCC member in his/her own patrimony (income, access to higher position, recognition, etc.) An indirect interest is an interest which may affect the IPCC member by affecting one of his/her family members or another person with whom he/she has economic dependence (a customer, etc.), or which may have an impact the relationship that he/she has with this family member or other person and the possible influence that can be exercised on the IPCC member due to this relationship.

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[1. General Comments]**

The TG report is well structured and in a useful manner. However, many recommendations still lack implementation or implementation details. Concrete text proposals for amending the 'procedures' are mostly lacking. To our understanding an additional step is needed to translate the TG recommendations into real procedures, that should then also be checked by an IPCC legal advisor.

### **[2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings]**



(1) It should be made clear who could decide in case of a conflict: the Executive Committee? (coherence needed with TG governance)? The maximum number of participants has to be agreed on by the Bureau and/or WG Bureaus

(2) this topic should be consistent with f of the TG on G&M.

### **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

(1) Regarding 3.1: the TG recommendation is not a sufficient implementation of the Plenary decision regarding enhanced implementation. We would like to remember that improvement of the selection procedure was also requested in the framework of the recommendations regarding participation of developing countries presented in document IPCC-XXXI/Doc.11, in particular recommendation 2 (Ensure that procedures for the nomination and selection of authors and reviewers are conceived in a way that facilitates the identification and selection of suitable experts from DC/EITs...). What the required reporting concerns, it could be useful to identify the minimal elements for such a report and a common format.

(2) regarding 3.2 we proposed an amendment in last sentence: WG reports as appropriate, including experts (on that specific region) from countries outside the region.

### **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

In annex 2:

(1) We suggest clarifying by replacing: "Non-journal-based" by: "non-scientific-journal-based "

(2) Regarding 1: It is not enough to say that it needs to be done: some accounting is needed. We think that, for each such reference, authors should make a short note on (a) why the source is valuable and granted confidence, (b) why the source is needed and (c) if there is no summary or abstract in the document for any reason (and regardless of language), the note should include some information on the scope of the document. This should be part of the material made available by the TSUs or secretariat during the review process.

(3) still regarding 1: Why "commercially available"? There are also freely available documents. The problem may be more obvious with documents protected by a commercial license or copyright. We suggest the TG should propose to create a database of all publications that could be made available on request to all people that critically need these to support the work on the report, e.g. Review Editors.

(4) still regarding 1: language other than English : This is very restrictive: there could be useful documents that do not include a summary in EN. We would suggest establishing a mechanism by which an EN summary can be provided by the author; possibly with a signed declaration that he made all efforts to ensure that the translated summary actually reflects the content of the document.

(5) regarding 2. It seems logical that REs are involved, but they already have a lot of work. Either there should be more REs, or there should have some kind of help - e.g. by nominating young scientists as assistants in either the RE process or the checking of sources. The TG should address the means which will allow Review Editors to do a good job, particularly if their responsibilities are broadened. Otherwise it will become increasingly difficult to find volunteers.

(6) regarding 3: Please clarify which sources. All sources except those commercially available above? We find it annoying that this would mean that any source that cannot be distributed to anyone due to copyright restrictions could not be distributed at all. We believe that all sources should be made easily accessible (electronically) at least for some kind of "internal use".

## **[5. Handling the Full Range of Views]**

The TG recommendation to change "to aim for a range of views" by "to consider a range of views" seems a very superficial change and does not fully implement the IAC recommendation: ("explicitly document that a range of scientific viewpoints has been considered"). The changes suggested here by the TG, in addition to be minor, are about the selection of authors: something additional is required about how they work. While avoiding adding unnecessary burden on authors, it would be important to implement the IAC recommendation by requiring that for each controversial scientific issue the text would explicitly document the range of scientific viewpoints that have been considered.

## **[6. Report Review]**

We found no implementation options. Implementation is necessary, but may require further investigation/ or leave some flexibility, for the time being, to TSUs. A simple implementation may be to add the text proposed by the IAC to the procedures for RE work; we suggest rewriting and supplementing this text as follows:

"RE shall identify priority issues within the list of review comments, and send these together with a short summary of their evaluation of the needs for further action. The secretariat and/or TSU is required to support this process by providing software tools that facilitate the review process." The rationale for this proposition is to respond to the recommendation regarding "a more effective process for responding to reviewer comments". We believe that supporting tools are needed to facilitate the work of authors and RE, resulting in a more effective use of the reviewer comments.

## **[7. Summary for Policymakers]**

The existing Procedures should be amended to clarify the current practice. If the recommendation is not accepted (as suggested here), there should be at least an attempt to take into account the underlying motivation in the IAC report. This motivation (see p. 25 of the IAC report) is to reduce differences between the content of the SPM and that of the full report, in particular differences due to political influences on the content. This remark is not out of topic, considering the criticism that the IPCC received and could receive in the future. Having this in mind, the clarification of the procedures may involve:

- (1) making clear that authors have the final word on scientific issues and may thus reject changes that have no scientific basis (We believe such an addition to the procedures would be very important for the credibility of the IPCC);
- (2) creating "guardrails" regarding choices of content in SPMs : requesting that it is made clear that the balance of viewpoints and issues from the report is adequately reflected in the SPM, especially when changes are made during Plenary meetings.

# Canada

## General Comments on Overall Procedure

### **[General Comments]**

It is clear that further work will be needed beyond the 33rd Session to continue the consideration and implementation of the IAC's recommendations. Canada suggests that the Bureau, [Executive Committee] and Secretariat be directed to implement or enact the Task Groups' proposals where complete guidance has been provided by governments and to report to the Panel with final documentation. In areas where guidance remains incomplete, such as governance and management, governments will need to continue to collaborate in developing a path forward to fully respond to the IAC's recommendations. It will be important to maintain the momentum gained through the Task Group meetings and IPCC-33 in order to finalize a robust IPCC response to the IAC report.

## Governance: Executive Committee

### **[General Comments]**

Canada is pleased by the work undertaken thus far by the Task Group on this issue. Canada's main objective regarding the establishment of an Executive Committee is to ensure the creation of such a body fills genuine gaps in the IPCC's current management system. To do so effectively, the Task Group would benefit from further analysing the roles and responsibilities of the IPCC Bureau and the relationships and accountabilities between the Panel, the Bureau, the Executive Committee and the Secretariat. The Task Group should consider and reflect in its report whether current gaps are genuine or result from existing bodies not being managed or used effectively to fulfill tasks that they could address. The lack of Terms of Reference for the Bureau prevents clear understanding of this dynamic, and should therefore be developed to complement the work being done on the Executive Committee. The Task Group should be mandated by the Panel at its next Session to continue its work in that regard.

### **[3b]**

Consideration should also be given to how the Bureau could be managed more effectively to address non-urgent issues that arise between sessions of the IPCC (see General Comments).

### **[3d]**

(1) Consideration should also be given to the role of the Executive Committee vis-a-vis the Bureau on issues related to assessment reports (see General Comments). (2) As it is important that the Senior Communications Manager remain informed of issues that can attract public inquiry, such as errata, Canada suggests adding to the end of this section: "...in consultation with the IPCC's Senior Communications Manager."

### **[3f]**

Canada does not support the inclusion of section 3f. The Procedures for Preparing IPCC Reports identify author selection as the role of the IPCC Bureau. Decisions on the selection of authors (including for the SYR) and meeting participants requires a broader diversity of expertise and geographic

representation than is provided in the proposed Executive Committee. Author selection was managed effectively by the Bureau for the AR5. This role should be included in the Terms of Reference of the Bureau (see General Comments).

## **[5]**

(1) Given that Vice-Chairs are not directly accountable for the preparation of IPCC reports, Canada supports their inclusion in the Executive Committee as ex-officio members, noting that this would also help to maintain the streamlined nature of the Executive Committee. (2) Canada agrees with the Task Group proposal to include the Secretary as an ex-officio member on the Executive Committee, rather than a voting member. However, as this proposal differs from the IAC's recommendation, we would suggest that the Task Group provide a clear rationale to support this proposal. (3) Canada also encourages the Task Group to elaborate on its proposal to include the IAC's recommendation to include ex-officio members external to the IPCC on the Executive Committee (e.g., role envisioned, advantages and disadvantages with their participation).

## **[6a]**

Canada suggests adding to the end of this sentence: "...and act in accordance with the principles set forth in the 'Addressing Potential Conflicts of Interest' section of the Communications Task Group Strategy."

## **[6h]**

These materials should also be shared with the full Bureau.

## **[6i]**

These materials should also be shared with the full Bureau.

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[Rational 2]**

Canada is comfortable with the direction taken by the Task Group with respect to the issues related to the Head of the Secretariat, but would encourage further clarity on the recommendation not to follow the IAC proposal for an Executive Director position. The Task Group elaborated on some details associated with creating such a position and made comparisons across the UN system, but did not address all the issues that were raised in the IAC report (e.g., the IAC proposed that there was a need for a representative equivalent to the WG Co-Chairs who could act and speak on behalf of the Chair, etc.).

### **[Rational 4]**

It would be useful for the Task Group to be provided with the current job description for the position of the Secretary as supplementary information to share with and support the Panel's decision on this issue.

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[Rational 1]**

While Canada supports an ongoing dialogue on the mode of work for the IPCC and believes that this dialogue is important when discussing proposed changes in

IPCC governance, indicating a preference for one mode of work over another without a more fulsome analysis of this issue is not in keeping with the Task Group's mandate. Canada therefore suggests deleting the following section: "...such as the production of regular thematic reports instead of an overall assessment..."

## **[Proposal 2]**

Canada is supportive of the proposed process to maintain continuity through a "Chair Elect" system. We suggest that this mechanism be extended to all elected and voting members of the proposed Executive Committee.

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

(1) Page 4, paragraph 3 states that the scope of wider communications activities is to support good understanding of IPCC reports, and the processes that generated them. However, the bullets below this paragraph do not explicitly state that the IPCC should undertake to communicate the key conclusions of its reports. Canada suggests adding some text to the first bullet that would clarify this, as follows: "Raising awareness of new reports, AND THE MAJOR CONCLUSIONS THEREOF, among IPCC's primary audiences." (2) On page 5, second bullet, the following sentence should be clarified: "Working Groups are encouraged to continue their ongoing efforts to explore engagement with wider audiences as they develop their reports." Canada is not aware of what communications and outreach activities the WGs conduct during the development of IPCC reports; this should be elaborated.

### **[Target audiences]**

The text in paragraph two under Target Audiences should be made fully consistent with bullet 2 under Scope of IPCC Communications, in that the IPCC should not be, itself, producing derivative products aimed at specific audiences. To clarify, Canada suggests adding the following at the beginning of the last sentence: "WHILE THE IPCC ITSELF DOES NOT PRODUCE DERIVATIVE PRODUCTS AIMED AT SPECIFIC AUDIENCES, IT MAY ENGAGE with organizations that take elements of..." However, such products must not be considered joint productions or in any way products of the IPCC.

### **[Languages of communications, and translation]**

Canada agrees that IPCC communications products should be made available in all six UN languages. However, the first paragraph of this section that indicates that full IPCC assessment reports must be made available in all six UN languages is inconsistent with the Principles Governing IPCC Work and the current practice of the IPCC. IPCC Principle #13 indicates that reports should be made available in all UN languages to the extent possible. The current practice of the IPCC is to translate only the Summaries for Policymakers and Technical Summaries, not full reports.

### **[Guidelines]**

(1) Greater clarity is needed on the role of other members of the Bureau in IPCC communications. These individuals were elected by the Panel and will be asked to speak authoritatively on IPCC issues in their respective regions. (2) On page 6, under Selecting Authorized Spokesperson, first bullet, Canada suggests the following change: "The Chair, Vice-Chairs, or their designates, ARE THE LEAD

SPOKESPERSONS FOR..." This language is consistent with the following bullets, and is sufficiently flexible to reflect that there will be cross-over between the Chair/Vice-Chairs and the Co-Chairs on communications related to the IPCC as an organization and communications on the IPCC's products. (3) Canada suggests that this section clarify that the Secretary is not an authorized spokesperson for IPCC communications. (4) On page 7, under Planned Communications Materials, the need for high level media lines to ensure consistent messaging during the release of a report could be more explicitly identified.

## **[Addressing potential conflicts of interest]**

(1) Canada underscores the importance of the guidance provided in this section. We suggest that the strong language used here also be further reflected in the Principles section of the communications strategy, particularly with respect to emphasizing that individuals deeply associated with the IPCC not take on a policy advocacy role. (2) Canada suggests reiterating in Section 6 the third communications principle from Section 2, above, that IPCC communications should be drawn from IPCC Reports and that the IPCC does not issue statements updating scientific conclusions unless these come from formal IPCC assessment documents. We suggest the following edits to Section 6, page 8, third paragraph: "...IPCC participants are encouraged to respond to interest in emerging reports (OR EMERGING SCIENCE), as an opportunity to communicate how the IPCC works (AND THE NEED FOR CAREFUL ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING SCIENCE). The IPCC encourages the science community, including those involved in producing its reports, to engage with wide audiences ON AN ONGOING BASIS..."

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

(1) Canada would appreciate if the Task Group could elaborate on the extent of its consultations outside the IPCC on this policy and disclosure form. (2) Canada would encourage the Task Group to seek legal advice via legal services in WMO/UNEP on the policy and its disclosure form as they are further elaborated.

### **[Policy Statement]**

(1) Overall, the Policy does not present sufficient clarity on how the conflicts will be "managed." The Policy proposes a "Management of Interests" panel, but does not provide guidance on how this panel would evaluate or enforce resolution of conflicts that arise. (2) The Policy also does not sufficiently reflect the importance of potential scientific conflicts of interest. There are scientific conflicts that could have significant impacts on the integrity of the IPCC's work and that would require action to resolve (e.g., a Co-Chair or CLA serving in a chief editor role of a major journal where publication decisions and directions strongly influence the material available for the IPCC to assess). Canada suggests that the importance of scientific conflicts be reflected more prominently throughout this proposal, with a view to ensuring the integrity of the report production and review process. (3) Key Points 1: Has the Explanatory Note been developed? The Policy as it stands currently is difficult to interpret, so perhaps what was intended to go into the Explanatory Note actually needs to form part of the Policy. (4) Section 1: Suggest that the Purpose focus specifically on the purpose of the Policy, and not on reiterating the role of the IPCC. (5) Section 2a: Suggest deleting "financial or other" from first sentence. When reading the definition of a conflict of interest, the wording seems to place undue emphasis on financial conflicts compared to other conflicts of interest. Suggest also deleting "financial" from last sentence in this section, as non-financial conflicts can also be both direct and indirect. (6) Section 2a: Suggest replacing "significantly impair, or could be seen to impair" with "impair, or be seen to impair". "Significantly impair" implies that lesser impairment is acceptable, while keeping "significantly impair, or be seen to

impair" would literally mean that the appearance of impairment - whether significant or not - is unacceptable, but actual impairment is acceptable, as long as it is not "significant". (7) Section 2a: Canada would prefer the term "apparent" instead of "perceived," as it is more consistent with the terminology used in the Government of Canada's conflict of interest policies. (8) Section 2b: The term "relevance" is defined, but is not actually used in accordance with this definition anywhere in the Policy. (9) Section 2b: Is the Task Group certain that issues like property ownership and general shareholdings will never have a bearing on the IPCC's role or credibility? This explanation is not required to define "relevance", and could cause confusion with respect to interpretation of the policy. (10) Sections 2b and 4a: Suggest deleting the word "advice", as providing advice is not the role of the IPCC. (11) Section 3b: It is not clear how this statement is to be interpreted in this policy. Does it mean that the rules of the policy will be applied differently for individuals from developing countries? If so, further explanation is needed. (12) Section 3c: Suggest deleting the first sentence, as the issue of who the policy applies to is fully defined later in the Scope section. (13) Section 3f: Suggest deleting "...so that the efficient operation of IPCC is not impeded." This implies that exceptions to the Policy will be made whenever difficulties enforcing the Policy are encountered. (14) Section 3h: We suggest: "Compliance with this Policy is obligatory. Non-compliance may result in individuals being barred from participation in assessment activities." (15) Section 4a: The term "any other individuals" could include contributing authors, expert reviewers, government reviewers and government delegations - please clarify specifically who is included here. (16) Section 5a: This paragraph should clarify that it is not necessary to disclose all interests, only those posing a real, apparent or potential conflict in the context of the IPCC. (17) Section 5b: If the Policy cites the Explanatory Note, one can no longer claim, as "Key point 1" does, that "the Explanatory Note would not form part of the Policy" (18) Section 5d: We suggest: "In the event of any change in their relevant interests, that may give rise to a real, apparent, or potential conflict of interest situation, individuals must complete and submit a new Disclosure of Relevant Interests Form to the appropriate Working Group Bureau in a timely manner." (19) Section 6a: With what individuals would the Management of Interests Panel authorize sharing this information? This clause may not inspire confidence on the part of those disclosing their personal information. (20) Section 6a: The policy should specify the length of time information about interests should be stored (e.g., number of assessment cycles). (21) Section 8: We suggest a modified version of the second option: "Where a conflict of interest is identified, anyone failing to take appropriate mitigating measures may be excluded from any related IPCC activity or from the IPCC altogether."

## **[Disclosure Form]**

(1) Second paragraph, first sentence: Suggest changing "called for" to "required." (2) Second last sentence of disclosure form: Suggest deleting "...will not be released more widely except with my authorization." We do not foresee any reason why the IPCC should be responsible for releasing this information other than as required by law.

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

The Task Group's recommendation for this section does not fully respond to the issues raised by the IAC with respect to the transparency of selection criteria for the scientific credentials of nominees. In the selection of authors for the AR5, the WG Bureaux applied the selection factors identified in the Procedures (e.g., geographic balance, etc), but also applied different qualitative or quantitative criteria to make decisions with respect to the relative expertise and scientific merit of the nominees. Canada suggests that the Task Group

explore what criteria were used for the AR5 author selection, and discuss how these criteria should be developed, communicated and applied in future.

#### **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

(1) The statement regarding the use of newspapers and magazines should be more carefully nuanced to ensure that research based on archival documentary evidence is not inadvertently excluded. While documentary evidence does not constitute a large source of information on historical climate change, there is serious research based on documented harvest dates, etc., as an indicator of historical climatic conditions; in these instances at least some of that documentary evidence has come from archived newspapers, and other similar sources. For example, in the first paragraph of the proposed Annex 2, Canada suggests replacing "In principle, newspapers and magazines are not" with "Except in rare instances, such as in studies of historical harvest dates or historical reports of weather impacts, newspapers and magazines are generally not." (2) Under item 3b, Canada suggests noting that making sources available to reviewers is conditional upon having permission from the owners of the grey literature to disseminate it to others. (3) Under item 3, Canada suggests that grey literature should also be accessible upon request to readers of the final report (conditional upon permission of the owners). Accessibility of the referenced sources is important for the users of these assessment reports.

#### **[6. Report Review]**

(1) In the first sentence of the Task Group's recommendation in this section (last paragraph, page 6), Canada suggests the replacing "common practices" with "CONSISTENT practices." (2) Canada suggests that the Task Group use a different term than "guidance material" for the input that is being requested under this recommendation. Elsewhere in the Task Group's proposal, it is suggested that "guidance material" be approved by the Bureau, rather than the Panel. However, the input requested by this recommendation is expected to be returned to the Panel/Task Group for future deliberations. Specifically, the first sentence of the recommendation could be modified as follows: "The IPCC should DOCUMENT AND ANALYSE THE CURRENT review process in order to UNDERSTAND WHETHER the process is targeted and effective..."

#### **[8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors]**

(1) In the recommendation, Canada suggests including the following two additional points: 1. Errors should be addressed in a timely manner; and 2. Errors will be addressed in consultation with the IPCC's Senior Communications Manager. (2) Canada suggests that the Task Group further elaborate (or direct the authors of the error protocol to elaborate) on how error reports will be assessed and re-directed when first reported through online mechanisms. The protocol currently suggests that all error reports will be directed to Co-Chairs, other Bureau members, or CLAs. However, these individuals are volunteers in the IPCC process, and the procedures should be developed with a view of minimizing their potential burdens where possible. We are concerned that the process as currently described leaves the IPCC and the scientific community vulnerable to concerted "denial of service" attacks that could lead to thousands of error reports.

#### **[9. IPCCs Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty]**

(1) It is unclear why the Task Group's recommendation suggests that the Procedures make reference to a specific guidance document on uncertainty when this document is intended to be transient in nature. Canada suggests deleting the last line of this recommendation, which states: "...with reference to the guidance note on uncertainty when completed." (2) The Panel's decision and the Task Group's consideration are vague with respect to why the guidance note is



being presented to the Panel at its 33rd Session. Canada reiterates its preference that this document is to be provided for the Panel's information only. In addition, Canada suggests including the approval of guidance documents in the Bureau's Terms of Reference (to be developed by the Governance Task Group), which would be consistent with the text on "guidance documents" proposed in the Addendum.

### **[10. IPCC Guidance material]**

Canada supports the Task Group's continued efforts to resolve the status of "guidance material." The text proposed in the Addendum on this issue is generally consistent with Canada's views on this issue, but it would benefit from further explanation with respect to the distinction between "guidance material" and "supporting material." Canada supports guidance material being the purview of the IPCC Bureau (and not subject to approval by the Panel); this will need to be clarified both in the Procedures and in any future terms of reference for the IPCC Bureau.

### **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

Canada notes that the issues raised in the Addendum have not undergone sufficient analysis by the Task Group and require much further discussion. There are a number of issues in section 11.3, such as the proposals under "cross-cutting issues" and "range of scientific views," that would pose significant implementation challenges. It is suggested that the Task Group recommend that during IPCC-33 the Panel focus on the body of the proposal only. Canada would support an ongoing process after IPCC-33 for governments to consider other issues identified by the Task Group (in conjunction with the Bureau and TSUs).

# China

## **General Comments on Overall Procedure**

### **[General Comments]**

China holds that the decisions and actions on the IAC recommendations taken by IPCC at its 32nd session are timely, reflecting the IPCC needs for constantly improving its governance and assessment procedures. We appreciate the efforts made by those Task Groups set up at the 32nd session, and believe that the deliberations and proposals on related issues made by individual Task Groups will provide a good basis for Members to address relevant issues at the 33rd session of the IPCC.

However, we wish to emphasize that the release of the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) in 2014 is the most important task facing the IPCC. The reform of its governance and assessment procedures in accordance with the IAC recommendations should proceed in a gradual, practical, operable manner, and it should facilitate a smooth release of AR5.

We also noted that the discussions on the IAC recommendations by the Task Groups have not been completed yet, and we believe that IPCC should continue these discussions with an appropriate approach.

## **Governance: Executive Committee**

### **[4]**

China holds that proposals made by the Task Group on establishment of the Executive Committee could serve as a good basis for further discussion. The major Terms of Reference for the Executive Committee are to coordinate and facilitate decisions taken at IPCC Plenary and to handle emergencies during intersessional periods. The current proposals made by the Task Group on the TOR of the Executive Committee and mode of its operation are relatively appropriate, which provide IPCC Plenary with a good basis for further elaborations.

### **[5]**

Chinas believe that the Heads of TSUs may attend the meetings of Executive Committee on the issues related to their own Working Groups as technical assistants to Co-Chairs of appropriate Working Groups. In order to limit the size of the Executive Committee, the Heads of TSUs should not be formal members of the Committee.

The major Terms of Reference for the Executive Committee are to coordinate and facilitate the implementation of the decisions taken at an IPCC Plenary, address emergency matters during the intersessional periods. The IAC recommendation on the inclusion of external members in the Executive Committee will confront practical difficulties in terms of selection criteria and procedures.

In order to strengthen the linkage between IPCC routine work and its two parent bodies (WMO and UNEP), it is worthy of consideration to include one representative from WMO and one from UNEP in the Executive Committee, as external members.

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[General Comments]**

China holds that the proposals made by the Task Group with regard to the Executive Director of the Secretariat are appropriate.

## **Governance: General Comments**

### **[General Comments]**

China holds that proposals made by the Task Group on establishment of the Executive Committee could serve as a good basis for further discussion. The major Terms of Reference for the Executive Committee are to coordinate and facilitate decisions taken at IPCC Plenary and to handle emergencies during intersessional periods. The current proposals made by the Task Group on the TOR of the Executive Committee and mode of its operation are relatively appropriate, which provide IPCC Plenary with a good basis for further elaborations.

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[General Comments]**

China holds that the current proposals made by the Task Group in terms of tenure of the IPCC Chair and Working Groups Co-Chairs are appropriate, as TG has given comprehensive consideration to both IAC recommendations and reality of the IPCC work.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

China holds that the work by scientists for IPCC assessment is entirely voluntary. Therefore, the development of the conflict of interest policy needs to keep sound balance between maintenance of IPCC credibility on one hand, and attraction of excellent scientists on the other. While the conflict of interest policy is designed to enhance the IPCC profile and the credibility of IPCC reports, it must ensure that a great number of outstanding scientists worldwide will actively participate in the work of IPCC assessment report. We noted that both WGI and WGII have already initiated interest disclosure issues of the people who are involving in relevant work of each Working Group. But their individual enforcement criteria are not the same. We believe that IPCC should quicken the pace to develop its conflict of interest policy in order to harmonize the management on conflict interest and disclosure system for all working groups.

### **[Policy Statement]**

China holds that we should trust the moral quality of the scientists involved in the IPCC work, and therefore the principles for interest management and disclosure system should be voluntary and non-mandatory.

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[1. General Comments]**

China holds that the proposals made by the IPCC Task Group on Procedures concerning the IPCC assessment procedures are positive for promoting the efforts to improve its procedures, and they are feasible on the whole. We have noted that it is still necessary to develop specific rules and guidelines concerning the responsibilities of the Review Editors and the procedures for error corrections in order to improve the IPCC assessment process. These rules and guidelines should be specific, operable, and helpful in maintaining the vitality of the IPCC assessment work.

We also hold that the Task Group on Procedures should focus more attention on the discussions on how to handle IAC recommendations based on the mandates given by IPCC at its 32nd session.

## **[6. Report Review]**

Taking into account the fact that the Review Editors of each chapter may need to handle several thousand comments during the review process, China believes that the advices of IAC to enhance the role of Review Editors are useful. However, comments on an IPCC assessment report should be handled by Lead Authors, Coordinating Lead Authors and Review Editors altogether rather than completely relying on Review Editors alone. A possible assignment of tasks among them is suggested as follows: (1) Lead Authors are responsible for handling the comments relating to their responsible sections under review, and submitting their individual reports on treatment of the comments to CLAs concerned; (2) Coordinating Lead Authors are responsible for handling the comments relating to a chapter as a whole, and submitting their reports on treatment of the comments to relevant RE; (3) Review Editors are responsible for reviewing the reports on comment treatments, examining the comments, and commenting on significant issues when identified.

## **[8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors]**

China holds that the decision made by IPCC-32 on the establishment of a procedure for handling potential errors is appropriate. However, due attention should be given to both the efficiency and operability of the specific operating procedure under development.

# Finland

## General Comments on Overall Procedure

### [General Comments]

The long-term development of IPCC should continue

The recommendations of the Task Groups contain many good ideas and advisable actions, but the whole process is hampered by the lack of a comprehensive and systematic overall consideration of what is the ultimate purpose of existence of IPCC, how the scope of the IPCC activities should be defined, and in particular, is the present form of operation best suitable for satisfying the ultimate purpose and covering the scope. It is understandable that such consideration cannot change anymore the basic process of preparing AR5, but these issues should be considered urgently, because some important choices in preparing the AR5 will affect the continuation of work after its completion. In the following "food for thoughts" on how to further develop the workings of IPCC.

The task of IPCC and what it requires

The purpose of IPCC is to provide governments and other decision makers with best possible science based background information on climate change, its consequences and on means of influencing its effects on human well-being and environment through mitigation and better adaptation. Best possible information means that the information should be as accurate as possible and its uncertainties should be described correctly, but it means also that the information should cover all important issues indicating where the present knowledge limits most severely the possibilities of rational decision making. When uncertainties on certain required information are very large, the presentation should avoid going too much into details, whose real relevance is insignificant taking those uncertainties into account.

The experience since 1990 has shown that different societies and different political systems use the information in different ways. IPCC should give much emphasis on these varying needs satisfying as equally as possible. The information should be formulated in such ways that its use is possible without unduly distortion.

Four assessment reports have been produced and the fifth is underway. Now it's time to look backwards and think, has the process been as good as it could have been, and now it's time to look forward and think, do we have the right model for the future needs. Is the regular five year interval optimal? Is it at all optimal to produce the whole set of reports regularly, or should the model be replaced by a continuous model as an example?

Is it optimal to have the same basic model for the three working groups? Does the current structure of three WGs serve the assessment work optimally? The reports of WG1, WG2 and WG3 look similar, but are quite different in content. Still they may be too alike as the problems considered are very different. WG1 describes the state of physical sciences basing its report on peer reviewed publications and having in most cases the possibility of comparing work of several research groups on the same issues.

WG2 describes a very wide and heterogeneous field. Many issues are covered by less scientific research reports only and very often only one research group has studied a specific problem. In addition the selection bias appears to affect strongly much of this research at all stages from initiating the research through funding to publishing.

WG3 has its own problems. Many of the central issues have a nature that is close to scenario analysis or futures research. These fields are not capable of producing reliable forecasts, rather projections selected by the authors. WG3 covers also areas, where direct economic conflicts of interest are important. That applies to all economic activities that may receive subsidies or direct benefits from regulatory actions or other policy decisions.

Perhaps the most difficult problem of all is estimating, how concrete policy decisions will ultimately influence the future. Will they have unforeseen large detrimental effects, or how the decisions of future decision makers will affect their significance. IPCC cannot expand much further towards decision making. On the contrary, it should be considered, whether IPCC should limit its task to be narrower than it has been, while some new bodies of different nature might be created to form a better interface between scientific knowledge collected by IPCC and the decision makers.

A possible alternative for the current workings of IPCC

For the sake of discussion an alternative is sketched below:

- The WG1 is replaced by a continuing process that maintains a data base that covers all related scientific publications that fulfill some minimal requirements, and an continuously updated evaluation document, which describes a selection in a way similar to the present WG1 report. New publications are included and other updates made to this document based on a formal process similar to the present writing of the assessment reports. The advantage is in the better timeliness of the document and in savings in effort, when changes are made only based on need.
- From the WG2 and WG3 those parts would be processed in the same way as far as the level of scientific knowledge is comparable.
- For those parts of WG2 and WG3 where the lack of sufficient publications or the nature of the knowledge makes the above process less applicable, new modes of operations are developed. Part of that could still be included in IPCC activities while parts most directly related to communications with decision makers would be transferred out of the IPCC scope.
- Summaries of the status of science may be written for the policy makers as found appropriate, but the schedule of such summaries does not require similar schedules for the other activities. If the other activities keep their knowledge base continuously up-to-date, they are not affected by writing of summaries.
- It is unlikely that any single body could provide optimal support for areas where ethical questions, policy issues and very uncertain projections on future dominate. For these a number of parallel working groups could produce alternative solutions that take the scientific knowledge into account. They could propose alternative pathways for policy decisions avoiding better the lockup to a single solution that turns out to be unacceptable to many countries. The nature of these activities makes accommodating them within the IPCC framework questionable.

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

The effort to improve communication strategy is very welcomed. It is important that the new strategy will be implemented without delay. Production of easily understandable information material, especially graphs and figures, will help the communication of IPCC results at national level, too.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[Disclosure Form]**

Please, add "Mail address" to the required contact information at the end of the form.

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[10. IPCC Guidance material]**

Not all guidance material is issued out of specific Working Groups or in association with an assessment. Some guidance (specified as Technical Guidelines) is also produced out of the Task Group on Data and Scenario Support for Impacts and Climate Analysis (TGICA). This is also designated as IPCC Supporting Material. It would be useful for the procedures to be more specific on the types of guidance being referred to. TGICA is currently reviewing its own procedures directed to authors preparing technical guidelines. These guidelines build on information contained in IPCC assessment reports, offering guidance and illustrations of how to apply data and scenarios generated out of those reports. (see also p.12 Guidance documents)

# France

## **Governance: Executive Committee**

### **[General Comments]**

Recommended date of implementation : as early as possible.

### **[5]**

Regarding the options on Size and composition :

- inclusion of the IPCC Vice-Chairs, without voting rights : approved ;
- inclusion of the Heads of the TSUs : not approved ; the Heads of the TSUs should be invited when needed, for consultation ;
- inclusion of members external to the IPCC : not approved ; the Executive Committee will be a place for executive decisions that will be taken during intersessional periods of the Bureau and of the Plenary, most often via a teleconference and it will practically not allow extensive oral debates ; for these two reasons, it could probably not benefit of advices from participants external to the IPCC.

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[Proposal 4a]**

This position is a key-position within IPCC. The TG might be more precise and say that the two-year contracts should only be renewed with explicit consideration and approval ; it could propose that the renewal should receive prior approval by the Executive Committee with advance notice e.g. 6 or 9 months.

The term should be limited to 10 years.

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[General Comments]**

The recommendations of the TG are approved.

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

The main media of scientific communication by IPCC are the reports produced by IPCC.

Other communication objectives are, mainly, about the IPCC processes and procedures.

### **[Target audiences]**

The main target are governments and policy-makers.



## **[Addressing potential conflicts of interest]**

Regarding the conflict of interests policy, the TG should envisage that the scope includes the domain of external Communication : the Secretariat-Communication-staff, and the contractors and contracts, as well as temporary and occasional contributors to the external Communication.

## **[Implementing the new strategy]**

A single communication-specialist position in the Secretariat, in the area of external Communication, is probably not enough. More continuity in this function is needed. The continuity and quality may require a larger team. Access to continuous technical support " e.g. webmaster - is needed to allow rapid-responses.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

The development of an explicit policy as initiated by the TG is very positive.

Such a policy, based on management of conflict of interests, and not aiming at exclusion of any conflict of interest, will allow to maintain the diversity and plurality of contributors to the IPCC.

Recommended date of implementation : as early as possible.

### **[Policy Statement]**

The TG should envisage that the scope includes the domain of external Communication : the Secretariat-Communication-staff, and the contractors and contracts, as well as temporary and occasional contributors to the external Communication.

The TG might explicitly address the contribution of e.g. Bureau members to the COPs of the UNFCCC : the recommendation to restrict "within some limits" their presence and contributions. The idea is not to exclude the participation of these individuals as experts e.g. in a national delegation but to avoid a first-rank participation in the negotiations.

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

Topic 3.1. IAC recommendation on criteria

The TG recommendations seem appropriate. However, as far as possible, the reflection on the criteria and processes for the selection of the CLAs, LAs and REs should be deepened.

### **[7. Summary for Policymakers]**

Topic 11.4 Approval and Acceptance of SPMs (section 4.3 of the Procedures)

We particularly support the proposal of the Task-Group. The role of the CLAs, which is, in practice, strong, should be reflected in the procedures : the CLAs

have the right of a veto based on scientific grounds, regarding the proposals made by the governments.

# Germany

## General Comments on Overall Procedure

### **[General Comments]**

Not all TGs have completely responded to their mandate. At IPCC-33 a decision should be made prolonging the mandates of the TGs as needed. The mandate should specify the issues to be addressed, going also beyond the IAC-recommendations if needed. --- A decision that the TG on Governance and Management is to establish terms of reference should be taken at IPCC33. The task of this TG according to the decision of IPCC-32 is the following: ".. to examine the role of the Secretariat in its relation with WMO, UNEP, the IPCC-Chair, the Vice-Chairs, Co-Chairs of the WGs and the TFI, and Technical Support Units. The Task Group is requested to review the responsibilities of key Secretariat positions and consider the issues associated with it and to make recommendations to the Panel at its 33rd Session." Terms of reference should be established for the secretariat, the bureau and all of its individual members including the government representatives, and for the TSUs. --- The documents should be more consistent in style, a common introduction should be added (the one from TG PRO could be used). The Explanatory Notes mentioned in TG CoI is missing. It would have been helpful if the secretariat would have supported the TG in formal editing issues, like addition of page and line numbers to the documents. An Excel Sheet for the provision of the comments - and for national coordination would have been helpful.

## Governance: Executive Committee

### **[1]**

Agreed

### **[2]**

Agreed

### **[3a]**

Agreed

### **[3b]**

Agreed

### **[3c]**

Agreed

### **[3d]**

Agreed

### **[3e]**

Agreed

### **[3f]**

NOT AGREED: As suggest by TG Pro (section 2), the selection of meeting participants should be done by the IPCC Bureau or the respective Working Group Bureau/Task Force.

### **[3g]**

Agreed

### **[4]**

Agreed

### **[5]**

All Vice Chairs should be members of the EC. They need to be informed in order to fullfill their function to act as a substitute for the Chair in his/her absense. They should not have a voting right, except for the one Vice Chair who is acting as a substitute for the Chair in his/her absense. See also our proposal for a rule for deputyship. --- The heads of TSUs should be included. --  
- External members can be invited as advisors as needed.

### **[6a]**

Agreed

### **[6b]**

Agreed

### **[6c]**

The Vice Chair should not have the right to vote. Only in the absence of the Chair his selected substitute should have the right to vote.

### **[6d]**

Given that the number of members might not be n\*3 votes should be rounded.

### **[6e]**

NOT AGREED: Modify 6e and join with 6f, delete current text and add rule for deputyship:

"In case of absence of the Chair he/she will be represented by a Vice Chair nominated by the Chair as deputy. In case of absence of the head of the Secretarait he/she will be represented by the Deputy Head of the Secretariat. The deputy has the full power to act on behalf of the Chair or Head of the Secretariat in his/her absence."

### **[6f]**

NOT AGREED: Modify 6e and join with 6f, delete current text and add Rule for deputyship:

"In case of absence of the Chair he/she will be represented by a Vice Chair nominated by the Chair as deputy. In case of absence of the head of the Secretariat he/she will be represented by the Deputy Head of the Secretariat. The deputy has the full power to act on behalf of the Chair or Head of the Secretariat in his/her absence." --- As a fall back option we request to modify the current formulation as follows: "The Deputy Head of Secretariat may substitute for the Head of Secretariat in his/her absence."

**[6g]**

Agreed

**[6h]**

Agreed

**[6i]**

Agreed

**[6j]**

Modify text: The Executive Committee meets normally four times per year

**[6k]**

Agreed

**Governance: Executive Director**

**[General Comments]**

no comment

**[Rational 1]**

Agreed

**[Rational 2]**

Agreed

**[Rational 3]**

Agreed

**[Rational 4]**

Terms of Reference for all higher secretariat's positions should be established to make sure that the secretariat fulfills the needs of the EC, the bureau, the scientists, the TSUs, and the members of the IPCC.

## **[Proposal 1]**

Agreed

## **[Proposal 2]**

Terms of Reference for the head of the secretariat should be established to make sure that the secretariat fulfills the needs of the EC, the WGs, the scientists, the TSUs, and the members of the IPCC. The TG on Governance and Management should propose such TOR in consultation with the EC, the bureau and the members of the IPCC.

## **[Proposal 3]**

The TG should provide suggestions for the titles for the senior secretariat's post that better reflect their functions, in line with the recommendation of IAC to strengthen the secretariat's role.

## **[Proposal 4a]**

"The limit of terms should also apply to the Deputy Head of the secretariat. --- Option 4a is supported - exchanging important management staff should be avoided during critical assessment phases. The head and the deputy head should not be exchanged at the same time. "

## **[Proposal 4b]**

not supported

## **[Proposal 5]**

This should be tightened. Add: "The senior secretariat posts should report to and be fully accountable to the Chair of the IPCC." In the current situation, the secretariat is reporting to WMO, who is not practically involved in the work of IPCC.

## **Governance: General Comments**

### **[General Comments]**

A decision that the TG on Governance and Management is to establish terms of reference should be taken at IPCC33. The task of this TG according to the decision of IPCC-32 is the following: ".. to examine the role of the Secretariat in its relation with WMO, UNEP, the IPCC-Chair, the Vice-Chairs, Co-Chairs of the WGs and the TFI, and Technical Support Units. The Task Group is requested to review the responsibilities of key Secretariat positions and consider the issues associated with it and to make recommendations to the Panel at its 33rd Session." Terms of reference should be established for the secretariat, the bureau and all of its individual members including the government representatives, and for the TSUs.

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[General Comments]**

It is important to maintain institutional knowledge and memory. As chairs might change we suggest that this memory should be mainly with the secretariat.

## **[Rational 1]**

Agreed

## **[Rational 2]**

Agreed

## **[Rational 3]**

Terms of offices of all elected IPCC members should be addressed by the TG Governance. It should be decided at IPCC33 to mandate the TG to make proposals on this matter for IPCC34.

## **[Proposal 1]**

Agreed

## **[Proposal 2]**

Agreed

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

The roles of responsibilities of the head of the secretariat and the deputy, the sen. comm. man. must be clarified, consistent with the proposed decisions from the other three TGs. --- The head of the secretariat and her/his deputy can be a spokesperson on issues concerning the principles governing IPCC work, IPCC rules of procedures etc., but not on scientific content. --- The sen. comm. man. should focus on strategic issues development of outreach material, in consultation with the EC and according to the rules of IPCC and panel decisions, but not speak on behalf of IPCC. He/she should be responsible for preparing and issuing coordinated messages from IPCC. He/she should actively support the spokesperson and the focal points in their outreach activities. --- The strategics of any communication actions proposed by the sen. comm. manager must be approved by the panel. --- A report on communication and outreach activities must be provided by the sen. comm. man. on an annual basis to the panel.

### **[Principles]**

Agreed

### **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

Change 4th bullet: "Continuous provision of information and responding to media queries (including on short notice) about IPCC s activities and processes, and the content of published IPCC reports."

### **[Target audiences]**

Sustainable cooperations with other organisations should be established to reach out to broader audiences. A mechanism for the development of such cooperations

should be proposed by the senior communication manager to the Panel at its 34th session.

## **[Languages of communications, and translation]**

We note that additional translations into all UN languages would have budgetary implications. This should be mentioned in the decision.

## **[Guidelines]**

"How authorized spokespersons ...": refer to the "Principles" of the Communication Strategy.  
(What would happen, if this is violated?) --- "Selecting authorized spokespersons...": Who is the "designate" of the Chair/Vice Chair? --- 3rd bullet: Change language: The sen. comm. man. must always be involved to ensure consistent messages. ---The rapid response strategy should be consistent the decisions on Procedures and Management/Governance. The role of the senior comm. man. should be clarified, see above. ---The error handling strategy should be consistent the decisions on Procedures. The description of the process is not detailed enough. ---Comm. Material: Improvement of the head of the secretariat and its deputy is not needed. ---Funding for media training must be part of the budget plans.

## **[Addressing potential conflicts of interest]**

Consistency with the recommendations from TG CoI is required. --- Who is "IPCC participants"?

## **[Implementing the new strategy]**

We are not sure about the staff situation concerning comm. in the secretariat, but the sen. comm. man. might need support to fulfill the suggested tasks.

## **[Evaluation of IPCC communications]**

Agreed

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

The Explanatory Notes mentioned in TG CoI is missing. --- Man of Interest Policy: should apply to both the secretariat's and the TSUs senior positions. --- The Man of Interest panel should be the decision making body in case of violation and choose sanctions according to bullet 8. --- 2a: is occurring twice. --- 3h: should read: Compliance the the policy is obligatory. --- 4a, 4th line: should read: involved in report AND OUTREACH MATERIAL preparation --- 6a: The legal aspects both in international and national law should be checked. --- 7b: the TSUs should be mentioned here. --- 7b: We support Option 3 --- 8: The rules should take into account the different roles individuals have in the IPCC. For example, the elected, leading IPCC team should be treated differently from authors and reviewers. This should especially include the consequences of non-compliance to the policy.

### **[Policy Statement]**

no comment



## **[Disclosure Form]**

no comment

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[1. General Comments]**

The amendments proposed will improve the transparency and robustness of IPCC deliverables. It should be decided to review the procedures after the end of the current assessment cycle. --- Spelling and language should be improved. --- Introduction: A general introduction for all TGs should be provided for IPCC33.

### **[2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings]**

The proposed selection process of the participants for scoping meetings is not consistent with proposal 3f of TG Governance for the tasks of the EC. We suggest amending the proposal of the TG Gov and agree with the proposal of the TG Pro. --- Add: The selection process must be transparent, a report must be provided to the Panel.

### **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

Add (if not already included in procedures): "The selection process must be transparent, a report must be provided to the Panel."

### **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

TG consideration: The reasons for the refusal of the IAC recommendation must be strengthened and explained more carefully as the issue of grey literature has been a major topic of the public discussion. A review of the new rules is needed after the end of each assessment cycles, as the way of scientific working changes. --- 4. Responsibilities of the secretariat, add a third point: "The IPCC Secretariat will (a) ..., (b) ..., and c) will store these source after publication of an IPCC-report and make them available on request."

### **[5. Handling the Full Range of Views]**

TG recommendation: In the IPCC32 decision it says "the full range of scientific views", the TG recommendation now reads "the range of scientific views". The reason for this change of the language of the IPCC32 decision should be explained carefully as the issue of potential biases in IPCC has been a major topic of the public discussion.

### **[6. Report Review]**

Agreed

### **[7. Summary for Policymakers]**

Task Group recommendation for decision by the Panel:  
We do not understand, how the existing Procedures could be amended to clarify the current practice. As the procedure is clearly described, there is no need for clarification.

### **[8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors]**

We urge the responsible persons to provide a finalized version of the protocol on error handling to the Panel at its 33rd session for decision. ---

This is a cross cutting issue with TG Gov and Com, decisions should be amended accordingly. ---

We note that additional personnel would be required to maintain a public web site for error submission. We suggest to mention these budgetary implications in the decision.

## **[9. IPCCs Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty]**

Agreed. The guidance notes on Uncertainty have been published in the mean time. The text should be adapted accordingly.

## **[10. IPCC Guidance material]**

agreed

## **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

The TG on procedures should be mandated at IPCC33 to continue its work in consultation with the EC. The mandate should specify the issues to be addressed.

# Hungary

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

Process of selecting authors: Arguably, authors play the most important role in developing IPCC's main products, i.e. the various reports. It is therefore that the process of selecting authors is critical. This process should be improved as selecting the authors is not transparent enough, and may not be fully efficient, either. Additionally, of experts of similar quality, several have been selected many times (i.e., sometimes too many times), while others have not, which is not fair. Concerning the selection of CLAs, the same concern could specifically be made. It is not fair if there are always very few persons that are selected to be CLA in a certain field, and no others. That inevitably leads to inbreeding. Restricting the CLA office to one report would also be in line with the suggested and fair procedure of restricting the term of office of the IPCC Chair and Working Group Co-Chairs.

How to select Authors? It is suggested that a process of always including new people in the authors cycle is maintained, and thus, it can be ensured that all kinds of thoughts and approaches can be included. This, and only this could ensure an impartial development of science, and that it is avoided that some people or schools have too much influence on conclusions and statements. From a practical point of view, author selection could be done by explicitly requesting governments to always nominate new people, and to suggest a wider range of experts than before.

How to select CLAs? In case somebody that was a CLA in a previous report is suggested again by a country, it must be carefully checked by IPCC if indeed there is nobody else that could do the job.

It must also be transparently ensured that people from CETs and developing countries with good scientific record could have EQUAL chance to become CLAs.

One way of electing CLAs has been a decision by a few core people at a meeting. However, it could also work that CLAs are at least partly elected by the team itself, i.e. the team of LAs elected. The LAs could be more knowledgeable with respect to the scientific record or leadership capabilities of a CLA than a selection meeting by a few people. Also, once a CLA has been elected by his or her people, he/she would feel more responsible for the group to live up to their expectation.

### **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

Archiving data and procedures: It happened before that after developing data for an IPCC methodology report that was published, colleagues identified potential problems and the source data and the procedure of processing them was needed to be analyzed. Unfortunately, fellow authors were unable to recover what they did, and also refused to uncover their approach. This is not a good practice. For the sake of transparency, we suggest to develop procedures for archiving data and approaches of developing data that are used in the development of a report. This procedure might even include publishing source data, as well as publications analyzed by authors.

# India

## **Governance: Executive Committee**

### **[3g]**

Terms of Reference may be too demanding and could lead to increase in the non-scientific work load of the authors and distract the attention from scientific to political and procedural aspects.

### **[4]**

The Executive Committee should include additionally 3 independent members, from outside of the climate community in order to bring perspective into the functioning of the committee.

### **[6b]**

1. The clause for taking decisions through simple majority should be removed as it results in providing voting rights to a few which infringes on the spirit of the IAC of non-discrimination between the members.

### **[6k]**

2. Sufficient clarity should be provided on the jurisdiction of the Executive committee. The committee is not supposed to be a power beyond the Plenary and is only supposed to act on behalf of IPCC between Plenary sessions. Further it the role of this committee during plenary sessions should be elaborated to include whether it would it formally provide a brief report on its work during the two IPCC plenary.

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[Guidelines]**

In regard to selecting authorized spokespersons, spokesperson selected from the authors and contributors to the reports by the Co-chairs should ensure adequate regional representation along with other factors such as knowledge of subject etc.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

1. The procedure seems to be elaborate and may discourage genuine scientists from participating in the assessment process. The disclosure form should only ask for them to declare all relevant potential issues of conflict, focusing only on those issues that are relevant to Climate change related activities.

2. Background and Key considerations, item # 2 states that "The policy is intended to encourage the participation of individuals from developing countries". While the encouragement of individuals from developing countries may be a desirable ideal, it is not clear what the differences in circumstances of "conflict of interest" are for developing country individuals, nor how the manner of application of the policy will encourage their participation.

3. The issue of transition from existing CoI policies in different WGs needs to be clarified

### **[Policy Statement]**

1. Section 2 (a) states "Financial conflicts may be direct or indirect". It is not clear what "indirect" means. Some example(s) of situations might be helpful

2. Sections 2(c) "Relevance" states "... such as general shareholdings or property ownership, is not relevant and need not be declared". However, the "Declaration of interest form" provided does not make that distinction leading to lack of clarity on this matter.

3. Section 9: Since the "assessment cycle" is itself under discussion in terms of how IPCC might function in the future, this should be changed to something more general.

### **[Disclosure Form]**

1. With regard to making Compliance with the policy obligatory, while making it obligatory it may be better to give some flexibility for authors to disclose only relevant issues.

2. Section 3(h): A "voluntary disclosure" would have a better chance of attracting people with the necessary skills rather than an obligatory one where people are likely to shy away from taking on an already onerous responsibility.

3. Currently, WGI advises an annual disclosure by persons involved. It may be worthwhile putting down some frequency at which disclosure is made.

4. The last sentence of the penultimate paragraph reads "I understand that information about interests will be treated as confidential, unless required to be disclosed by law, will not be released more widely except with my authorization." The part "unless required by law" is not discussed anywhere in the draft policy document and is very worrisome. It leads to questions like which law?, what jurisdiction?, etc. as many countries have various degrees of disclosure mandated under laws such as RTI in India, or "Freedom of information Act (FOIA)" in the USA, etc.

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

1. A condition should be stipulated that Regional Experts (or local experts) must meet the scientific capacity to assess and synthesize the scientific literature. The CLA and LA should have adequate scientific expertise and capacity for preparing the Assessment Report Chapters.

2. Also, the selection criteria should be displayed before hand on IPCC websites in order to increase the transparency. Including an open tracking system on nominations received, their evaluations on selection criteria, and final selection should be made public. Sufficient reasons should be provided if a good candidate is not selected.

### **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

1. It is important to note that the Reports of many agencies particularly that of World Bank, UNEP, FAO, WMO, IEA, Regional Development Banks, etc are in most cases peer reviewed. Thus there is a need for a category that reports from such reputed multilateral institutions and agencies is treated appropriately.

2. It should be ascertained and possibly certified by CLA and LAs that non-journal-based information is not available in journals, and that it would add value to the IPCC report in reflecting a new point of view. In case inclusion of such unpublished and non-peer-reviewed literature changes the context and nature of discussions/inferences, certification by CLA/LAs should be mandatory. In any

case, unpublished and non-peer-reviewed literature should not date more than 2 years than the last allowed reference citing date for any IPCC report, since if it were such an important work, why was it not published in these two years, which is a reasonable time for any journal publication.

### **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

The IPCC Task Group on Procedures, in consultation with IPCC Secretariat, may consider documenting the addendum on Issues for further discussion on Procedures separately to put up to IPCC appropriately

# Italy

## **General Comments on Overall Procedure**

### **[General Comments]**

The outcomes of the Task Groups are quite good and I do not find any big problem. I think IPCC Secretariat should consider the big challenge to address all these issues at the next IPCC Plenary and so I invite to allocate enough time in the agenda for the discussions among the governments.

I find essential that the "new protocol for addressing errors in previous assessment report" is finalized before the IPCC Plenary in order to allow the governments to agree on that.

In this way IPCC finally can have a correction of the HIMALAYAN GLACIER ERROR in AR4 WGII:

## **Governance: Executive Committee**

### **[4]**

SIZE and COMPOSITION:

The Executive Committee must include:

- 1) IPCC Chair
- 2) Working Group and Task Force Co-Chairs
- 3) Head of Secretariat (ex-officio)
- 4) One or more IPCC Vice Chairs
- 5) The Heads of the TSU as ex-officio members

### **[6c]**

Members with the right to vote should be the Chair, Co-chairs and vice chairs. Ex-officio members do not have the right to vote.

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[Rational 4]**

limits on the term of the head of Secretariat:

The Head, following WMO two year contracts, should be limited to 8 years.

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[Rational 1]**

the term of office for the IPCC Chair and Working Group Co-Chairs must be restricted to one term (the assessment cycle or another time period as defined by the Panel) without the provision of possible extension for individual cases if the Panel so decides.

### **[Rational 2]**

It is a good idea to make working in parallel for 6 months the CHAIR and CHAIR ELECT.

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[Guidelines]**

Be careful in the paragraph "Selecting authorized spokespersons for the organization as a whole, and for individual reports" only "Chair, Vice-Chairs, or their designate" are in the text, while in the paragraph "Rapid response" it is mentioned " the Chair, Vice-Chairs, the Secretary, the Deputy Secretary,"

It is not clear from this text which are the guidelines for the Secretary and Deputy Secretary to speak on behalf of IPCC:

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

I agree on the amendment of the Procedures in order to require a report on the selection process.

I am aware that each WG Bureau finalized a document with all procedures applied and statistics during the selection of AR5 authors last year. These documents were never made available on the IPCC web site. I inquired about that by writing an email to the IPCC Chair on June 25, 2010. So I am strongly in favor to have the reports of the selections public for increasing the transparency of the process.

I strongly ask you to make this documentation , in the correct public format, available on line on the IPCC web site.



# Japan

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[General Comments]**

2. The secretariat:  
To ensure the improvement in effective operations, tasks to be out-sourced should be identified by an external review or other methods.

### **[Proposal 4a]**

1. The terms of the senior posts of secretariat:  
As to the terms of the senior posts of secretariat, not only that of Head of secretary but also that of Deputy Secretary should be prescribed.

## **Governance: General Comments**

### **[General Comments]**

5. The roles and responsibilities of IPCC Bureau:  
As to the roles and responsibilities of IPCC Bureau, too strict criteria should not be applied and the balance of regions, gender and disciplines etc., should be considered.

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[Proposal 1]**

3. The term of the IPCC chair and WG co-chairs:  
It should be prescribed that what kind of "individual cases" are allowed to be considered possible extension. If not, the original TG proposal would be not effective, because it would be essentially the same as conventional rules of election of the IPCC chair.

### **[Proposal 2]**

4. The continuity of knowledge and experiences:  
To ensure the continuity of knowledge and experiences, IPCC chair and co-chairs should be allowed to stay in the IPCC Bureau, if necessary, after stepping down.

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

1. Future work and nature of documentation:

The revised documentation should be used as a guide for the senior communication manager for the development of the Strategy. Then the time frame of the complement of the communication strategy document should be clarified. Also the approval process of the document (who will approve, panel or Bureau?) should be clarified.

2. Role and responsibility of the senior communication manager:

The role and responsibility of the senior communication manager should be described in the document.

Japan's recommendation on the outline of TOR of the senior communication manager is as follows:

[[a]]Implementation of enhanced and effective communication activities under guidance of the Panel/Bureau/EC

[[b]]Strengthen outreach activities through collaboration with stakeholders including governmental focal points

[[c]]Management of the entire public relations and communication activities including quick responses

[[d]]Review the communication activities and report the outcomes to the Panel and the Bureau

### 3. Development of Communication strategy:

Communication has two different vectors: enhancement of presence through active communication while ensuring self-discipline. A guideline concerning self-discipline (e.g. treatment of conflicts of interests) shall be severe and clear, but communication with public and media relation should be active. Based on this principle, IPCC's communication activities shall be implemented effectively and strategically, and this requirement should be clearly described in this report.

## **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

### 4. Defining the scope of IPCC communications:

IPCC Communication strategy should focus to rule its own activities, and in terms of activities implemented by member countries, IPCC's role shall be limited to support efficient enhancement of such outreaches. Scope of IPCC's communication should not be excessively expanded.

In the section titled "Global engagement", it is written that "the senior communications manager should ... consider capacity-building relating to the role of focal points in communication and outreach activities." Japan agrees that capacity-building is important to effectively implement IPCC's communication activities, but would like to clarify that this sentence does not mean that IPCC will provide media training or other activities to the focal points using IPCC resources.

## **[Guidelines]**

### 5. Guidelines:

In cases media of each country contact with a CLA or LA to make questions concerning IPCC matters, the CLA or LA should clarify that he or she is not representing IPCC but answering as a research scientist involved in writing of the IPCC assessment report.

Please clarify the rational of using two different wordings - "spokespersons" and "spokespeople (on page 7)".

## **[Addressing potential conflicts of interest]**

### 6. Addressing potential conflicts of interests:

A guideline to treat conflict of interests and that on roles of LA should be developed.

## **[Evaluation of IPCC communications]**

### 7. Evaluation of IPCC Communication:

On page9 in line 1, there is a mention about "the objectives". Please indicate on which page of this document this "objectives" is described.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

1. Interests Policy:

Japan supports overall policy delivered by the TG referred in the "Task Group Commentary on the Proposals". However, senior IPCC leadership should take the most care because of their influence on the IPCC reputation. Thus, guidance on "do not" shall be provided for those people, and clear guideline on non-compliance and its consequences shall be prepared.

2. Timeline and Future work (referring to "Cross-cutting Issues"):

How will the issues referred as "Cross-cutting issues" be dealt with? When will these issues be discussed, and how will the member governments be engaged in the development process?

### **[Policy Statement]**

3. Compliance (referring to "IPCC MANAGEMENT OF INTEREST POLICY, 8" ):

Considering that the participation to the IPCC activities are voluntary basis, no penalties should be given to individuals those involved in the preparation of IPCC reports, if the violation of the policy is trifle. However, senior IPCC leadership (Chair, Vice Chairs, Working Group Co-Chairs and other members of the IPCC Bureau) should be stringently treated, and in the case of non-compliance, such treatment as refusal of the participation in the process afterwards or dismissal shall be applied.

4. Management of interest (referring to "IPCC MANAGEMENT OF INTEREST POLICY, 7)b" ):

Concerning the composition of the Management of Interest panel, Japan recommends the EC (excluding the person in charge) to take the role.

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

1. The IPCC should make the process and criteria for selecting participants for scoping meetings more transparent:

Japan support the recommendation by the TG on selection of experts for the scoping meetings and the authors.

2. (Not in the IAC recommendation) Process of selection of experts to invite IPCC workshops and IPCC expert meetings:

Similarly to the procedures to select experts for the scoping meetings and the authors, those for expert meetings and workshops held by IPCC should be clarified to ensure the transparency of the process.

3. The IPCC should make every effort to engage local experts on the author teams of the regional chapters of the Working Group II report, but should also engage experts from countries outside of the region when they can provide an essential contribution to the assessment:

Japan support the recommendation by the TG that IPCC should engage regional experts on the author teams of regional chapters on the Working Group reports (not only in WGII report).

#### **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

4. Sources of Data and Literature:

Japan support the recommendation by the TG. Additionally, submitting a brief description of the nature of medias in which non-English literatures are presented would be preferable. (For example, descriptions such as "a local journal of Japanese Economic Association", or "its targeted readers are ...", etc.)

#### **[5. Handling the Full Range of Views]**

5. Handling the Full Range of Views:

Japan support the recommendation by the TG.

#### **[6. Report Review]**

6. Report Review:

Japan support the recommendation by the TG.

#### **[7. Summary for Policymakers]**

7. The IPCC should revise its process for the approval of the Summary for Policy Makers so that governments provide written comments prior to the Plenary:

The current practice has a problem that the panels would not have enough time to read the final draft of WG reports in detail because the final drafts is available only at the session to approve these reports. For non English-native panels, it is essential to have enough time to read through the final draft before the discussion on the floor. Therefore, the final draft should be submitted to the governments at least few weeks before the Session of the Panel that adopts/approves the WG assessment reports, similarly to the current practice for the SYR.

#### **[8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors]**

8. IAC discussion and suggestion in the Box analyzing the Himalayan glacier error (IAC report page 22). Discussion of time required for a response on Himalayan glacier error (IAC Report page 54):

[[a]]The decision making processes by the panel meeting, which are included in the current guidance note, should be amended to the decisions by the Executive Committee to make quick response.

[[b]]In the cases of 5a) and 9a) of the Guidance Note, in which it is concluded that there is an error, the fact should be posted by the IPCC web page in timely manner.

[[c]]Even in case of an important error, the necessary procedure should be done in timely manner (with a time limit) by Executive Committee, without waiting for the decision by a panel meeting.

#### **[9. IPCCs Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty]**

9. All Working Groups should use the qualitative level-of-understanding scale in their Summary for Policy Makers and Technical Summary, as suggested in

IPCC's uncertainty guidance for the Fourth Assessment Report. This scale may be supplemented by a quantitative probability scale, if appropriate:

The Guidance Note should be written with consideration that different treatments (types/levels) of uncertainty among Working Groups are desired, since WGI handles pure natural science while WGIII includes policy matters.

10. Typo:

8.1-8.5' should be '9.1-9.5' in the first line of 'Task Group consideration'.

## **[10. IPCC Guidance material]**

11. IPCC Guidance material:

Japan supports the recommendation by the TG. The status of the guidance notes should be "living document" which may be amended when needed.

# Madagascar

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[Proposal 3]**

3- Révision des titres ou appellations des postes : les titres devraient être conformes aux pratiques au sein des organismes des Nations Unies auxquels sont rattachées ces catégories de personnel, par exemple l'OMM ou l'UNEP si tel sera encore le cas.

### **[Proposal 4a]**

4- Durée du mandat : la durée devrait se conformer aux pratiques au sein de l'organisme de rattachement et nous pensons qu'il serait mieux de limiter le renouvellement de contrat à 3 ou 4 fois pour un contrat de 2ans.

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[Rational 1]**

Madagascar approuve et soutient les approches 1 et 2 du TG

### **[Proposal 1]**

1- La limitation à un seul mandat ( cycle du rapport d'évaluation ) devrait s'appliquer à tous les membres du bureau. Des considérations de cas individuels ne devraient pas exister.

### **[Proposal 2]**

2- En pratique, une passation de pouvoir et de travail s'effectue entre le Président sortant et le Président nouvellement élu. Au lieu de l'idée d'un Chair Elect , Madagascar suggérerait que le Président sortant siège au sein du Comité Exécutif pour une durée de 6 mois à titre consultatif et sans droit de vote.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

Madagascar approuve et soutient les principes et approches 1 à 4 du TG en matière de considérations des conflits d'intérêt au sein du GIEC.

# Malaysia

## **General Comments on Overall Procedure**

### **[General Comments]**

Overall, the proposals from the four Task Group respond very well to the relevant recommendations of the Inter-Academy Council (IAC) in the 'Review of the process and procedures of the IPCC' and follow according to the decision, terms of reference (TOR) and within the mandate given by the 32nd Session of the IPCC.

## **Governance: Executive Committee**

### **[General Comments]**

As recommended by the IPCC, an Executive Committee is to act on its behalf between Plenary sessions. The membership of the Committee should include the IPCC Chair, the Working Group Co-chairs, the senior member of the Secretariat, and 3 independent members, including some from outside of the climate community. However, we suggest that the 3 independent members must be from outside of the IPCC, either from climate or non-climate community, as appropriate and elected by the Planery.

### **[4]**

We do not support the inclusion of "one or more IPCC Vice Chairs as ex-officio members," as this is unnecessary and redundant to the Bureau Members. However, we support the inclusion of three (3) independent "normal" members (not ex-officio), which are to be from outside of the IPCC (external to the IPCC). All members must have the same rights to debate, making formal motions, and have the right to vote. We do not support the ex-officio member structure since officio members will abstain from voting. All members of the Executive Committee must be elected by the Plenary and serve until their successors are in place.

### **[6c]**

Under the Mode of Operation, all members of the Executive Committee must have the right to vote (ex-officio members in the Executive Committee is not necessary). All members must be elected by the Plenary and serve until their successors are in place.

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[General Comments]**

We support the recommendation given in the TG Proposal, in keeping with UN practice.

## **Governance: General Comments**

### **[General Comments]**

All members of the proposed Executive Committee must be elected by the Plenary and serve until their successors are in place. We do not support the ex-officio committee member mechanism.

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[General Comments]**

We fully support the IAC Recommendations for the term of the IPCC Chair and the Working Group Co-chairs should be limited to the timeframe of one assessment.

### **[Proposal 1]**

We support the recommendation to restrict the term of office for the IPCC Chair and Working Group Co-Chairs to one term (the assessment cycle or another time period as defined by the Panel), with the provision of possible extension for individual cases if the Panel so decides.

### **[Proposal 2]**

We support on allowing a "Chair Elect" process to give a smooth transfer from one Chair to the next and guaranteeing institutional memory. We agree that, a Chair Elect could be elected from six months to one year before the end of the term of office of the Chair. This must be ensured so that the Chair and "Chair Elect" could have distribution of tasks in consultation with the Bureau.

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

We consider an appropriate communication strategy is very important step in promoting the IPCC reports and information. However, we feel that communication would be more effective if it is organized by national authorities at national level, guided and supported by the IPCC.

### **[Principles]**

The essential quality of the IPCC's findings and conclusions should remain policy-neutral and maintain scientific balance, which is policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive. It is important to fully ensure that the IPCC's communications approach and activities should be consistent with these qualities.

### **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

We consider outreach as an important step in promoting the IPCC's findings. However, we feel that outreach would be more effective if it is organized by national authorities at national level. We propose that the scope of communications needs to also consider at national level, by providing IPCC materials early to members for effective communication strategies at the national level.

### **[Target audiences]**

It is extremely important to communicate information with more audience-specific formats. Information with audience-specific formats are:

- Technical Papers on regions and/or topics.



- IPCC outreach material specifically designed for regions
- Regional seminars
- Summaries of IPCC Reports prepared by regional organizations
- A special report on regional issues.

We also support a wider access of the IPCC reports, particularly at the national and regional level, with those activities such as:

- Data sets and interactive models
- Posters
- Outreach activities.

## **[Languages of communications, and translation]**

High-quality multilingual accessibility of IPCC communications products should always be guaranteed.

## **[Guidelines]**

Senior communications manager of the IPCC should always be involved, for effective coordination according to guidelines. Effective communications can only be assured if there is centralized coordination of the message.

## **[Addressing potential conflicts of interest]**

Addressing potential conflicts of interest should be under the Task Group Conflict of Interest Policy. In this respect, Cross-Task Group review and discussion is important for the 33rd Panel of the IPCC.

## **[Implementing the new strategy]**

IPCC needs to have some flexibility to engage additional temporary staff, including consultants, when necessary. This, however, must be supported by a regular updates and review on the financial implications and needs by the IPCC.

## **[Evaluation of IPCC communications]**

It is important for the senior communications manager of the IPCC to provide to plenary meetings on the appropriate evaluation about IPCC communications, including the type and extent of outreach and media coverage.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

The Explanatory Note, which is not included in the TG Report should be made available together with the Management of Interest Policy document.

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[1. General Comments]**

1. General Comments:

The 33rd Session of the IPCC should consider, discuss and make appropriate decision on the other issues noted by the Task Group (TG) stated in the Addendum.

### **[2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings]**

2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings:  
The TG recommendation on the elements for the new step or new paragraph preceding paragraph 4.2.1 of the Procedure are sufficient enough to make sure that the process and criteria for selecting participants for scoping meetings will be more transparent.

### **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors:  
All the TG recommendations are sufficient and acceptable.

### **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

4. Sources of Data and Literature:  
We agree with the new proposed Annex 2 of the Procedures ('Procedure for using non-published/non-peer-reviewed sources in IPCC reports'). However, the IAC recommendation for unpublished and non-peer-reviewed literature to be appropriately flagged in the IPCC Report should still be considered if any relevant source of data and literature is deemed important/ useful. This "flagging" procedure shall be considered in the implementation after taking into consideration to the additional procedures (1 to 4) as stated in the newly proposed Annex 2 by the TG.

### **[5. Handling the Full Range of Views]**

5. Handling the Full Range of Views:  
The TG recommendation is sufficient and acceptable.

### **[6. Report Review]**

6. Report Review:  
The TG recommendation for the IPCC to develop guidance material and the required revision to the current Section 4.2.4 is supported.

### **[7. Summary for Policymakers]**

7. Summary for Policymakers  
The current IPCC practice already allows for governments to provide written comments on the Summary for Policymakers prior to the Plenary. However, a more transparent selection of the drafting committee of the Summary of Policymakers should be implemented.

### **[8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors]**

8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors  
The responsible body for handling potential errors shall be addressed in the recommendations of the Task Group on Governance and Management. In this respect, Cross-Task Group review is important in the 33rd Panel of the IPCC.

### **[9. IPCCs Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty]**

9. IPCC's Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty  
The final guidance note on evaluation of evidence and treatment of uncertainty to be presented to the 33rd Panel of the IPCC should be a common approach to the treatment of uncertainty in all the three Working Groups.

### **[10. IPCC Guidance material]**

10. IPCC Guidance material

All the IPCC guidance material need to be classed as supporting material, and this should be further considered by the Panel of the IPCC.

**[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures

Since the Task Group members do not have the mandate given by the 32nd session of the IPCC to consider the issues as noted in the Addendum, therefore, the matters must go back to the Panel of the IPCC for consideration - the 33rd Panel of the IPCC should further discuss those issues and make decision.

# **Morocco**

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

\* Target audiences:

The major target audiences of the communications efforts of the IPCC are governments and policy-makers. Engaging with the Media is an important way in which the IPCC can communicate its findings, processes and procedures. Speaking of broader audiences, we think that the IPCC should ensure that information is available and accessible for these audiences, particularly the kids through its website and/or via specialized organizations.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

We support the Task Group's proposition that the policy is entitled a Management of Interests Policy to signal that interests are inevitable and conflicts have to be managed rather than completely avoided. We think this is a very good step so as to underpin the credibility of IPCC.

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

\* Guidance documents:

In section 10 of this document, the Task Group recommends that the Panel may wish to give further consideration of this group of guidance materials with the aim of developing appropriate procedures. These guidance documents are important for each group/individual. However, we are not sure of the effectiveness of these guidance documents that ultimately will be used or converted into final procedures. Many documents might not be practical for an efficient process.

# Netherlands

## General Comments on Overall Procedure

### [General Comments]

(1): The Netherlands welcomes the first results of the Task Groups. We remain fully committed to engage in discussions in these Task Groups with the aim to restore, improve and maintain credibility and authority of the IPCC as an unbiased and comprehensive scientific body that considers the full range of scientific views.

(2): Task groups should prepare clear draft decisions on all IAC recommendations for IPCC-33. In addition, they should interpret their mandate as not strictly limited to responding only to the recommendations of the IAC, if deemed important to support the broader context of IPCC reform. The Task Groups mandates give an opening to broaden the work of the Task Groups beyond the IAC recommendations, since they contain a sentence "The Task Group is specifically requested to address, inter alia, the issues listed in Annex I to this decision" (being the IAC recommendations, NL)

(3): All four task groups should fulfill their mandate completely. \*\*For each of the issues the Task Group should establish a timetable for action, consider resource implications and identify responsibilities for implementation\*\*. The Task Groups should complete their work in this regard including taking into account: - those recommendations that should be applied to the AR5. These should be implemented as soon as possible but in all cases before November 2011 (that is before completion and review of the first First Order Draft of WG I) - Recommendations that should be applied to subsequent assessment periods. These should be decided by the Panel at the latest by early 2014.

(4): The four Task Groups are requested to identify crosscutting issues and report how these are handled.

(5): We kindly request all four Task Groups to follow a comparable format for reporting and deliver clear draft decision texts with rationales for IPCC-33.

(6): In case there would be issues or proposals that need further work after IPCC 33, the Panel should extend the mandate of existing Task Groups at IPCC -33 or defining new mandates for one or more new task groups.

(7): The mandate does not exclude addressing the Principles Governing the IPCC work. Article 2 of the Principles describes the role of IPCC: "is to assess the information relevant to understanding the scientific basis of the risk of human-induced climate change, its potential impacts and options for adaptation and mitigation". We suggest a slightly different text that would better reflect the consideration of the \*\*full range of scientific views\*\* as recommended by the IAC: "the scientific basis of the risk of climate change, including human-induced influence, its potential..."

## Governance: Executive Committee

### [General Comments]

The performance of the Executive Committee should be evaluated by the Panel after a trial period of 2 years after its inception

(1): its mandate and mode of operation may be adjusted.

(2): The Executive Committee should become operational in 2011 in order to effectively fulfill its mandate.

### [3f]

this should be brought in line with the recommendation of the Task Group on Procedures that states for scoping meetings: "Participants should be selected by the IPCC Bureau or the respective Working Group Bureau/Task Force".

#### **[4]**

(1): the IPCC Vice chairs should be part of the Executive committee including voting rights.

(2): **ex officio** means by virtue of ones office. Consequently, all proposed members of the EC are ex officio, with the possible exception of members from outside IPCC, which might be appointed in a personal capacity. We suggest to distinguish between elected and appointed, and/or between voting and non-voting members of the EC and not to use the term **ex officio**

#### **[5]**

(1): the IPCC Vice chairs should be part of the Executive committee including voting rights.

(2): **ex officio** means by virtue of ones office. Consequently, all proposed members of the EC are ex officio, with the possible exception of members from outside IPCC, which might be appointed in a personal capacity. We suggest to distinguish between elected and appointed, and/or between voting and non-voting members of the EC and not to use the term **ex officio**

#### **[6c]**

**ex officio** means by virtue of ones office. Consequently, all proposed members of the EC are ex officio, with the possible exception of members from outside IPCC, which might be appointed in a personal capacity. We suggest to distinguish between elected and appointed, and/or between voting and non-voting members of the EC and not to use the term **ex officio**

### **Governance: Executive Director**

#### **[Proposal 2]**

the Executive Committee or its members should decide what messages to convey to the media. Both the senior communication officer and the Secretary have an advisory role. Please specify their tasks and responsibilities

#### **[Proposal 3]**

We suggest including the position of the senior communication officer in addition to the two other senior posts, including specification of their tasks and responsibilities.

#### **[Proposal 5]**

include the senior Communications position.

### **Governance: General Comments**

#### **[General Comments]**

(1): There should be periodical audits of the performance of IPCC by an external body - like the InterAcademy Council has done with its review

(2): these may be staggered for the different WGs and TFI or before decisions are taken for a next assessment period. These audits should be seen as a part of the quality management of a large organization.

(3): The IPCC needs a full time chairperson, as a step in further empowerment of its organization, in order to meet its increased governance and management demands. Current practice is a part-time chairmanship.

(4): The Task Group should present terms of reference for Chair, co-chairs, vice chairs, WG vice chairs, TFI board.

(5): All decisions other than those with regard to the terms of office should be implemented as soon as possible but no later than November 2011

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

(1): We request the Task Group to provide the Panel with a transparent and critical analysis of the crisis in 2010 and what lessons can be drawn, without finger pointing at individuals.

(2): The text should be more concise - clear draft decision texts are needed. We suggest to follow format: IAC decision - rationales - draft decision texts, while avoiding trivial statements and focusing on what has to change related to current practices

(3): The suggested responsibilities of the senior communications manager are too big. Please note that this individual formally reports only to the IPCC Secretary. The Executive Committee or its members should decide on what messages to convey to the public media. The terms of reference of the senior communication manager should be coordinated with the TG on Governance and Management.

### **[Principles]**

Third bullet: please delete "supporting material" is not accepted or approved by the IPCC

### **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

Engagement of focal points may not always be effective given time and resource constraints.

### **[Guidelines]**

(1): Authorized spokespersons:

(i): this paragraph should specifically address the position of the IPCC chair, being the most visible person and held responsible by the public and media for all matters concerning IPCC, justified or not. Therefore, the chair of IPCC should be extremely careful in voicing personal views in the media on climate science or climate policies - also when he is publicly speaking in another capacity than IPCC chair as his views will always be linked by the media to the IPCC.

(ii): Spokespersons should avoid presenting themselves as the 'Nobel prize laureate' in person but clarify that the Nobel peace price was for the IPCC organization as a whole

(2): Rapid response: A clear 'management script' should be available that should be used in case of a crisis. This script should be part of the Communication strategy. It should include the role, tasks and responsibilities of all involved individuals in IPCC, and clearly indicate how decisions are taken. Responses to media should be in principle available within 24 hours. The Task Group is invited to co-ordinate this issue with the Governance and Management team.

(3): Errors:

(a): this issue should be dealt with in co-ordination with the TG on Procedures.  
(b): The IPCC secretariat should have a publicly accessible website for reporting potential errors and pro-actively invite stakeholders to use this facility. The handling of errors needs procedures ensuring co-ordination on between the communication manager, the executive team, the WG /T|FI co-chairs and authors. Resource issues need to be addressed.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

(1): Please present one proposal without options to ensure decision making by the Panel.  
(2): 'management of interest panel': please do not provide 4 options but a clear recommendation; please do not submit bracketed texts in the final Task Group report.  
(3): Make clear who should report their relationships to whom

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[1. General Comments]**

The opportunity should be taken to repair some technical flaws in Procedures in consultation with the Secretariat, such as:

(1): adding the practice of the SPM review, overview chapters and/or Synthesis reports preceding approval sessions  
(2): ensuring the possibility of having more than 2 Review editors in a chapter

### **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

it should be emphasized that newspapers and magazines are in no circumstances valid sources of scientific knowledge. We suggest adding the possibility to refer to both sources only in case it is necessary to note media attention to climate events relevant for the report.

### **[6. Report Review]**

The review editors may be easily overloaded with work. It is important to involve the whole writing team in handling the review comments. In addition, we suggest to add to the author team young scientists as chapter assistants helping with basic quality checks, such as correct referencing

### **[8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors]**

To date, no correction has been posted on the IPCC website about the Himalaya error that started the IPCC crisis more than one year ago. The Panel IPCC-32 has urged the IPCC Chair and co-chairs to finalize the error protocol and implement it. IPCC 32 also decided that further analysis to be considered by the Task Group on Procedures with the view to submit a proposal for a decision at IPCC-33. We request the TG on Procedures to fulfill this task and inquire about the progress in finalizing the error protocol in the Executive team.

### **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

We believe this addendum contains very useful suggestions which are all within the mandate of the Task Group given the inter alia clause – and we urge the Task



Group to develop draft decision texts for consideration by the Panel for all of these suggestions. We particularly wish to highlight the following suggestions:

- (1): making expert reviews anonymous; we request the TG also to list the pros and cons (11.3)
- (2): making review comment responses available for expert and government reviewers during the assessment process (11.3)
- (3): document the range of scientific views if there is no consensus (11.3).
- (4): strengthen the role of the CLAs at the SPM approval sessions;
- (5): defining guidance notes and guidance documents and its relation to the IPCC Procedures

# **New Zealand**

## **Governance: Executive Committee**

### **[General Comments]**

1. A role of Chief Financial Officer with budget accountability should be included on the Executive Committee 2. Consider the need to introduce additional management capability in the Executive Committee (This could be via a representative of WMO or UNEP) 3. Establishment of an Executive Committee will require some redefinition of the roles and accountability of the existing Bureau, TSU and secretariat

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[General Comments]**

The term of office for Chair and Co Chairs should be limited to five years with provision for possible extension of up to 2 years. (This will address the issue of a potential move away from a single large assessment process to a more ongoing process)

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[Guidelines]**

1. Include mention of the importance of effective internal comms so elected reps and membership are advised personally and usually in advance of public comment so they are not surprised by their own organisation's public comments 2. Media training for any spokespeople should be mandatory 3. The Working Group Vice-Chairs should be added to the list of those who WG Co-Chairs may engage as spokespersons.

### **[Implementing the new strategy]**

1. How will you drive readers to the website? Other than publishing address on press releases? Consider partnerships with other websites or the govt focal points described earlier to provide links?

2. in regard to "other technologies"...would you consider use of social media? Facebook? Twitter? Official IPCC blog?

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

1 Anonymous expert review: We do not support anonymous expert review. Under the general IPCC principles of transparency the names of the expert reviewers should be available to the lead authors who are deciding how to address their comments, and should also be available in the archive of review comments. 2 Role of Coordinating Lead Authors at the SPM Approval Session: we agree with the Task Group's comment that "changes in the SPM text are adopted only if the relevant CLAs can ensure that these changes are consistent with the scientific findings in the underlying report"

# Norway

## **Governance: Executive Committee**

### **[4]**

Norway welcomes the proposal of establishing an Executive Committee. We would like to see the committee composed of the IPCC Chair, the Working Group and Task-Force Co-Chairs, the Vice-Chairs of the IPCC and the Head of the Secretariat. Other representatives should be invited to the meetings of the Executive Committee when needed.

We are however concerned about the danger of establishing another large and potentially inflexible structure within the IPCC. We therefore support a certain flexibility regarding the quorum - still ensuring that all Working Groups are represented before decisions are taken.

### **[6k]**

We would like to see the development of Terms of Reference for the Executive Committee - and would suggest that the Bureau updates these Terms of Reference upon the start of each mandate period.

We will underline the importance of transparency related to the work in the Executive Committee and would recommend inclusion of a point stating that the minutes from the meetings in the Executive Committee should be sent to the IPCC Focal Points and the IPCC Bureau members.

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[Rational 1]**

Norway supports that the IPCC head of Secretariat should continue to be an appointed position.

### **[Rational 4]**

Norway would prefer that the term of the IPCC head of Secretariat should be limited to a certain number of years, however for continuity reasons the maximum total period should be longer for the Head of the Secretariat than for the IPCC Chair and the Co-chairs. Norway also sees the potential for greater emphasis on communications and maintaining external representation, as well as overall management.

## **Governance: General Comments**

### **[General Comments]**

General comments

Norway welcomes the proposals from the Task Group and is in general very happy with the draft document. We still find the document to be a bit short about the motivation or rationale for various proposals, in particular we would like to see the motivation elaborated when the recommendations are not in line with the recommendations of the IAC.

We have noticed that a few issues in Annex II to the decision to establish the Task Group so far are not dealt with by the Task Group. We therefore suggest that the Task Group develops a proposal about the need to clarify the roles and responsibilities for all Bureau members, including the IPCC Chair as noted in Annex II ch 4.3 in the decisions from the IPCC plenary (ToR for the Task Group on Management). Furthermore we would like this to include a clarification of the role of the TSUs..

Increased transparency is a priority in the IAC review. Norway therefore suggests that the minutes from IPCC Bureau meetings, WG Bureau meetings and Executive Committee meetings should be sent to the IPCC Government Focal Points and the members of the IPCC Bureau and (the secretariat and TSUs).

The TSUs are not dealt with by the Task Group and Norway would like to stress the importance of TSUs functioning as secretariats for all Co-Chairs in their respective Working Group / Task Force.

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[Rational 1]**

Terms of office, the IPCC Chair and Working Group Co-Chairs  
Norway supports the proposals from the Task Group, including the proposed model to ensure the institutional memory and transfer between the outgoing and incoming chair.

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

Norway is in general happy with the draft recommendations from the Task Group on Communications. It is important that in the next step, during the development of the actual communications strategy, the goals of IPCC communications activities are further defined.

Further, a separate crisis communications strategy must be put in place.

### **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

First paragraph: Would it make sense to replace "physical sciences" with "natural sciences" ?

Global engagement

As the outreach capacity of the IPCC as such is limited Norway finds it important that the IPCC supports the IPCC Focal Points and ensures that they are in a position to assist in the outreach and communications activities of the IPCC. This must be taken into consideration when developing the actual communications strategy of the IPCC.

The last word in the second paragraph: Is "positions" the right term?

Web presence

The IPCC should prioritize a well-functioning website directed at targeted audiences which also serves the IPCC Focal Points in their own communications and outreach activities.

### **[Target audiences]**

Norway finds it important to include the UNFCCC in the list of major target audiences.

## **[Guidelines]**

Selecting authorized spokespersons for the organization as a whole, and for individual reports, 2nd bullet point:

In reality a large number of authors will have to be available for national media during the release of reports. It is therefore important that the IPCC and the Government Focal Points support and facilitate the authors so that they can prepare well for these releases.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

Norway welcomes the work of the Task Group on Management of the Conflict of Interests: We find this work crucial to ensure a more transparent IPCC.

### **[Policy Statement]**

3b: Norway finds it very important to encourage the participation of individuals from developing countries in the work of the IPCC. We are still wondering if it is through the Conflict of Interests policy such participation should be encouraged.

3h: Norway would like to see that compliance with the IPCC Management of Interest Policy is made obligatory.

5a: If a mechanism to manage potential conflicts of interest is established we would like to reserve the term "Panel" to the IPCC itself and are therefore proposing to rename the structure to a Management of Interest Board or Group.

7b: Norway would like to underline that the members of the Management of Interest Panel/Board/Group will have to be highly professional. We also find it beneficial if the panel members are not too closely linked to the IPCC. We would therefore prefer either option 1 (representatives of the parent organizations) or option 3 (external representatives).

7c: If the Panel decides to establish such a body, the role, mandate and procedures of the body must be described thoroughly in publicly available documents. Furthermore we would like to reserve the term Panel to the IPCC itself and are therefore proposing to rename the structure to a e.g. Management of Interest Board IPCC Management of Interest Group

8: Norway would suggest to find another term than "in extreme circumstances" or to take this part of the sentence out.

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[1. General Comments]**

The IAC review and the task group have identified a number of areas for potential improvements and Norway very much welcomes the proposals for improving the procedures of the IPCC. Still, it remains important to identify the resources needed to implement the various recommendations and it would be important to secure that IPCC can work as efficient as possible.

Norway supports most of the recommendations listed in section 11 and suggests that most of them are included in the draft recommendations from the Task Group to the IPCC plenary. See detailed comments under section 11.

In order to enhance the transparency we propose that the IPCC Government Focal Points are kept better informed about the selection of participants at different kinds of meetings and in author teams as soon as the selection is done.

## **[2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings]**

Norway supports the proposal. Furthermore the relevant IPCC Government Focal points should be informed about the selection of participants from their own country.

## **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

Norway supports these two recommendations from the TG. Furthermore the relevant IPCC Government Focal points should be informed about the selection of authors from their own country.

## **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

(1) Norway supports the recommendation from the TG

(2) The TG says: The TG, after consulting the WG /TFI TSUs, found that the implementation of this IAC recommendation regarding the appropriate flagging of unpublished and non-peer reviewed literature would not be practical.

Would it be wise to include an explanation of why this is not practical?

## **[5. Handling the Full Range of Views]**

Norway supports the recommendation from the TG

## **[6. Report Review]**

Norway supports the recommendation from the TG

## **[7. Summary for Policymakers]**

Norway supports the recommendation from the TG

## **[8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors]**

Norway supports the recommendation from the TG

## **[9. IPCCs Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty]**

Norway supports the recommendation from the TG

## **[10. IPCC Guidance material]**

Norway supports the recommendation from the TG and also suggests that the concrete suggestions in 11.7 are included in the recommendation to the IPCC Plenary.

## **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

11.1 General comment

Norway regards most of these issues relevant to the IPCC treatment of the IAC review. We suggest that most of them are included in the recommendations from the Task Group to the IPCC Plenary for their consideration.

#### 11.2 Nomination and selection process

Norway supports the development of thorough and publicly available descriptions of both the scoping process and the nomination process. We suggest that these proposals are included in the recommendations from the TG to the IPCC Plenary.

There is a word missing between "current" and "by" in the first sentence under the subtitle "Nomination process"? For instance "practice"?

#### 11.3 Review process

Availability of review comments and responses:

Norway supports making review comment responses files available to the reviewers as soon as possible after their completion. We suggest that this proposal is included in the recommendations from the TG to the IPCC Plenary.

Anonymous expert review:

Norway would like to see an evaluation of previous practices with anonymous expert reviews before moving on with this proposal. Further, we find it unnecessary to treat the Governments' comments anonymously.

Improving quality and completeness of review:

Norway finds it important that the review process is organized so that it covers the full report. We also see the need for including cross checking by lead authors from other Working Groups. We suggest that this proposal is included in the recommendations from the TG to the IPCC Plenary.

Range of scientific views

Norway supports that this proposal is put forward to the IPCC Plenary for their consideration.

Repository

If establishing a repository the IPCC should prioritize non-journal based literature as this is more difficult to get compared to journal based articles.

#### 11.4 Approval and acceptance of summaries for policymakers

Norway supports the procedures to be amended so that they reflect the current practice and role of Coordinating Lead Authors in the SPM approval sessions. In our view the CLAs are doing an excellent job in assuring the SPMs to be scientifically correct.

#### 11.5 Synthesis report

Norway supports that the procedures should include a specification of the SYR review process along the lines of current practice.

#### 11.6: Workshops and expert meetings

Norway supports clarification of the procedures describing the processes for selecting participants for Workshops and Expert meetings. Furthermore the relevant IPCC Government Focal points should be informed about the selection of participants from their own country.

#### 11.7 Guidance documents

Norway finds the development of such guidance documents useful and underlines that such guidelines should serve to enhance transparency and support common rules. We suggest that this proposal is included in the recommendations from the TG to the IPCC Plenary.



# Peru

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[Proposal 4a]**

Peru supports option a with a slight modification. Shall read: "The term should be limited to 10 years, starting from the next assessment cycle"

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

Key points of the Proposals

In paragraph 5, 2nd line, replace the word "body" for "IPCC Plenary Committee constituted by members from all WMO regions not participating in the IPCC Bureau."

### **[Policy Statement]**

IPCC Management of Interests Policy

In paragraph 7 b. Peru supports Option 2, that shall read: "Representatives from the IPCC Plenary from all WMO regions and not participating in the IPCC Bureau".

In paragraph 8, the text shall read: "Failure to make a disclosure will result in a call for appropriate mitigating measures. Failure to undertake the requested appropriate mitigating measure may result in an individual being excluded from certain activities or processes or, in extreme circumstances, being asked to step down."

# Republic of Korea

## **Governance: Executive Committee**

### **[4]**

We recommend that the Executive Committee include IPCC Vice-Chairs along with IPCC Chair, Working Group and Task Force Co-Chairs, Head of Secretariat. IPCC Vice Chairs should be voting members of the Executive committee; IPCC VCs are elected official by the Panel.

The IPCC Bureau reflects balanced geographic representation with due consideration for scientific and technical requirements, as provided in paragraph 5 of the Principles and Procedures of the IPCC. The IPCC Vice-Chairs should be included in the Executive Committee with full membership not as ex-officio members.

### **[6c]**

IPCC Vice Chairs should be voting members of the Executive committee; IPCC Vice Chairs are elected official by the Panel.

# **Russian Federation**

## **General Comments on Overall Procedure**

### **[General Comments]**

First of all, we would like to thank all TGs established at the 32nd IPCC Plenary session for their efforts on working out the recommendations and thorough preparation of the drafts.

However, we would like to suggest some amendments and additions aiming at the improvement of the drafts. Our comments concerning some aspects of the proposals from the TGs are given below.

## **Governance: Executive Committee**

### **[General Comments]**

We support the TG recommendations on this subject in general. However, some details certainly require clarification and/or correction:

1. The specification "in particular with respect to the production of IPCC reports" (item 2) is misleading and it should be deleted. It is the IPCC Bureau that should mainly supervise and coordinate the preparation of scientific reports, not the Executive Committee.
2. We do not agree that the Executive Committee should have power "... to provide guidance to the Chair, other members of the Bureau ..." (see TG recommendation 3e). The Bureau members are IPCC top level scientists elected by the Plenary and reported to the Plenary. Therefore, we suggest this part of the phrase should be deleted.
3. Item 3f: We believe Executive Committee would be very helpful in selecting participants for inter-group IPCC meetings. However attendees of group meetings should be selected by respective WGs' Bureaux.
4. Size and composition of EC: it seems reasonable to include IPCC Chair, all WGs' Co-Chairs, IPCC Vice-Chairs into Executive Committee as voting members, and a Head of the IPCC Secretariat as an ex-officio member. While WGs' Co-Chairs are fully responsible for the preparation of IPCC scientific reports, IPCC Vice-Chairs could take specific responsibility on other important activities, in particular, they would help the IPCC Chair in the development of communication strategy and the involvement of experts from developing countries into IPCC work, as well as in representing the IPCC scientific findings and views to the world community.
5. It should be emphasized that EC is to be composed of elected IPCC Bureau members and the Head of the IPCC Secretariat (ex-officio) with no additional elections.

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[General Comments]**

We support the Task Group recommendations on this subject in general. With regard to the limits on the term of the head of Secretariat, we suggest that the IPCC should follow the current WMO practice.

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[General Comments]**

We support the Task Group recommendations on this subject in general. With regard to IPCC Chair and WGs' Co-Chairs term, it would be expedient to define the term precisely as one assessment cycle, because assessment reports are and will be the most important IPCC products in the foreseeable future.

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

We support the proposed approach in general. However, some aspects should be formulated more distinctly and in a simpler way.

It would be expedient, if two key persons were responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the IPCC communication strategy, namely,

- an IPCC Vice-Chair responsible for communications and
- a communication manager, officer with the IPCC Secretariat.

The communication manager monitors the publications and statements related to the IPCC work, including negative ones. He/she collects and systematizes external inquiries submitted to the IPCC, and prepares a monthly draft note highlighting the IPCC current work and responding to the above publications, statements and inquiries. WGs' TSUs and Bureaux are to be involved in the preparation of the note, if an issue relates to their sphere. After approval of the draft by the IPCC Vice-Chair responsible for communications, the communication manager makes the monthly note publicly accessible through the open IPCC website.

Once in three months the IPCC Vice-Chair responsible for communications with assistance of the communication manager calls a press-conference where a three-month summary of the IPCC current activity and responses to publications and statements related to the IPCC work, including negative ones, are to be presented. Other IPCC officials and experts may be involved if necessary. After the press-conference the summary is to be published through the open IPCC website.

No publications or statements, including negative ones, should be answered by the communication officer or any other IPCC official hastily or carelessly, it being not a proper style for a serious scientific organization like the IPCC.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

The proposal is too complex. A simple "IPCC Disclosure of Relevant Interests Form" seems to be sufficient. "Register of Interests" and special "Management of Interest Panel" appears redundant. The disclosure forms should be stored by the IPCC Secretariat.

WGs' Bureaux could be responsible for the management of interests within respective WGs including TSUs.

IPCC Vice-Chairs (as members of Executive Committee) could be responsible for the management of interests with regard to IPCC Bureau members and the IPCC Secretariat.

All problems should be reported to the IPCC Bureau. In all the cases an ultimate decision in regard to concrete individuals should be endorsed by the IPCC Plenary.

Specific comments:

Subject: item 2 "Definitions".

In section "2. Definition", subsection "a. Conflict of interest": The definition can be shortened: "A "conflict of interest" refers to any current financial or other interest of an individual which could negatively influence, or could be seen as negatively influencing, the individual in carrying out his or her duties and responsibilities for the IPCC in accordance with "Principles Governing the IPCC Work".

The rest of the section is unclear, because the notions "real", "perceived", "potential", "direct", "indirect" are ambiguous, and some of those notions may be conflicting with "current" - see above.

Subject: section 2, subsection "a. Disclosure".

Our proposed additions are given in capitals: "Disclosure in the context of this policy means making known any interest OF AN INDIVIDUAL ASSOCIATED WITH THE IPCC which might conflict with the capacity of IPCC to fulfil its role or undermine its credibility. SUCH Interests are TO BE declared via the "IPCC Disclosure of Relevant Interests Form".

Subject: item 3 "Principles", section h).

While reforming the IPCC, one should not forget that IPCC authors and review-editors are volunteers. They bring very valuable scientific knowledge to decision makers and the public. They work for free for the IPCC, with no contracts and salaries. So, one should be very cautious with proposals on "obligatory" declarations.

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings]**

Scoping meeting is a very important initial point in the process of preparation of IPCC reports. As the IPCC is an intergovernmental body, the right to nominate participants should be limited and given to government Focal Points and IPCC Bureau members. The major criteria are to be scientific expertise, geographical distribution, and awareness of nominees on needs of governments in climate change related information.

### **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

1. Acceptable sources of information, besides scientific journal papers, should be limited to a) scientific monographs having an editorial board or a scientific editor, b) scientific reports prepared by governmental agencies and national/international scientific organizations, and c) proceedings of scientific conferences having an editorial board. All such publications must have ISBN. Use of information sources of any other type in the IPCC reports is unacceptable.

2. It remains unclear who will store the archive collected by a given TSU after the assessment cycle is ended.

### **[8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors]**

According to IAC recommendations, IPCC should work out a mechanism for correction errors that may be found in approved IPCC reports. However, the error correction process ought to be initiated by a formal letter from a government, a national/international institution dealing with climate change issues, or an IPCC Bureau member. Request of individuals should be first considered by the IPCC Bureau or respective WG Bureau (this could be made through electronic discussion).

### **[9. IPCCs Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty]**

1) Very often, complexity and non-linearity of processes in nature and socio-economic sphere lead to enormous difficulties in accurate estimating/assigning probabilities for particular parameters to be assessed in the IPCC reports. Therefore, the probabilistic approach should be applied very cautiously and only in cases where it is crucially needed (e.g., in comparative analysis, in attribution exercises, etc.) when a result even cannot be formulated with no

confidence statement. In other cases it would be just an unnecessary additional load for the authors.

2) Probabilistic evaluation and confidence statements are generally understood with difficulties by decision makers and the public. They also very often lead to ambiguous conclusions. Therefore, such information should be given in the IPCC products as clear and simple as possible. It is expedient to have a unified scale for characterizing uncertainty/confidence throughout all IPCC products.

# Spain

## **General Comments on Overall Procedure**

### **[General Comments]**

Spain welcomes the invitation by the TG Co-Chairs and the IPCC Secretariat to provide written comments to draft recommendations prepared by the Task Groups in preparation of the 33rd Session of IPCC in Abu Dhabi. Spain would like to express its gratitude to TG Co-chairs and members for the hard work made. Spain also highly appreciates the value proposals and recommendations contained in the TG documents

Spain is submitting its preliminary comments to the TG proposals and is looking forward to sharing its views with other governments during the next IPCC Plenary in Abu Dhabi.

## **Governance: Executive Committee**

### **[1]**

We support to establish an Executive Committee as well as the purpose reflected in the TG proposal (proposals 1 and 2), but we would like to stress that particular attention should be paid to ensure that the establishment of the EC will not undermine any of the functions and responsibilities of the IPCC Bureau. Therefore we suggest to add some text mentioning it. One option could be to add at the end of para 1. or para 2. the following sentence:

The EC will not undermine any of the functions and responsibilities of the IPCC Bureau

### **[3f]**

On the Terms of Reference of EC , we propose to delete the paragraph f (in brackets) as we support that participants for scoping meetings, including Synthesis Report, should be selected by the IPCC Bureau or the respective Working Group Bureau/task Force, as it is mentioned in the document on the recommendations by the IPCC Task Group on Procedures (page 3, section 2, last paragraph).

### **[4]**

Regarding size and composition (proposals 4 and 5) we consider that the Executive Committee must include: IPCC Chair, the three IPCC Vice Chairs, Working Group and Task Force Co-Chairs and Head of Secretariat (ex-officio). It could also be useful that WG/Task Force Co-Chairs could be accompanied by the Heads of the TSU as advisors. However, we do not support to have members external to the IPCC in the EC as we do not see any need or advantage on it.

From our perspective the role of the IPCC Vice Chairs in the EC could be mainly focussed for cross cutting issues and for the implementation of the IPCC communication strategy.

### **[6a]**

Concerning the mode of operation (proposal 6), in the proposed text it is not mentioning who should be the EC Chair. In our opinion, the IPCC Chair should also be the EC Chair.

So, we propose to add in 6., after paragraph a., a new one:

abis) IPCC Chair shall act as the Chair of the EC

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[Proposal 1]**

From our point of view, there is not a need for the creation of a new post for an Executive Director, in fact, as mentioned by the Task Group, the functions and qualifications specified in the IAC Report are broadly consistent with the job description for the current post of Secretary. We also agree that the title of "Executive Director" would not be appropriate of the IPCC Head of Secretariat of IPCC. In this context, we support TG proposals specified in para. 1 and para 2.

### **[Proposal 3]**

Regarding para 3, we recognize that it will be valuable that the Panel review the titles of the two seniors posts with a view to accurately reflecting their positions and responsibilities. But, we believe that for the review it would be important the participation of WMO and UNEP representatives, in particular for the evaluation of the potential implications that different options could have. In addition, it is also important for the review to complete all the work on the roles of the Secretariat and Bureau, that the TG can not finished due to time constraints.

### **[Proposal 4a]**

Concerning the limitation on the term of the head of Secretariat in principle we recognize benefits on fixing a term limit, but in order to avoid risks and undesirables gaps in the current Secretariat functioning, further discussions will be needed about implications, numbers or years, and on the most appropriate time for applying the limits on the term.

### **[Proposal 5]**

With regard to para 5, from our perspective it is essential that any WMO consultation to EC on the senior posts of the secretariat is made in a transparent way ensuring the participation of all members of EC. In this regard, it could be useful to add some text to the current one for more clarity.

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[Proposal 1]**

we agree with the proposal to restrict the term of office to one term, only in the case that this limitation will be applied after the completion of the AR5, for the next assessment cycle or another time period as defined by the Panel.

Even though it is mentioned in the TG Cometary/rational, we consider that for more clarity it should also be explicitly mentioned in the recommendations to the IPCC Panel, therefore we propose to add in the proposals a new paragraph

1(bis) the limitation of the term of office shall be applied after the completion of the AR5



## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[Principles]**

Spain considers crucial the implementation of an effective communications strategy in IPCC and, in general, agrees with the recommendation of the Task Group. The recommendations establish clearly the essential principles and cover most of the issues.

### **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

We welcome the proposal on the engagement of national focal point as they could play an important role not only in the communication strategy of their countries but also to harmonize and ensure the consistency of the IPCC communication strategy as a whole. In this context, the development of some guidelines could be beneficial.

In addition, in order to increase the presence of outreach and communication of the countries in the framework of the IPCC communication strategy could also be beneficial to incorporate in the IPCC Web specific material that can be produced by the different countries members of the IPCC or institution, indicating that the material has been prepared under the respective country or institution.

### **[Guidelines]**

In relation to the guidelines on who should speak on behalf of the IPCC, in our view is very important to have a clear definition of who would be responsible to speak on the different aspects, as well as to ensure good internal coordination in the preparation of the external communications. In addition, it would be highly recommendable to minimize the number of spokespersons, to ensure better identification of them abroad and especially by the media.

Concerning to who should speak, in general terms, we find the Task Force proposals quite clear and adequate, but we believe that the Chairman or his designate should also be authorized to speak on the content of the Summaries for Policymakers and in particular on the content of the Synthesis Report.

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[1. General Comments]**

We believe that the proposals made by the Task Group are very clear, detailed and cover very well all issues on procedures raised in the IAC report.

Concerning the additional issues raised by the Task Group, which are not strictly under the mandate given to the Task Group, from our perspective it would be very beneficial to continue working on them. Our suggestion is to discuss and decide on the way forward in the IPCC Plenary Session in Abu Dhabi. One option could be to extend the mandate of the Task Group with the view to submit a proposal with recommendations for consideration of the Panel in the next Plenary Session.

# Sweden

## Governance: Executive Committee

### **[General Comments]**

IPCC has to be careful not to make the processes too bureaucratic. Sweden finds most of the suggestions good or acceptable, although believing that the IPCC already has very solid rules and procedures but need a better process for rechecking that the material in the reports are in compliance with these. The establishment of an Executive Committee could be a step in that direction. On the other hand, It might be timely to update the role and mandate of the Bureau. Why was the E-Team established, when there already was a Bureau? The mandate of the Bureau is to select authors and assist Co-Chairs, which is now discussed for the EC. Further, will the EC replace the E-Team? If not, is there room enough for three different bodies where the IPCC Chair and Co-Chairs are involved? Will it be possible to find time for meetings? How to avoid unnecessary overlapping? Specific general comment: Should members of the panel simply be mentioned as the panel? Is it time for re-evaluation of the role of the IPCC Bureau in light of the establishment of an Executive Committee?

### **[1]**

We support the proposal to establish an Executive Committee. However, we believe it is necessary to distinctly define the roles for the EC and the Bureau and possibly close down the E-Team.

### **[2]**

It has to be more elaborated on what is really included in the mandate of the EC to act on behalf of the IPCC between sessions.

### **[3a]**

OK but how is the relation towards and between the Bureau and the E-Team? There should not be overlapping between these three bodies.

### **[3b]**

EC shall act on behalf of the Panel but giving notice to Focal Points when so has been done

### **[3c]**

Agree

### **[3d]**

Agree

### **[3e]**

Agree

### **[3f]**

This is quite delicate and shows very clearly that the line between the Bureau and the EC is diffuse. EC will have an enormous strategic power if they shall select participants, on the other hand if this power stays in the Bureau, some Governments will have a much greater possibility to influence on selecting participants than others.

### **[4]**

OK but we would like to add also the Vice Chairs, in accordance with both WG Co-Chairs being in the EC. Sweden's view is that no ex-officio, except the Head of Secretariat, should be in the EC.

We believe that the EC could be composed of  
IPCC Chair  
Vice Chairs  
WG and Task Force Co-Chairs  
Head of Secretariat

### **[5]**

We do not agree on a large EC.

The EC should have a close collaboration with the Bureau and therefore TSUs participation in this group is not necessary. While the Bureau also contains several Government representatives at the Bureau meetings, the EC should be kept small and focussed.

Regarding External to the IPCC we are hesitating. Representatives from WMO and UNEP could be an option, but it has to be discussed which competence these persons should have.

### **[6a]**

Should go without saying

### **[6b]**

OK

### **[6c]**

Sweden believes that the EC should only consist of elected persons except the Head of Secretariat.

### **[6d]**

OK

### **[6e]**

One of the Vice Chairs should replace the IPCC Chair if he/she cannot be present

### **[6f]**

OK

### **[6g]**

OK. We see this possibility to be a better option instead of having external persons onboard as regular participants

### **[6h]**

OK

### **[6i]**

OK

### **[6k]**

It is important that the EC is transparent and that the availability of conclusions and decisions (6i) will keep Panel members updated between the yearly meetings.

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[General Comments]**

Sweden supports all bullets proposed by the TG, but see further 4a.

### **[Proposal 4a]**

We support the term to be limited to 8-10 years.

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[General Comments]**

Sweden support the Option no 1 (one term). The rationale for this is that keeping the same organisation for more than 10 years will have a conservative effect. It is also part of the critique to the IPCC that there is a certain party that manage/influence/steer the IPCC results. We suggest a change in the last sentence: with the provision of possible extension for exceptional cases if the Panel so decides. In option no 2, which we do not support, the roles between Chair and Chair Elect is not defined. The Bureau shall be consulted, but what happens when Chair and Chair Elect have different opinions?

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

Sweden supports the proposals by the Task Group and acknowledge that communications is a very important part of the IPCC work. Therefore, to finalise the communication strategy should be one of the first priorities.

The process for handling errors has to be developed in close connection with the Executive Committee.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

Sweden does not have any special comments on this section

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[1. General Comments]**

Sweden believes that the IPCC has a solid set of procedures even though there are always room to make them even better.

What is needed is to have a stern review process that can be monitored all through the work with the reports.

### **[2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings]**

it should read "in the first hand scientific expertise but also geographical distribution, gender etc."

While the selection procedure is also under discussion in the EC, it should be further elaborated on where this process shall take place.

### **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

we agree on this recommendation

### **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

We agree to the text in the box on Annex 2, but we would like to remove "In principle" in the last row on page 4.

In page 5, bullet 1, Responsibilities, second para: Authors who wish to include information from a non-journal based source that is not commercially available. Does that mean a commercially or publicly? Or commercially or non-commercially?

### **[5. Handling the Full Range of Views]**

we agree to proposal in changeing in language

### **[6. Report Review]**

we agree to a staged process

### **[7. Summary for Policymakers]**

We support the TG recommendation to clarify the current practice in the procedures

### **[8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors]**

We are concerned about a procedure that invites for potential errors. It could lead to a huge amount of extra work load for the IPCC to deal with formally. It has to be defined what is meant by "potential error".

## **[9. IPCCs Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty]**

We are satisfied with the work done on the draft guidance not by WG Co-chairs and a coming inclusion in the procedures, in the end leading to a common approach in the WGs.

## **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

Improving quality and completeness of review, page 11, second para: Cross checking in this manner is very important

# UK

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

Preamble. We suggest adding the following text on the role of the Executive Committee and how this relates to the Senior Communications Manager: The Executive Committee will be ultimately responsible for ensuring that IPCCs Communications are appropriate, and that the Strategy meets the requirements of the Panel and is being delivered suitably. The Senior Communications Manager will work within the IPCCs Secretariat, but should also be considered an expert advisor to the Executive Committee on issues of communication.

### **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

Under Global Engagement, recommend extending the document to note that the IPCC Senior Communications Manager should also consider which external organisations and stakeholders should be kept aware of the activities of the IPCC, for example by receiving copies of relevant press notices. This Stakeholder List could be kept updated through time

Under Communication Responsibilities of the IPCC (page 4 to 5), we propose making one addition to this list of IPCC communication responsibilities: Respond effectively to incorrect representations of the IPCC and its processes, where these could be damaging to the IPCCs reputation.

### **[Guidelines]**

In the section on authorized spokespersons (page 6, final bullet point) we suggest adding a sentence to note that the Senior Communications Manager should be authorised to provide off the record briefings to provide background context

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

Generally overall very clear and well thought through. Needs more information on the functioning of the CoI Panel. How the policy will be implemented is unclear.

It would be good to see an affirmation that a simple clear explanatory note, with examples, that could be easily understood by people whose first language is not English is needed. Also there is an issue as to whether this explanatory note is part of the policy or a side document.

### **[Policy Statement]**

It would be good to see an affirmation that a simple clear explanatory note, with examples, that could be easily understood by people whose first language is not English is needed. Also there is an issue as to whether this explanatory note is part of the policy or a side document.

Para 3b) Why focus on Developing Countries? this may be perceived as prejudicial. Suggest deletion.

Para 3c) Why just highlight reports. Surely this is true for guidelines to and indeed any IPCC activity.

Para 3h) It is hard to escape the logic that this has to be universal.

Para 7b) Suggest calling it a committee to avoid confusion with the IPCC as the Panel.

More substantively we suggest that more will need to be agreed on this committee  
What are its terms of reference?

What powers would it have?

To whom does it report? the Panel?

How will members be chosen?

Should it have a chair or co-chairs?

What size should it be?

Should there be a time limit on how long people serve on it?

Para 8 How will decisions be taken on individuals? By majority voting? Consensus?

Will anyone transgressing the rule have a right of appeal?

Will expulsions be publicised in any way?

Is there a role here for the Executive Committee (noting they are subject to the same rules of course)?

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[1. General Comments]**

Where possible it would be useful to propose actual text that we can agree. There are quite a few areas where this would be possible. We should aim to minimise the number of issues that will require to be returned to subsequently.

What will be done with text/decisions on governance and management issues? How will this be written into the principles/procedures? Suggest text is prepared for the Plenary on this.

We dont yet have universal ToRs for the TSUs (WG2 has prepared a list) . Could these also be elaborated and included in the procedures? This could help with our response to other IAC recs, such as the selection of CLAs/LAs. We need to know more about how this is done currently. This may be for later?

In general we detect a lack of detailed guidance at WG level on how things are done. we should elaborate these on a longer time scale.

### **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

Prepare proposed text for 4.2.2 based on what is there

Propose text on requiring a report.

an we define better what we mean by gender balance? For example Writing team gender ratio the same as ratio in nominations?

The mandate is to make this process fairer and more transparent. The TG recommendation is to amend the current procedure text to reflect what we believe is current practice. It doesnt suggest ways forward to ensure transparency. Recommend a guidance note to TSUs on how to run the nominations process and ensure this is available on the IPCC website?

one way to do this is to get the TSUs to prepare such a note that would be endorsed first by the Bureau and then agreed by the Plenary as a complete doc (ie not line by line) .

### **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**



In the suggested Annex 2, recommend adding the word technical to the list of reports that are acceptable. Do we really want to include NGO reports or other docs emanating from advocacy organisations? Also we would want to make it explicit that policy documents shouldn't be included. Suggest we put together a more rigorous list of what literature is acceptable and what isn't.

Recommend an easy mechanism for flagging non journal based vs. journal based. Para 4. can we refer to peer reviewed and non peer reviewed literature. Splitting the world into journals and others is not quite the issue.

## **[7. Summary for Policymakers]**

Agreeing the SPM. If the process needs clarifying would be helpful to have some text that can be agreed.

## **[8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors]**

Process for handling of errors

1. This is a cross-cutting issue and should be treated as such
2. What is the current status of the document on the error protocol? Recommend that the TG PP considers it and comes up with recommended text to take to plenary. Otherwise this risks delaying decisions on this recommendation. Can a new section 4.5 be proposed? The outcome is not particularly clear.

## **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

Some of the proposals in Para 11. Addendum are helpful and can be dealt with now.

11.2 agree. Recommend preparing decision text

11.3 we should move to anonymous comments now - best way to remove bias

11.4 I can't see anything needs to be changed here

11.5 not clear what is being proposed here

11.6 Worth revisiting but not before IPCC 33

11.7 Important area which is too big to resolve now but definitely needs revisiting.

# **United States of America**

## **Governance: Executive Committee**

### **[General Comments]**

The US broadly supports the proposals in this document. The US has noted our preference where options are identified.

### **[3b]**

This sub-paragraph could be read as overly broad, and could encompass activities that would fall to the head of Secretariat, the Chair, or other IPCC leadership. To the extent that other sub-paragraphs cover the functions identified for the Executive Committee, this sub-paragraph may not be necessary.

### **[3c]**

We would propose to amend the sub-paragraph as follows " Ensure coordination in the effective and timely implementation of communication and outreach activities."

We will need to clarify the relative role of the Executive Committee and Secretariat in executing communication and outreach activities. This sub-paragraph could be combined with sub-paragraph 3(a)

### **[3f]**

This sub-paragraph may be more clearly constructed to read: "...such scoping meetings, workshops, and expert meetings that involve all three working groups."

### **[5]**

As a general matter, the Executive Committee should be comprised of members who have significant executive responsibilities for delivering the basic products of the IPCC to the Panel. The US notes that the IPCC Chair and Working Group and Task Force Co-Chairs are tasked with these responsibilities. The US believes there is value in Vice Chairs and Heads of TSUs participating on the Executive Committee in an advisory role.

### **[6a]**

If this paragraph is specified, care will need to be taken to ensure that functions assigned to the Executive Committee are not functions more appropriately taken by individuals responsible for IPCC leadership.

### **[6e]**

This sub-paragraph should be amended to read: "If the Chair cannot be present, he/she may nominate a chair from among the members."

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[Rational 1]**

The US supports this proposal, with the head of Secretariat appointed to support the Parties and the elected leadership of the IPCC.

### **[Rational 2]**

The US supports this proposal.

### **[Rational 3]**

The US notes that the Task Group considered the title of "Executive Director" is more often used for an institution that develops programs, whereas the titles of "Secretary" or "Executive Secretary" are most often used for the head of a secretariat.

### **[Proposal 4b]**

The US notes that there are pros and cons to both of these options, but prefers option 4(b), on the understanding that contract renewals are considered by WMO every two years in consultation with the Executive Committee, as specified in paragraph 5 below.

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

On the Preamble:

The last paragraph of the Preamble should be amended to read as follows: "This document provides guidance to the head of Secretariat, who is expected to develop, in consultation with the Executive Committee, and deliver a holistic communications strategy that reflects the expectations of the Panel in respect of outreach and media communications."

It is customary to ask the head of Secretariat to undertake activities, and to delegate those activities accordingly. The responsibility for secretariat functions rests ultimately with the head of Secretariat.

### **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

On Global Engagement:

First paragraph: "senior communications manager" should be replaced with "IPCC Secretariat"

On Web Presence:

Second paragraph: "senior communications manager" should be replaced with "individuals in the Secretariat responsible for communications"

### **[Guidelines]**

We propose a new first sentence to this section, reading: "Neutrality and objectivity in statement by IPCC leadership are critical to the support of the IPCC over time."

Also in the first paragraph: "authorized spokespersons must..." should be replaced with "authorized spokespersons should..."

Also in the first paragraph: add the phrase "or being perceived as" between "or refraining from" and "advocating". Thus, that section of the sentence should read: "... most notably maintaining policy neutrality, scientific balance, and refraining from, or being perceived as, advocating or communicating personal views..."

Under "Selecting authorized spokespersons",  
-- in the first bullet, the phrase "or their designate" is unclear: how will designates be chosen? It would perhaps be more clear to say "or an appropriate designate" in this case  
--bullet 3 from the top should be amended to read: "IPCC leadership should ensure the relevant and appropriate coordination of message with the senior leadership of the Panel, and keep the Executive Committee members, and the Secretariat informed of any significant communications activities, and should coordinate key messages where appropriate."

On "Rapid Response", we would propose the first paragraph to be amended to read as follows: "To communicate in these exceptional circumstances, head of Secretariat and Executive Committee will develop procedures to ensure a timely and effective response to urgent inquiries. In general, executive responsibility for ensuring timely and effective response will depend on the nature of the request, but will fall to the Chair and/or relevant members of the Executive Committee, supported by the Secretariat." The previous iteration seemed overly prescriptive and as was drafted, would not adequately reflect the strengths and expertise of members involved in the process. We would also suggest the Executive Committee be tasked with proposing a process for rapid response for consideration of the Panel.

### **[Addressing potential conflicts of interest]**

This category may speak more to the issue of bias as opposed to conflict of interest, and a change in the heading may be appropriate here.

In the second paragraph, we would suggest the first sentence to read as follows: All those associated with the IPCC should be clear to distinguish in which appearances they are speaking in an official IPCC capacity, and in which appearances they are speaking personally or on behalf of other organizations.

### **[Implementing the new strategy]**

In the second paragraph:  
-- the "significant resources implications" associated with communications and their implications should be explored as soon as possible.

In the final paragraph:

-- We would propose replacing "senior communications manager" with "individuals responsible for communications in the IPCC" in the first usage of this term in the paragraph.

-- We would propose the deletion of the line "and be under the authority of the senior communications manager." at the end of the paragraph, as this phrasing suggests that TSUs cannot have their own communication function, which is not intended.

### **[Evaluation of IPCC communications]**

In the second paragraph, we would propose replacing "senior communications manager" with "head of Secretariat" as this responsibility is typically that of the head of Secretariat in other instances.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

1) We would like to see the term "conflict of interest" retained as the title of this element, rather than "management of interests." The focus of the policy should be on minimizing and eliminating conflict of interests, in keeping with IAC recommendations and policies governing similar bodies; the term "management" could be interpreted to suggest that conflicts of interest could as a general matter be tolerated, which we understand is not the intention of this policy. We think the terms "potential" and "perceived" conflicts of interest should be avoided, so it is clear we are applying an objective standard. We think the conflict of interest policy and form should be as short and understandable as possible.

2) We would see the policy of conflict of interest primarily or exclusively covering financial interests, along the lines of the 2003 National Academies conflicts of interest, which was referenced by the IAC as a possible model for IPCC, and which ordinarily deals with financial conflicts of interest. The National Academies policy identifies certain specific other circumstances that present conflicts of interest (e.g., particular circumstances where an author's work is a central focus of a review; or where an author is responsible for an organization with a policy that relates centrally to the subject matter assessed); however, its primary thrust is ensuring that situations that do not compromise the integrity of the IPCC as a result of financial interests of authors and other key officers involved in the development of NRC IPCC products.

3) We would like to see consideration of the adjudication of conflicts of interest as a professional function under the Secretariat, accountable to the Executive Committee. This is analogous to the professional application of the conflict of interest policies that exist in other bodies (such as the National Academies). We could also envision a role for working group and other bureau members in identifying potential professional conflicts of interest in the author selection process (e.g., through CVs) and in engaging the secretariat in the implementation of the conflict of interest policy as it relates to authors and reviewers of IPCC products.

4) We think the policy should be as explicit as possible about protecting the confidentiality of the disclosure documents, and should note that these documents will be destroyed when an assessment is completed. If the person in charge of adjudicating conflicts is based in Geneva, Swiss law will be invoked in protecting confidentiality.

5) With regard to the form, consideration needs to be given as to whether disclosure includes all financial and professional interests an individual has or whether it is limited to those interests where the individual disclosing deems an interest may present a conflict.

6) We think a waiver system, akin to that of the National Academies, should be more fully developed.

7) In the revision of this draft, we suggest building around the main elements addressed in the Working Group 2 guidance:

- explanation of the distinction between bias and conflict of interest, and an explanation of the management of such issues by the Panel;
- reference that conflict of interest applies to current interests, and not to past or possible future interests;
- reference that financial interests of close relations (family and business partners) are pertinent to the scope of conflict of interest of an IPCC author or officer;

- reference to specific examples of potential financial conflicts of interest, and non-financial conflicts of interest, drawing from the examples provided in the National Academies policy.

8) Provision should be made for regular updating of disclosure forms by authors and others.

9) Appropriate mitigation action and procedures spelled out, in particular for financial matters, as the policy will ordinarily cover financial conflicts of interest. Where a conflict of interest is found, the appropriate mitigation measure will in general involve elimination of the conditions giving rise to the conflict of interest, disclosure through the waiver process, or withdrawal from participating as part of the IPCC.

10) Guidance should be developed to ensure uniform, informed, and balanced application of this guidance by individuals involved in conflict of interest review.

11) Certain issues that have arisen in the context of conflict of interest guidance may be more appropriate for a code of conduct (e.g., author treatment of draft IPCC findings, author participation on IPCC delegations), as distinct from a conflict of interest policy. Some generality may be of help here, perhaps avoiding situations in which, "a reasonable person would conclude judgment is impaired" or "a reasonable person might question the ability to act solely in the interests of the IPCC."

12) As a matter of presentation, it may be preferable to include major substantive elements of the guidance in the body of the policy.

## **[Policy Statement]**

Paragraph 2a.

- It would be useful to distinguish here between "bias" and "conflict of interest." As the National Academies policy indicates, these are distinct issues, managed in different ways.

- The National Academies NAS policy characterizes conflict of interest requirements as objective, and does not refer directly to "perceived" or "potential" conflict of interest, and we think it may be helpful for us to do the same.

Paragraph 2b. We think there is no need for a 'register of interests' independent of an author's form.

Paragraph 3a. The second sentence should be amended to read: "This policy is intended to encourage the participation of these individuals while ensuring that the integrity of IPCC processes and products is not compromised."

Paragraph 3a. framework for addressing conflicts of interest...

Paragraph 3d. This is not as strong as National Academies NRC guidance, which calls for prompt and public declaration of a conflict of interest in these exceptional circumstances; we believe that such a disclosure is important.

Paragraph 3h. is this sentence necessary?

Paragraph 5c. One month is a very short time. We would suggest two months unless strong reason not to.

Paragraph 6 We think the register should be eliminated.

Paragraph 7a. Please see comment 3 above.

Paragraph 7b. Please see comment 3 above. We note that the Secretariat is already subject to WMO conflict of interest policies.

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings]**

The US supports this recommendation

### **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

The US supports these recommendations.

### **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

On the updated Annex 2, the US believes the first paragraph of Annex 2 as worded is still too ambiguous to provide guidance to authors as they consider information for assessments. Furthermore, we would prefer the emphasis to be placed on assurance of quality of the non-peer-reviewed literature, (i.e. Was the data used in the report from a reliable source? Have previous reports from this source been subsequently verified as consistent with the peer-reviewed literature? Has any data presented been validated and/or is of such a nature that authors have high confidence in its validity? Are the findings presented from a climate change subject area that normally presents new findings in peer-reviewed journals e.g., observations in fields of natural science, or in a subject area that uses other valid avenues to present information e.g., case studies of adaptation or mitigation policies through government publications?) rather than on a differentiation of specific sources. We do not think it is useful to reference specific sources in a general policy.

### **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

on 11.3

Crosscutting issues: The function of the tasks of coordinating lead authors has tended to evolve in each assessment and need not be included in the procedures.

Anonymous expert review: the suggestion of evaluating the disadvantages related to the process proposed by the Special Report on CCS is a good suggestion.

Improving Quality and completeness of review: The suggestion of including cross checking by lead authors of other WGs where relevant in the expert review process is a good suggestion. CLAs could specify subject areas that require expert review as part of the process of developing regional chapters.

# Zambia

## **General Comments on Overall Procedure**

### **[General Comments]**

we commend the working groups for the documents that they have produced that have provided a good basis for us to proceed and make progress. in general we support the outcome of the work of the task groups except for a few comments highlighted in our comments

## **Governance: General Comments**

### **[General Comments]**

The country supports the recommendations of the task group particularly on the following issues:

1. Establishment of an executive committee to provide a formal coordination mechanism to ensure timely and effective implementation of IPCC decisions
2. IPCC to elect an executive director to lead the secretariat and handle day to day operations of the organisation. However, the proposed term of 8-10 years for the Executive Director needs further consideration as the period may be considered too long on account that the position should be rotational.

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

In line with the mandate of the Task Group on Communication, reflected on page 2 of the draft document, bullet point 3 highlights the need for the task group to articulate a set of objectives for IPCC communications. While this requirement has been satisfied in the draft document, it would have been more helpful to have a separate or stand alone chapter highlighting the objectives of the IPCC communications. In this regard, I wish to recommend that a chapter on objectives be included in the draft document and it should come before the section on principles. The chapter on objectives should generally state the overall purpose of the IPCC communication and can read as proposed below:

"The overall objective of the IPCC communications strategy is to provide a framework for the transparent, effective, rapid and audience specific communication of IPCC products and processes in a timely and coherent manner"

### **[Target audiences]**

2. There is need for the draft document to be clear on the target audience for IPCC communications. For instance under chapter 2 on page 4, they have used the term primary audience in reference to policy makers only while on page 5, under chapter 3, there's mention of major target audiences in reference to governments and policy makers. I wish to propose instead of "major audiences", there is need to maintain the use of the term "primary audiences" to refer to governments and policy makers.

The paragraph talking about broader audiences and what constitute this group can remain. However, I wish to propose that the media as a target group have a special place in communications as they are used as a conduit to reach out to all the other target groups. In this case, the media should be considered as a separate entity altogether, whose role should explicitly stand out.



## **[Guidelines]**

Under chapter 5 on page 6, the title of the chapter is guidelines while second paragraph of the same chapter also talks about objectives of the guidelines in reference to the selection of authorised spokespersons to speak for the organisation. In order to remove any ambiguity in the use of the word guidelines, I wish to propose that paragraph two be recast to read as follows:

"In keeping with the principles set therein, it is necessary to identify a group of spokespersons allowing the IPCC to speak credibly to its products and processes".

## **[Evaluation of IPCC communications]**

4. Chapter 8 on page 8 and 9 talks about using the objectives set out in the draft document as a guide to evaluate the IPCC's communications. However, you will recall in my earlier comment that the draft document does not have a chapter on objectives. In this context, I wish to propose that rather than the objectives, the evaluation should be based on the communications strategy to be developed from this draft document. This is on the understanding that this draft document will guide the Senior Communications Manager of IPCC to develop a comprehensive and concise communications strategy. Thus evaluations of the IPCC communications should be based on the strategy rather than on the current draft document under review.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

However, on the proposed name for the body that would be overseeing conflict of interest issues, the name, Management of Interests Panel should be changed. Particularly, the panel should be replaced by another word so that it does not appear to have the same status as the IPCC, being a subordinate body under the IPCC. In this context, we wish to propose that the name be changed to Management of Interest Unit (MIU) or something like that.

# Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32

## General Comments on Overall Procedure

### [General Comments]

-1Thank you to all TG members for their hard work. It will certainly help the IPCC to become even better. I hope you can consider some of the comments I made in the specific sections. I refrained from commenting on every issue, because I believe the opinion of governments matters most in an intergovernmental process such as the IPCC. However, I remain at your disposal should you have specific questions. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

### [General Comments]

-1Some general comments on the mechanics of the review:  
(1) for ease of reference and clarity during the review, it would have been helpful if each document had page numbers and line numbers as has been standard practice for IPCC products under review.  
(2) an uploadable Excel table for consolidating input among a number of co-workers would have been appreciated.  
(3) the usual IPCC notice on the drafts, warning not to cite, quote or distribute, is missing. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## Governance: Executive Committee

### [General Comments]

-1The proposal does not specify who organizes the meetings of the Executive Committee. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

### [General Comments]

-1The proposals of the TG for the Executive Committee should not conflict with the current IPCC Procedures where paragraph 4.2 states that the "WG and TFB Co-Chairs are responsible for implementing the work programme..." [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

### [2]

-1May add The Executive Committee would be chaired by the Chairperson of the IPCC. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

### [2]

-1The proposal for establishing the EC should include an explicit reference to the operational relations between the EC and the IPCC Bureau, with a clear distinction of their mandates. [Ramon Pichs-Madruga, Co-chair, WG III]

### [3d]

-1It is not clear why these proposed tasks for the Executive Committee would be handled by the Executive Committee and not the relevant Co-Chairs and the relevant

Bureau(x). Consistency should be checked with the recommendation of the Task Group on Procedures. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

### [3d]

-1The protocol for handling errors, which is currently being finalised, clearly assigns responsibilities to the IPCC Chair and WG or TF Co-Chair for the respective IPCC products. There is only a role for the Executive Committee in issues that arise beyond the WG and TF level. Edit text to read "Address issues, including handling of errors, that arise beyond the WG and TF level in the context of the assessments and other relevant IPCC products." This is a cross-cutting issue that needs to be consistent with TG Procedures. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

### [3f]

-1It is not clear why these proposed tasks for the Executive Committee would be handled by the Executive Committee and not the relevant Co-Chairs and the relevant Bureau(x). Consistency should be checked with the recommendation of the Task Group on Procedures. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

### [3f]

-1Participant selection for expert meetings (EM) and workshops (WS) is in the realm of the Co-Chairs of the respective Working Group(s) and the Scientific Steering Group that is formed for each EM/WS. That is, the expertise is in the respective Working Group(s) that organize the EM/WS and there is no reason why the Executive Committee as a whole shall decide upon participation. [Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, WG III]

### [3f]

-1Implementing this would increase transparency in the selection process, and encourage an "IPCC-wide" approach. I very much welcome this proposal. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

### [3f]

-1Paragraph 4.2 of the current IPCC Procedures states that the "WG and TFB Co-Chairs are responsible for implementing the work programme...". Together with the WG/TF Bureau, they select participants for scoping meetings, workshops and expert meetings, including when the meeting involves all three WGs, as for example the current EM on Geoengineering. There is only a role for the Executive Committee for meetings that are related to the Synthesis Report.

This is a cross-cutting issue that needs to be consistent with TG Procedures.

If included here, edit text to read: "Select participants for scoping meetings, workshops, expert meetings related to the Synthesis Report, from the nominees in accordance with IPCC procedures and decisions of the panel and the Bureau. " [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

### [4]

-1Just as the Head of Secretariat, the Executive Committee must also include the heads of TSU (ex-officio) as these are running the day-to-day business of the Working Groups. [Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, WG III]

## [4]

-1Comment on Proposals 4 and 5: Those who have an elected responsibility to produce an IPCC product (Assessment Report, Special Report, Inventory Guidelines), i.e., the IPCC Chair, WG and TF Co-Chairs, must be full members of the Executive Committee. Other elected members of the current E-team, i.e., the IPCC Vice-Chairs, who do not have such responsibility may be ex-officio but non-voting members of the Executive Committee. Those who are responsible for the implementation of the operational and administrative aspects of any decision, i.e., the head of Secretariat and the heads of the WG and TF TSUs must all be present on an equal basis as ex-officio but non-voting members of the Executive Committee.

Edit text: move "The heads of the TSU as ex officio members" from Proposal 5 to Proposal 4. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## [5]

-1If the IPCC Vice Chairs are included in the Executive Committee, they must be ex-officio as they don't carry any direct responsibility (unless they replace the chair in his absence and act upon his behalf). [Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, WG III]

## [5]

-1As I explained orally at the TG meeting in Geneva and a written answer to request (copied below), the role of Vice-chairs is quite broad, and they have been elected to assume those roles, and not to become non-voting observers in the EC.

About the external members recommended by the IAC: the proposal lacks clarity, and cannot be implemented as such: who are they, how would they be selected, how would some kind of geographical balance be respected, what would be their mandate, who would cover the cost of their participation ?

Copy of my email answering a question about the role of, e.g., IPCC Vice-chairs:

Dear Christiane,

Thank you for the question.

I leave the Secretariat answer about the existing texts describing the TOR for the IPCC Vice-chairs.

Here are the main roles I see for the three IPCC VCs:

- Assist the Chair in performing his duties. This may involve advising him on sensitive issues, representing him when he is not available (I believe by default, the Chair should be represented by a VC in official meetings the Chair cannot attend), or performing specific tasks that the Chair delegated to the Vice-chairs.

- As example of the latter, I would like to remind the Task group on the Future of IPCC, which I co-chaired with China, and which produced a dozen draft decisions building on the government submissions at the start of AR5. Most of those draft decisions became decisions at the Antalya Plenary. There was also the report Vice-chair Hoesung Lee and I prepared for the Bali Plenary on how to increase the participation of Developing country/EIT scientists in the IPCC. This report provided the background in which the AR5 author selection was made. I was also tasked by the Chair to accompany the reflection about the cross-cutting issues in the AR5, and helped the secretariat survey the views on these before the Venice scoping meeting.

Among those cross-cutting issues, I invested significant energy to improve the handling the treatment of regional information in AR5. This contributed to split the AR5 WGII contribution in two parts, with the second (regional) part benefiting from WGI and WGIII contributions, which should decrease the risk of

further "Himalayan" mistakes (and this was decided BEFORE the crisis erupted). I also chaired a "small group" about the regional division, and played a key role in the establishment of a specific "Oceans" chapter in this regional part of the AR5 WGII.

- Vice-chairs can help build bridges across the Working groups. Their knowledge of the IPCC "across the board" can often help the Chair to find consensus or compromises when there are diverging views, or advise Co-chairs in a friendly and discrete manner on issues related to the overall coherence of the IPCC, or difficulties they meet in their WG. They help to "put oil between the cogs" when that is needed, and it may be particularly useful during times of crisis.

- I also think VC can contribute to the representation of IPCC in front of public audiences, and communication about IPCC in a cross-cutting manner, complementing the Chair by providing sometimes a different, even if coherent, voice to communicate about the IPCC as a whole. I have done a lot of that since my election, working closely with the IPCC Communication advisers to deliver the most policy-relevant but not prescriptive messages to a wide variety of media. I have addressed a few hundreds of journalists as IPCC Vice-chair, either through interviews or training sessions for media, organized by UNFCCC, UNESCO, the European Commission, or other organizations. If there was a decision to task a member of the Executive body to oversee the IPCC communications activities in close cooperation with the Senior Communication officer, I volunteer to take that responsibility, if the framework is clear.

- Vice-chairs also sit on the Science board of the IPCC Scholarship programme, to orient the programme and help select the applications which will benefit from one of the grants.

I am sure I have forgotten some aspects, and hope my colleagues can complement or correct what I said above.

I copy this message to the E-team (using the list server I maintain precisely to facilitate communication among all E-team members), so that other members of the E-team can comment.

Best regards,

Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, IPCC Vice-chair

Christiane.Textor@dlr.de a Ã©crit , le 3/02/2011 11:33:

> Dear Colleagues,

>

> The Task Group on Governance and Management is working on the Terms of Reference of IPCC-leadership. We would like to ask for the following information:

>

> Can we have the ToR for the WG-co-chairs, co-chairs of the TFI, the Vice chairs, and the WG-Vice chairs, which would identify your current functions and roles?

> Please let us know if such ToRs still have to be developed.

>

> We would be very grateful to receive your responses as soon as possible - hopefully by today.

>

> Many thanks,

>

> Christiane Textor

> Rapporteur of TG Gov&Man [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

**[5]**

-1It would not be desirable to have Heads of the TSUs as ex-officio members. The Executive Committee should be confined only to those elected or appointed on behalf of the IPCC as a whole and not employees of any unit such as the Working Groups or the TFI.

It would not be desirable to induct members external to the IPCC. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

## [5]

-1Comment on Proposals 4 and 5: Those who have an elected responsibility to produce an IPCC product (Assessment Report, Special Report, Inventory Guidelines), i.e., the IPCC Chair, WG and TF Co-Chairs, must be full members of the Executive Committee. Other elected members of the current E-team, i.e., the IPCC Vice-Chairs, who do not have such responsibility may be ex-officio but non-voting members of the Executive Committee. Those who are responsible for the implementation of the operational and administrative aspects of any decision, i.e., the head of Secretariat and the heads of the WG and TF TSUs must all be present on an equal basis as ex-officio but non-voting members of the Executive Committee.

Edit text: move "The heads of the TSU as ex officio members" from Proposal 5 to Proposal 4.

Comment 5.1 Edit first bullet by deleting possibly as so now reads "One or more IPCC Vice Chairs as ex officio members".

Comment 5.2 Do not agree that external members are appropriate in an Executive Committee. External members do not have the operational, up-to-date knowledge required in the Executive Committee. Their input would be very valuable for long-term, strategic questions and issues, which are typically dealt with through an Advisory Board. Therefore, delete last bullet.

[Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## [6a]

-1It would be operationally impossible for any member of the Executive Committee to act and speak on behalf of the Committee. This would have two major handicaps.

1. It would be impossible for any member of the Committee to provide a rapid response on any issue or dispute concerning the IPCC, because valuable time would be lost in getting the agreement of all the members of the Executive Committee. This would, therefore, go against the interests of rapid and efficient communication as laid down by the recommendations for a communications strategy.

2. If every member is required to act or speak on behalf of the Committee, individual initiative would be lost completely. Every member of the Committee must be regarded as responsible and empowered to speak on behalf of the IPCC, and it would be best to allow a broad approach on communications to be adopted by the Executive Committee and allow individual initiative to the elected members to speak on behalf of the IPCC depending on the needs of the situation and their own judgement which would be exercised in the interest of the IPCC. If we wish to pursue communication by common agreement, the IPCC would stand to lose due to lack of initiative on the part of IPCC officials. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

## [6b]

-1If consensus is not possible, decisions should be adopted by a two third majority rather than simple majority. [Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, WG III]

## [6b]

-1Since there is a provision for voting by simple majority the membership of the Executive Committee should be an odd number. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

## [6c]

-1I believe Vice-chairs have not been elected to be observers in the EC, with no voting right. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

## [6c]

-1Delete "[and Vice-Chairs] " as they would be ex officio members. Add "TSU Heads may vote on behalf of their Co-Chairs if no Co-Chair is present."

In order to preserve the balance of the WGs, the voting of the WG Co-Chairs will have to be weighted due to the exceptional decision for AR5. Suggest adding "Each Co-Chair shall have one vote with the exception of the two developing country Co-Chairs of WGIII AR5. Due to the exceptional decision for AR5, they shall have one vote between them. " [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## [6d]

-1May have to consider proxy or other forms of absentee voting. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## [6e]

-1I suggest that the sentence be a bit more affirmative and precise: "If the Chair cannot be present, he or she nominates a chair for the duration of the meeting among the elected members of the EC" [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

## [6g]

-1It is not clear why a formal signed invitation by the Head of Secretariat should be required. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## [6h]

-1The Secretariat will have to prepare a draft agenda in consultation with the Chairperson of the Executive Committee with provision for any changes at the start of the meeting where the first item on the agenda would be the acceptance of the draft agenda. Operationally it would be totally unworkable if an agenda has to be prepared in consultation with all the members of the Executive Committee. In no management board or committee is this procedure followed. The agenda is always prepared between the Chairperson of the Committee and the Secretary of the Committee. If we allow for consultation with all the members of the Executive Committee, we would only be creating a situation that would not allow efficient functioning of the Executive Committee. Any member of the Committee would have the option of suggesting a change in the agenda at the start of any meeting. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

## [6h]

-1The provision of an agenda to the Panel before each meeting of the Executive Committee seems to be micromanaging. The agenda should be an Annex to the

documentation provided for information to the Panel after the meeting is held.  
[Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

### **[6i]**

-1The conclusions and decisions of the Executive Committee should only be distributed after approval by the Committee and this should be \*for information\* of the Panel. Edit text to read "... to IPCC members for information as soon as possible after approval by the Executive Committee but not later than ... "  
[Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

### **[6j]**

-1Add in the last line after the words Bureau meetings [or any other meetings].  
[Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

### **[6j]**

-1This may not be practicable as written so split first sentence and edit text to read "The Executive Committee meets at least four times a year. Meetings may be held in person or via web or teleconference. In addition, on request of the Chair or of at least three elected members of the Committee, a web or teleconference will be held within two weeks of the request if meeting in person is not practicable." [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[General Comments]**

-1This document uses the term "IAC Panel," which may be confusing given that the IPCC Panel is usually referred to as the "Panel" elsewhere. Perhaps it would be clearer to change this to "IAC Report" throughout the document; this also would make this document consistent with other Task Group documents. The document does not clarify whether the head or deputy head of Secretariat should have "senior scientist" credentials as recommended by the IAC. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

### **[General Comments]**

-1The IAC recommendation was made because the Secretariat assumes an essential role in the good working of IPCC, and because the IAC perceived that the Secretariat had not worked ideally during and after the crisis of 2010. To avoid the repetition of such situations, it would be good practice to organize regular management audits/reviews of the Secretariat, so that its working can be improved. Such audits/reviews would need to be done by an external firm, to have the most objective view. It would be useful for the TG to consider this proposal in the context of the reform of the Secretariat and of its management positions.  
[Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

### **[Rational 3]**

-1Line 4: please add "should" after "individual" [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

### **[Rational 3]**



-1Add at the end of the para [and report to the Chair and be accountable to the Chair]. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

### **[Rational 3]**

-1The IAC recommendation that "the individual should be able to act on behalf of the Chair as needed" is not picked up in these recommendations and needs to be consistent with the recommendations for the Executive Committee. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

### **[Rational 4]**

-1The TG notes that "these functions and qualifications are broadly consistent with the job description for the current post of Secretary". This seems to be a very different conclusion from that of the IAC review. In order to support the TG's conclusion convincingly, it would be helpful to append the job description for the current post of Secretary to the report of the TG. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

### **[Proposal 2]**

-1This sentence is not clear whether a change is proposed in the emphasis on external relations and communication. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

### **[Proposal 2]**

-1In defining the functions of the IPCC Head of the Secretariat it should be specified what the reporting arrangements of the head of the Secretariat should be. Currently, the head of the Secretariat reports to the WMO which is an operationally unworkable arrangement. A clear line of reporting to the IPCC is essential for the efficient functioning of the IPCC. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

### **[Proposal 2]**

-1In order to support the recommendation that "The functions of the IPCC head of Secretariat should remain largely as presently defined", it would be helpful to append the job description for the current post of Secretary to the report of the TG. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

### **[Proposal 4a]**

-1I assume this overall limit to the term would come in complement to the present WMO renewable two-year contract basis? Please clarify. In any case, I believe that the renewal of such an important position cannot take place without an appropriate consultation of the EC, and without regular management audits, made by an external firm, at regular interval (4 years ?). [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

### **[Proposal 4a]**

-1Comment on Proposals 4a and 4b: Do not agree to a term limit if the functions of the IPCC head of Secretariat remain largely as presently defined. This person can provide important institutional memory, not only of Panel business but also of operational matters. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

### **[Proposal 4b]**

-1Comment on Proposals 4a and 4b: Do not agree to a term limit if the functions of the IPCC head of Secretariat remain largely as presently defined. This person can provide important institutional memory, not only of Panel business but also of operational matters. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

### **[Proposal 5]**

-1There could be clarification on whether the process of selecting the head and deputy head of Secretariat should be open and transparent, including the process for contract renewal and what the role of the Executive Committee is in the process. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

### **[Proposal 5]**

-1It is welcome that the TG proposes a consultation of the EC, but the proposal should clarify what the weight of this consultation is, and how and by whom is the final decision made (for recruitment and renewals). Could a recruitment or renewal take place without the support of at least a 2/3 majority of the EC? Regular management audits, made by an external firm should also be organized at regular intervals (every 4 years ?). [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

### **[Proposal 5]**

-1This again is an unworkable arrangement because you cannot have the Executive Committee as a body being consulted by the WMO. Consultation should take place with the IPCC Chair who speaks on behalf of the Executive Committee, in case the WMO remains as the authority responsible for the head of the Secretariat. No mention is made of the reporting arrangements for the head of the Secretariat. The current set of recommendations appear to skirt this issue. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

### **[Proposal 5]**

-1This is a good proposal that should bring a necessary improvement. Suggest inserting the words "in due time" after "WMO is requested to consult". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **Governance: General Comments**

### **[General Comments]**

-1(1) What other topics does TG Governance feel should be considered? There is no discussion of the role of the Secretariat and its relationship to other actors; also the qualifications and roles of all Bureau members. Have these topics that were part of the Decisions at P-32 been deferred and, if so, until when? The need for this discussion may be satisfied by reviewing and further developing Terms of Reference for the elected senior officials (Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs, Co-Chairs); for the Bureau as a whole; for the Secretariat and the TSUs.

(2) The "modular" format is quite convenient for the review but before the TG sends its report to the Panel, please add a cover page and an introduction to let the Panel know what can be found in this report and what has been deferred, with an indication of the timeline for the next steps. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

## **[Rational 1]**

-1To avoid the appearance of prejudging the outcome of future decisions by the Panel, suggest changing "possible changes in the overall mode of work" to read "any significant changes in the overall mode of work". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[Proposal 1]**

-1The phrase "possible extension for individual cases" could be amended to further specify how frequently and for what reasons such extensions would be made. Without such clarification, the restriction has little meaning. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **[Proposal 1]**

-1To add at the end of the para [However, the decision if implemented on this recommendation should apply only with effect from the next election of the Bureau as decided by the Panel in Busan.] [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

## **[Proposal 1]**

-1Speaking as a WG Co-Chair, I can agree with the proposal to limit the term of office for the IPCC Chair and WG Co-Chairs to one term. Consideration should also be given to term limits for the other members of the Executive Team, i.e., IPCC Vice-Chairs and TF Co-Chairs. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[Proposal 2]**

-1The last sentence [Both the Chair and [Chair Elect] would agree upon their distribution of tasks in consultation with the Bureau] should be modified to read [The Chair would delegate to the Chair Elect specific tasks in consultation with the Bureau]. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

## **[Proposal 2]**

-1It would be hard to organize an election for the new Chair separated in time from the new Bureau. Therefore, I would rather suggest that the past Chair remains available in the function of "Past IPCC Chair" with a purely advisory role for an overlap period with the new Chair in order to provide a smooth transition and guarantee institutional memory. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

-1Thanks to the TG members for their hard work.  
One subject that is not really addressed in this document is the needed transparency of the IPCC process.  
Everybody agrees on the surface to say it is very important, but most meetings of the IPCC are closed to media. Is this really justified? Could the TG address this point, and make recommendations about how to improve on this? The practices of other international bodies (e.g., UNFCCC) could be used as a reference. In those bodies, media have a much larger access to the process, while some parts of the proceedings remain of course out of scope. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

### **[General Comments]**

-1In the Preamble on p.3, line 3 in last para., replace "a holistic communications strategy" by "a comprehensive communications strategy", to be more understandable. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[Principles]**

-1On p.4, 2nd bullet, line 3, to be clear, suggest replacing "The presentation of its findings and conclusions should ... ", which are words often associated with research results, by "The presentation of its assessments/reports should ... "

On p.4, 3rd bullet, line 3, supporting material is a specific term in IPCC and is characterised as NOT having been subject to IPCC's review process. Therefore, in line 3, delete "and supporting material". In line 4, it should be "adopted or approved by" rather than "adopted and approved by". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

-1On p.4, 2nd para., 2nd line, insert "strive to" so it reads "authors should strive to make as comprehensible as possible".

On p.4, 3rd para., 2nd line, it is good that the TG recognises the importance of communicating about the processes that generated the reports.

On p.5 under Global engagement, the elected Bureau members can play an important role as well as the focal points. Suggest inserting "Bureau members and" before each occurrence of "focal points" in these three paragraphs.

On p.5 under Web presence, assume that the FAQs referred to in the last sentence of the first paragraph are the ones that are developed and approved with the Chapters. Add "from IPCC Assessment and Special Reports" after "FAQs".

On p.5 under Web presence, 2nd para. could be more specific about what is meant by "appropriate technologies". Also the senior communications manager should propose or recommend appropriate technologies to the Executive Committee, but should not have the authority to decide to use them without consultation. Therefore, change text accordingly to read: "The senior communications manager should propose [recommend] to the Executive Committee the use of appropriate technologies to implement the agreed communications strategy.". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[Target audiences]**

-1On p.5, first para., IPCC does not itself have "findings", so suggest replacing "findings" by "the information contained in its reports". Thus editing last sentence to read: "IPCC can communicate the information contained in its reports, as well as its processes and procedures."

On p.5, 2nd para., "the IPCC should ensure " is rather strong language for an activity that is not a primary part of the mandate. An appropriate level of facilitation is needed, so suggest replacing "the IPCC should ensure that information is available" by "the IPCC should look for ways to ensure that information is available". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[Languages of communications, and translation]**

-1It is important that the IPCC brochures are also translated into the six UN languages. Suggest editing p.6, first para., 2nd sentence to read "IPCC communication practices should follow this model, and IPCC communications

products, including brochures, should be translated and made available.". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## [Guidelines]

-1Page 6: It may be overly binding to require that the senior communications manager always

be involved in all communications activities, as long as coordination of messages is

maintained in more general terms.

Page 7, Rapid response section: Further specification of which members of the IPCC

leadership should be contacted for approval in various cases could be helpful. For

example, if a response involves information specific to one Working Group, approval by one

of the Working Group Co-Chairs should be required before a response is issued.

[Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## [Guidelines]

-15. Guidelines " rapid response

Concerning the sign-off/approval cannot be done by any two members of the executive committee but by individuals that match the expertise / are from the pertinent working group. [Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, WG III]

## [Guidelines]

-1Comment under the heading planned communications materials

Planned communications materials would also need to be approved by the Chair of the IPCC to ensure consistency of messages and particularly in respect of the Synthesis Report. In any case all communications from the IPCC should be within a framework that cuts across Working Groups and should ensure consistency of messaging. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

## [Guidelines]

-1(1) Selecting spokespersons, p.6, 1st bullet. In line 1 delete "or their designate". In line 3, insert "Panel Sessions and" before "Bureau Meetings".

(2) Selecting spokespersons, p.6, 3rd bullet. Not all WG-internal issues would need involvement by the communications manager. In last sentence, change "always be involved" to "always be informed".

(3) Rapid response, p.7, main para. A better mechanism for rapid response is needed, but this suggestion shows how difficult it is to delegate authority too narrowly away from the Co-Chairs who are responsible for implementing the work programme (Para. 4.2 of the existing IPCC Procedures). Suggest that the Executive Committee delegates responsibility to a subgroup which works with the senior communications manager. If the enquiry concerns a WG product, at least one of the Co-Chairs from the relevant WG must be involved. It is hard to say that two individuals signing off will be sufficient to capture all relevant people. Suggest rewriting as follows:

"To communicate in these exceptional circumstances, the senior communications manager needs to be able to rely on members of the IPCC leadership. The Executive Committee delegates responsibility to a subgroup from the Chair, Vice-Chairs, the Secretary, relevant Working Group Co-Chairs, TF Co-Chairs which works with the senior communications manager. This group has a responsibility to respond to urgent inquiries in a timely manner. The senior communications manager requires sign-off/approval from all relevant individuals before issuing a response. Before and after the response, the senior communications manager

should maintain open channels of communication with the full Executive Committee and provide updates as appropriate."

(4) Errors, p.7. Needs a bit of clarification on what kind of errors and who is the authorised spokesperson, which in this case must be the person tasked with responsibility for leading the process of handling errors. Suggest rewriting as follows:

"The IPCC is in the process of developing a formal procedure for acknowledging putative errors of fact that might change the scientific content of an assessment. In the case of addressing such a putative error of fact, the individuals tasked with responsibility for leading the process of handling errors, i.e., the Co-Chairs or IPCC Chair, should work closely with the senior communications manager on a timely and cogent response." [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

### **[Addressing potential conflicts of interest]**

-1This is a very useful section but the title is a bit misleading. It is not really about conflicts of interest in the usual sense, so suggest changing subheading to read "Limits of IPCC Communication". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

### **[Implementing the new strategy]**

-1Page 8, Implementing the new strategy section: It is unclear what extensive network within the IPCC is referred to, and how this network is different from the activities already occurring through the Working Groups and Task Force. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

-1It is unclear whether the "IPCC Explanatory Note on Management of Interests" appears in this document, or has yet to be drafted. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

### **[General Comments]**

-1(1) The IAC Review recommended that "The IPCC should develop and adopt a rigorous conflict-of-interest policy". This is the basis for WGIs insistence that the policy cannot be voluntary and cannot be applied in a less than rigorous manner.

(2) It is hard to comment on the Policy without having the Explanatory Note available, which contains not just examples but also more detail about the implementation of the Policy. It is important that the Panel has sufficient time to review this important part of the documentation. What is the timetable for its delivery?

(3) The Explanatory Note should contain concrete examples. In implementing the rigorous policy of WGI, we found that such examples are very helpful in outlining and describing the spirit and intent of a CoI regulation. With clear guidance, such as provided by the WGI Guidance Note on CoI, we found that authors are very cooperative and forthcoming in addressing real, perceived, or potential CoIs.

(4) The Policy mentions the Working Groups but not the Task Force on Inventories, which I assume should also be covered by the policy, even though it was not mentioned by the IAC Review. Therefore, wherever "Working Group" appears, add "and Task Force".

(5) Having recently completed the first CoI exercise for WGI, I note the need for consistency of implementation across the WG (and TF) Bureaux and the Management of Interests Panel. I am concerned to know how this consistency will be ensured.

(6) The following comments are on the section on pp. 3-4, which is headed Task Group Commentary on the Proposals:

#### Comments on Background and Key Considerations

Point 2 does not signal a rigorous policy. Suggest strengthening the first sentence by inserting "using appropriate strategies" after "the challenge is to manage these interests". The second sentence seems out of context in a CoI policy. Perhaps what is meant is more about cultural sensitivity, so suggest replacing the second sentence by "The TG noted the need for sensitivity to different cultural approaches to the management of interests. This policy is intended to encourage cooperation from all individuals participating in IPCC.". Point 3: the confidentiality of information is critical. Suggest strengthening the sentence and making it more specific so that after the comma it now reads "the specific information pertaining to each individual will remain confidential.".

#### Comments on Key points of the proposals

Point 2: it is important to be able to review the Explanatory Note. For instance, does the guidance on completing the Disclosure Form require information about the interests of close family members? WGI would disagree with this. The specific examples are an important component and, if chosen correctly, may very well have drawn significant comments.

Point 3 does not signal a rigorous policy. Suggest strengthening by inserting "using appropriate strategies" after "conflicts have to be managed".

#### Comment on Cross-cutting issues

Point 3: also relates to selection of future Chapter teams. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## [Policy Statement]

-1Management of Interests Policy, Item 3c: This statement does not make it clear whether conflict of interest standards will be defined and/or applied differently depending on an individual's position within the IPCC.

Management of Interests Policy, Item 6a: It is unclear what is meant by, "Interests may be disclosed to individuals authorized by the Management of Interest panel." This could be viewed as conflicting with the subsequent statement about interests being treated as confidential. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## [Policy Statement]

-13b. Delete this sentence or edit as follows: "The policy should be applied in a culturally sensitive way that encourages the cooperation of all individuals participating in IPCC. ".

3g. First sentence "observed" seems vague. Suggest rephrasing: "Information disclosed will be kept confidential".

3h. A rigorous policy cannot be voluntary, although it can rely on self-disclosure. Delete "Compliance with the policy is voluntary but" and begin a new sentence with Non-compliance .. "

4a. Include TF Co-Chairs. Be more specific about who is meant by "any other individuals directly involved in the development of IPCC products or advice."

5a. In line 3, insert "via the Technical Support Unit" following "relevant Working Group Bureau".

5c. In line 4, following the 2nd sentence, insert "TSU and Secretariat staff should submit a Disclosure of Interest form within [one month] of taking up their appointment. ".

6a. The third sentence is far too vague when the next sentence says "Information about interests will be treated as confidential. " Suggest deleting the third sentence and rephrasing the next to read: "Specific individual information about interests will be treated as confidential. ".

7b. The preferred composition of the panel is option 2, or a mix of options 2 and 1. Option 3, external representatives, brings questions about what is a credible organisation, who selects, etc.

7d. Insert "and Technical Support Units" after "The IPCC Secretariat" at the start of this sentence as they would logically be the ones to assist the WG Bureaux. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[Disclosure Form]**

-1It is important to introduce an element of self disclosure by including a caveat after "I disclose all my current and relevant interests" (last bold sentence) as follows: "that may constitute a real, perceived, or potential conflict of interest ". Otherwise the entry will be a CV and impossible to scrutinise and assess for hundreds of authors.

II. The topic of "government representation including membership of international delegations" should be expanded in the Explanatory Note.

First paragraph on page 9 (cont. from p.8): More discussion is needed about what is behind the phrase "unless required to be disclosed by law". This may also need to be expanded to explain what is meant, e.g., national or international law. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[1. General Comments]**

-1The TG explored a range of interesting proposals, but still needs to transform them into operational ones. Textual proposals would be welcome before the Abu Dhabi Plenary for each topic, otherwise clear decisions will be very hard to make. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

### **[1. General Comments]**

-1(1) Should avoid being too prescriptive and detailed in the Principles and Procedures themselves. Given the plenary approval process, they may need to live for more than one cycle. Thus it would be better to use Annexes if more detailed or specific text is necessary, as is the case for the Use of Literature.

(2) The TG Procedures took a rather strict view of its mandate and did not make recommendations on topics that were not raised by the IAC Review. This means that some necessary adjustments to the Principles and Procedures to address other important issues such as confidentiality were not properly developed. This is potentially a missed opportunity.

(3) The draft makes an exception for Topic 10 Guidance Notes, a topic not raised by the IAC Review. WGI proposes that another exception should be made for confidentiality, which is a topic of great importance that was also discussed by the TG during its meeting in Geneva in February 2011. It is mentioned in the



Addendum under the review process but clear guidance on confidentiality is needed in a broader context. It is part of the basic way in which IPCC goes about its work and is a necessary requirement for authors to be able to have a free and frank exchange of views. Interim discussions and communications during the preparation and finalisation of the assessment are \*pre-decisional\* information. As such, these remain confidential and related documents are not public, nor should they be cited, quoted or distributed, as is standard IPCC practice to indicate this on all documents under review. The ability of the WGs to produce an independent and unbiased assessment would be threatened if material that is in the nature of a draft and/or incomplete information to be further developed were to be released prematurely. It is increasingly clear that this needs to be specified in the Procedures, also showing that it does not contradict the current Principles of IPCC, which state that the assessment is carried out on a "comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis".

Therefore WGI proposes moving this topic into the first part of the TG report, between Topics 3 and 4. The preceding text in this comment can serve as the basis for the TG consideration and the recommendation would be as follows: "Section 4 of the Procedures should be amended to discuss the notion of the confidentiality of drafts and other interim documentation. Suggested text could be the following: "Drafts of the reports, interim discussions and communications, and other documentation created during the drafting and review process are considered pre-decisional materials and as such are confidential. Drafts and other documentation may not be cited, quoted or distributed. ""

(4) The Addendum is not very helpful as presented because it is not clear to a reader who was not part of the discussions in February 2011 in Geneva whether all these suggestions have a similar status in terms of degree of support, depth of discussion, etc. They are in fact highly variable and most of these suggestions will need to be discussed properly by the TG first. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings]**

-1Section 2: For some Special Reports, Science Steering Groups have been established that work in coordination with the relevant Working Group Bureau(x) that select meeting participants. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **[2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings]**

-1The proposal is ambiguous: who decides: the Bureau (I plead for this option) or the WG/TF Bureau (they can prepare a proposal for the Bureau)? The case of the SYR scoping meeting is not treated explicitly, and it should. Through all these selection processes, one should attempt to keep an "IPCC-wide" perspective, which is broader than the usual WG or TF perspective. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

## **[2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings]**

-1TG recommendation: Middle of last paragraph, what footnote is referred to here? [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

-1TG recommendation: Suggest rewording second point for clarity to read "Procedures shall be amended to reflect current practice, requiring a report on the selection process. " [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

-1Annex 2, first paragraph: The parenthetical examples, currently placed at the end of the sentence on non-journal-based sources, could be interpreted as giving examples only related to adaptation and mitigation activities as opposed to being general examples of nonjournal-based sources. Consider making the parenthetical a new sentence, e.g., "Nonjournal-based sources include reports from governments...".

Annex 2, section heading 1: It could be better to use "Coordinating Lead, Lead, and Contributing Authors" here.

Annex 2, section 1: Please correct the unconventional paragraph structure used in this section. In addition, here and elsewhere the Task Force should be referred to as the "Task Force," not the "Task Force Bureau."

Annex 2, section 1, second paragraph: It would be more appropriate to direct authors to provide sources that are not commercially available to the relevant Working Group/Task Force TSU, rather than to the Co-Chairs.

Annex 2, section 1, third-to-last sentence of section: It might be clearer to say that an executive summary or abstract in English "must be provided" rather than "is required" to better clarify where responsibility falls for providing this summary.

Annex 2, section 1, last sentence: The current phrasing could imply that these sources will appear in some separate reference section. It does not seem that this sentence adds clarity, so it could be removed.

Annex 2, section 2: It would be clearer to say "are selected and used following the procedures in this Annex."

Annex 2, section 3: The previous comment on reference to the Task Force and on TSU vs. Co-Chairs collection of sources apply here as well. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

#### **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

-1TG consideration: In second sentence, for clarity suggest inserting "the part of" before "this", so it reads "the implementation of the part of this IAC recommendation "

Box on Annex 2: In first sentence under point 1, replace "a non-journal based" in the second line by "any", so it reads "from any source. ". Then insert "non-journal based" after "each" in the next line, so it reads "validity of each non-journal based source. ". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

#### **[6. Report Review]**

-1The review process could be improved by more targeted review efforts. That is, the Co-Chairs should identify important and/or contentious issues in the report, identify experts for these particular pieces and request the experts to

specifically review these instead of the whole report. [Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, WG III]

## **[6. Report Review]**

-1TG recommendation: needs clarification because it seems to be a curious reversal of the normal sequence of events where the WGs provide guidance notes to their authors to assist in the implementation of the current IPCC Policies and Procedures, not provide guidance notes on current practice to inform the Panel with the intention of revising Policies and Procedures. If the guidance note proposed has to be "consistent across the WGs/TFI", it would only be able to cover the fraction of the process that is common. The TG should also note that, depending on the timing, any Panel changes to the review process may be too late to be applied consistently to the WGI AR5. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[7. Summary for Policymakers]**

-1The TG proposes that "The existing Procedures should be amended to clarify the current practice.". Where is the clarification? I suggest that, at least, the procedures contain an explicit sentence indicating that the relevant CLA's & LAs, and not the government delegations have the last word about the scientific content of an SPM. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

## **[8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors]**

-1It is unclear what is meant by the Panel implementing a system to deal with potential errors. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **[8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors]**

-1This is a very important issue. The draft procedure presented in Busan has still not been finalized, preventing the correction of errors such as the "Himalayan glaciers" errors raised at the end of 2009. The TG is encouraged to engage with those in charge of finalising the procedure so that progress can be made. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

## **[8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors]**

-1TG recommendation:  
Bullet 1 is too elaborate. Suggest rewording as follows "The procedures should be updated with mention of the agreed protocol to address potential errors and develop errata as appropriate. ". The detail of the protocol should be in an Annex, if included at all.  
Bullet 2: replace "a mechanism" by "the procedure".  
Bullet 4 is not consistent with the protocol for handling errors, which is currently being finalised, where the responsibility is with the Chair and Co-Chairs. There is only a role for the Executive Committee in issues that arise beyond the WG and TF level. This is a cross-cutting issue that needs to be consistent with TG Governance. Edit text by inserting "that arise beyond the WG and TF level in the context of the assessments and other relevant IPCC products." at the end of the sentence. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[9. IPCCs Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty]**

-1TG recommendation: Replace "when completed" at end of last sentence by "which has been finalised and is being implemented by the WGs." [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[10. IPCC Guidance material]**

-1TG recommendation: This was not part of the IAC recommendations and it is probably not clear to an outsider what group of materials is meant here. Suggest rewording as follows: "The Panel may wish to give further consideration to the use of guidance materials developed by the WGs in order to clarify current practice." [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

-1Page 11, anonymous expert review: It is not clear that an anonymous review process would be more objective. An important component of the consideration of a specific review can be the context provided by the expertise of the reviewer providing the comment, which would not be available in the case of anonymous comments. The increased emphasis on the role and responsibilities of Review Editors already implemented for the AR5 will help ensure the objective consideration of all review comments.

Page 11, improving quality and completeness of review: The increased emphasis on the role and responsibilities of Review Editors will help ensure a comprehensive review of the Report. In addition, an increased emphasis on review by authors from other chapters and WGs will help ensure that individuals with the full range relevant expertise review chapters.

Page 12: The preparation of guidance documents, particularly those treating scientific subjects, is usually coordinated by the relevant Working Group Co-Chairs and TSUs, involving core writing teams as appropriate. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

-1Availability of review comments and responses 11.3  
Under the current regime the drafts are reviewed by experts (and Governments in the 2nd round) who, with their comments and expertise, discuss the text thereby helping to improve the draft. That is, the text is still in the realm of science and there is a need for room for discussion among experts, sharing ideas etc, without being displayed in the public sphere. Publishing the discussion on a not yet finished draft is therefore unlikely to facilitate the drafting process or to improve the quality of the report. Transparency is already ensured with the current handling of publication after the process has ended. It may be more helpful to better communicate the process to the public.

Anonymous expert review 11.3

The anonymous review is also regarded as not helpful to the process. The situation is different from scientific journals where the review process is double-blind, i.e. where not only reviewers but also authors are treated anonymously. The current proposal leads to an imbalance as only authors are held accountable for their writing. Instead, a more targeted review would be more useful to improve the review process (see nr 6).

Repository 11.3

The idea of transparency behind this proposal is welcome but the proposal seems to encounter insurmountable copyright problems when journal-based literature or commercially available literature (e.g. IEA reports) are freely accessible on e.g. a TSU website. [Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, WG III]

## **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

-1The confidentiality component of the IPCC work is partially mentioned in page 11 of the Draft Document provided by the TG on Procedures under the topic 11.3: Review Process. In my opinion, confidentiality deserves a section in itself to consider not only confidentiality needs during the IPCC review process, but also confidentiality needs during other stages of the IPCC work, such as LA meetings and the internal exchanges of mails and draft documents among the authors, contributors, etc., during the drafting processes. In my view, the required intellectual privacy during these intermediate stages of the IPCC work is a core element of the enabling conditions that the Panel should ensure to those in charge of the preparation of the IPCC reports. The drafts of the reports, review comments and responses to review comments could be accessible after the completion of the reports.

Therefore, confidentiality needs and transparency / openness provisions should be properly defined and effectively combined in the IPCC Procedures. [Ramon Pichs-Madruga, Co-chair, WG III]

## **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

-1Topic 11.3 Review process (Five comments)

(a) Comment on Availability of review comments

WGI does not support this proposal. There was little consensus on this proposal in the TG discussions in Geneva. Therefore, to be more balanced, the text should be edited as follows. Insert "It has been proposed that " at the start of the last sentence. Add a new last sentence that reads "However there are concerns that this could be open to abuse and would affect the independence of the authors. It would also require a change in the planned internal schedules of the WGs."

(b) Comment on Anonymous expert review

WGI believes that making the expert review anonymous decreases the openness and transparency of the process and is unnecessary because the comments are dealt with by a team of authors. Coupled with the role of the Review Editors, this ensures that any "bias" of one individual to another is filtered out without this new step. Furthermore, there was little consensus on this proposal in TG discussions in Geneva. Therefore, to be more balanced, the possible disadvantages that were mentioned should be specified as well as the purported advantages. The text should be edited as follows: Replace "need to be evaluated" at the end of the last sentence by the following addition: "include the lack of transparency in relation to the authors by withholding information from them, and the potential for abuse when reviewers do not have to put their name on their comments. The fact that the comments are dealt with by the author team, coupled with the role of the Review Editors, ensures that any "bias" of one individual to another is filtered out without this step."

(c) Comment on Improving quality and completeness of review

It is not clear what is meant by "Crowd sourcing " techniques and how they would be consistent with an open expert review.

(d) Comment on Confidentiality

Clear guidance is needed on confidentiality but this is not solely in the context of the review process. It is part of the basic way in which IPCC goes about its work. Therefore, propose moving this topic into the first part of the TG report as described in the general comments. Interim discussions and communications during the preparation and finalisation of the assessment are pre-decisional information. As such, these remain confidential and related documents are not public, nor should they be cited, quoted or distributed. Looking only at the text here, it should be edited for clarity by splitting it into two sentences after "openness" and inserting "report" after "draft" in the second sentence which now reads as follows: "Different versions of the draft report should be accessible after the completion of the report. "

(e) Comment on Repository

The suggested comprehensive repository is neither practical nor possible and would have considerable problems with copyright. Delete.

Topic 11.6 Workshops and Expert Meetings

"IPCC Expert Meetings and Workshops...[are part of the] work plan of a WG..." and, as Paragraph 4.2 of the current IPCC Procedures states, the "Co-Chairs are responsible for implementing the work programme" . Therefore, the Procedures, if changed, should reflect that Expert Meetings and Workshops are under the WG/TFI Co-Chairs/Bureau.

Topic 11.7 Guidance documents (Three comments)

Edit bullet 2 for clarity. Line 1 "Work Group" should be "Working Group"; line 2 "expert workshop" should be "IPCC Expert Meeting or Workshop".

Bullet 3: Guidance Documents are IPCC Supporting Material so it seems unnecessary to define a new subclass.

Bullet 5: these actions are all at the level of the WG Bureau, so insert "Working Group" before "Bureau" at end of first sentence. Delete second sentence.

[Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

# **IPCC Secretariat**

## **Governance: Executive Committee**

### **[General Comments]**

The relationship of the new EC with existing structures such as IPCC Bureau, any Task Force Bureau, the FiTT and its role in communications activities need to be clarified.

### **[2]**

2. Experience has shown that what is really needed is an intersessional decisionmaking body that is formally accountable to the Panel. Coordination may be too narrow.

### **[3a]**

3. The EC may also exercise financial authority or have a formal relation with FiTT to address financial issues that go beyond the current authority of the Head of the Secretariat or to address doubt in the implementation of financial decisions by the Panel. This is in particular relevant since according to the IPCC Financial Procedures the UNEP/WMO joint IPCC Trust Fund is managed according to the WMO Financial Regulations. These however refer to the WMO SG, EC, and Congress as authority, and thus do not reflect appropriately the highly developed and detailed decision making structure on financial matters in the IPCC though Panel and FiTT. It is suggested that the Panel at its next session looks into that matter to ensure that the IPCC Trust Fund can be used effectively consistent with decisions by the Panel and financial regulations. A revision of the Appendix B to the Principles Governing IPCC Work may be required.

### **[6c]**

6.c) While it is understood that the head of the Secretariat will be ex-officio member of the EC it is suggested that he/she has a veto power in case a decision by the EC is violating IPCC principles and procedures (standard procedure in many government administrations)

### **[6i]**

6.i) Please clarify how the conclusions and decisions will be made available to members of the IPCC. Shall it be on the web or formal correspondence? Further, a sequenced approach is suggested by which the notes are sent to EC members within two weeks, approved within the next one or two weeks and only then circulated to IPCC members.

### **[6k]**

6.j) Face to face meetings with a notice of 2 weeks may not be feasible

## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[Proposal 4a]**

Please reflect that the IPCC is a joint UNEP/WMP programme, that the two senior positions are provided by UNEP and WMO and that recruitment and reporting has been done jointly for the past 10 years.

### **[Proposal 5]**

Please reflect that the IPCC is a joint UNEP/WMP programme, that the two senior positions are provided by UNEP and WMO and that recruitment and reporting has been done jointly for the past 10 years.

## **Governance: General Comments**

### **[General Comments]**

Important aspects of the IPCC governance and management structure have not been addressed at all. This includes the problems arising due to the temporary and informal nature of the TSUs. Clarification is required inter alia what is a TSU, what is the role and responsibility of a TSU, who can establish a TSU, the relationship with the respective developing country Co-chairs and WG Bureau as well as with the Secretariat and formal hand over procedures from one TSU to the next/to Secretariat. Strengthening of the Secretariat has not yet been addressed. The role of the IPCC Bureau and its relationship with the new Executive Committee (EC) should be further elaborated and clarified.

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[Rational 2]**

Experience has shown that very often the outgoing Bureau/Co-chairs are no longer involved in outreach and dissemination of the reports they have prepared after the new Bureau is elected. It is therefore suggested to consider also some overlap whereby the outgoing Bureau/Co-chairs focus on outreach and dissemination while the incoming Bureau concentrates on the next assessment round. This may even make shorter intervals between reports feasible.

## **Task Group on Communications Strategy**

### **[General Comments]**

General:

General objective of IPCC communications is to support disseminating of the results of IPCC assessment work. IPCC communications should also improve the understanding of who we are, how we work. UN organizations and IPCC observer organizations should be recognized as partners to disseminate knowledge to specific user groups and audiences. Journalists are also very important because they regularly convey messages to the general public whose opinion is crucial for decision makers.

The draft strategy falls short of addressing a number of points raised in the IAC review and have been unclear in the past and thus lead to problems. Clarity is essential to allow consistent implementation, e.g communications material and how it will be authorized, stakeholders and audiences, who identifies spokespersons and who develops and approves the line to take and communicates to spokespersons. There are a number of inconsistencies which would prevent a rapid response in case of unforeseen circumstances.

Many sections refer to activities that have been carried out successfully in the past more than 10 years without referring to experience gained. The role of the



IPCC Secretariat in communications in the past 12 years should be recognized as well as the need to have a centrally coordinated communications strategy where the Secretariat plays a key role.  
Specific comments will be made under the specific sections.

Preamble:

While communication is mentioned a key issue it should be noted that only 5% of the Trust Fund budget is allocated to it. This included distribution costs for reports and staff.

Para 4 should move before the reference to the 2008 task group, because these activities were implemented much earlier. The Information Officer was recruited in 2006.

Comments on the last para of preamble: The IPCC Secretariat is recruiting a Senior Communications Manager. He/she will be reporting and be under the direct supervision of the Secretary of the IPCC.

Reference should be made in the preamble that following the award of the Nobel Peace Prize the communication requirements for the IPCC had changed dramatically, but the resources for communication remained unchanged. This led in part to the inability to address the criticism raised in 2009 and 2010 in an efficient manner.

## **[Principles]**

Add response strategies in the chapeau.

Bullet 3 - clarify terms. Supporting material has a specific meaning in IPCC context.

Bullet 4 - the term unique appears a bit arrogant and may not be helpful in the context of communicating the IPCC as user-oriented organization. Maybe - organization with specific characteristics - could be used instead.

Bullet 5 - audience appropriate communication has been the challenge in the past, but this strategy does not yet sufficiently address this need.

## **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

Para 2 - change Technical Reports to Technical Papers and add Methodology Reports

Para 3 - widen scope to advisers to decision-makers

Bullets 2 and 3 - these activities have been done since 1999

Bullet 3 - include UN and observer organizations

Last bullet - this is the new challenge which requires clear guidance

Global Engagement

FPs have been informed about upcoming reports and in fact they approve them. A training for FPs may be useful. Please be clear about terminology - supportive materials seems to be the wrong term.

Sending all press releases to FPs can only be done electronically; FPs should update their contact regularly to make sure they receive the information

Web presence

These activities have been done since 1999, using cutting edge technology; recently problems with procurement have delayed the quick availability of searchable versions of reports, and resulted in not fully satisfactory quality. Support from the new EC may be useful to ensure that advanced technology can be applied in the IPCC context (see also comments on governance)

IPCC Secretariat/Communications manager should have a general oversight role over all IPCC websites to ensure consistency in approaches, design and messaging.

Be clear on FAQs - are they the FAQs from the reports or additional ones beyond?

## **[Target audiences]**

Add UN, IPCC observer organizations and the scientific community as key audience.

Partnership activities were very successful in the past to address needs of wider audiences and should be explicitly encouraged. Some additional guidance may be appreciated to facilitate quick and targeted activities. Many UN international organizations already showed interest to produce information materials derived from IPCC reports in collaboration with the IPCC for the general public and special user groups.

## **[Languages of communications, and translation]**

If full reports are to be translated the cost will multiply. Currently SPM and TS are translated, FAQs from reports are to be added in the future.

## **[Guidelines]**

Spokespersons

This section requires more clarity about who designates on which grounds spokespeople, for specific tasks or for all matters related to IPCC, how are these designations communicated the IPCC Secretariat/Communications manager. What is the specific role of the IPCC Secretariat/Communications manager involved is too vague.

Rapid Response

How would the spokespersons system function in case of unforeseen circumstances, e.g. who communicates the line to take.

The reference to IPCC leadership needs to be clarified, and the role of the EC.

Errors:

Again who are authorized spokespersons in this case?

Materials:

Which material? Please specify

It is essential that the IPCC Secretariat/Communications manager is fully informed about all communications material prepared by TSUs and that he/she is able to provide advice and ensure consistency. He/she should work closely with the Co-chairs in this respect.

Again the spokespersons selection and role is not clear.

## **[Addressing potential conflicts of interest]**

Be clear in terminology; the use of senior positions, senior leadership and IPCC leadership is confusing. Further clarify what is meant by IPCC participants.

## **[Implementing the new strategy]**

To implement an efficient communications strategy including outreach and partnership activities sufficient resources are necessary. Having one senior staff and consultants will not work. There needs to be sufficient in house capacity to carry out all relevant activities and only for peak periods and specific tasks consultants should be used. The current situation with one post and short term staff is not sustainable due to restrictions on short term staff and consultants that do not allow for any continuity. It makes the activities also very vulnerable to unforeseen events. E.g. in 2008 the communications officer and the Secretary were on sick leave for an extended period, which lead to major missed opportunities in terms of communication after the award of the Nobel Peace Prize.

There are also some ground rules to make internal and external communication more efficient:

- All involved in communication activities have to have clear mandates. This applies also to TSUs and how they relate to the Communications manager.
- Differences between WGs (different specializations, TSUs in different countries, and so on) should be considered as an asset; and the role of the secretariat who harmonizes that work valued.
- The communications manager/team within the IPCC secretariat should be informed of interactions between journalists/bloggers and spokespeople/TSUs Heads.
- The communications manager/team within the Secretariat should coordinate activities related to IPCC communications in general. A focal point dealing with communications could be designated for each WG.
- The communications manager/ team should maintain contact with journalists (attendance to UN press briefings and more information notes) and organize regular briefings. journalists
- The IPCC Secretariat, including the communications manager/ team should maintain contacts and organize briefings for partner organizations to enhance overall cooperation and outreach
- Following the 33rd Plenary Session, an IPCC Communications Guide could be issued; it will be the line for IPCC Communications for public use. It would define clearly inter alia what type of information one could expect from the IPCC and who can speak on behalf of the organization.

## **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

### **[General Comments]**

Background and key considerations: You may further elaborate under this item (possibly point 2.) that IPCC reports and author teams should reflect a range of views and wide range of expertise. Participation of experts from business and industry is explicitly welcome. You may also wish to distinguish at the outset between elected office holders (members of the IPCC Bureau, TFB and staff) and CLA/LA/RE. Key points and approach: The distinction made in points 5 and 6 may lead to inconsistencies in the application of the policy. To avoid that you may wish to consider a larger management of interests panel where certain members focus on CLA/LA/RE and others/all on Bureau and staff. It is suggested not to use the term panel to prevent misunderstandings.

### **[Policy Statement]**

1.c) Be clear what is meant by its members? Members of IPCC are governments and therefore not subject to this policy. 3.b) It is not clear why developing countries are singled out as special case. If you want to emphasize the encouragements of special groups in this context then maybe authors from

business and industry. 3.c) specify higher office, e.g. members of the Bureau/TFB, the Head of the Secretariat etc. 3.h) It is suggested to distinguish between elected office holders (Bureau/TFB) and authors (CLA/LA/RE). 4.b) add Methodology Reports 7.a) Regarding management please see comments made under key points and approach. Different management structures for different groups carry the risk of inconsistency and therefore a larger management of interest structure is suggested. Due to the fact that Working Groups do not provide for a continuous structure it is suggested to establish a central register. 7.b) An independent specialized organization/company as is used by the UN system may be considered as option. Note on Secretariat - Senior staff is currently subject to UN and WMO policy

## **Task Group on Procedures**

### **[1. General Comments]**

Specific wording for changes in the procedures should be suggested to P-33 to ensure that the AR5 is produced according to the revised procedures. In this context other issues not raised by IAC should be addressed to the extent feasible and deemed necessary.

### **[2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings]**

The Panel may wish to consider also clear rules about who can propose a report, whether a scoping meeting has to be done and who can decide (Panel but in case of urgency EC?)

### **[7. Summary for Policymakers]**

Clarification is required about the third review stage (government review of SPM) and the duration thereof.

### **[10. IPCC Guidance material]**

Essential rules have to be incorporated in the procedures, only further elaboration should be in guidance documents. These guidance documents have to be referenced in the procedures.

### **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

11.2

See comment on point 2 about who can propose a report and scoping meetings. In this context it is suggested to import some provisions from the framework for Special Reports and Methodology Report into the procedures.

To ease burden on FPs and WG Bureaux it is suggested to have a comprehensive nomination exercise at the beginning of an assessment round. For any further tasks with the assessment process FPs can be invited to submit further nominations, but in principle the WG Bureaux could rely on the nominations received at the beginning of the process. Currently only nominations for CLA/LA/RE are available. Clarity is also required regarding identification of expert reviewers and credentials.

11.3

Last phrase of para 1 "during the assessment process" is not clear.

Cross cutting issues:

Cross cutting issues are to highlight key issues that have to be addressed by WGs in a consistent and comprehensive manner. However, strict procedures on CCTs may limit the awareness for other cross cutting matters. A general culture of cooperation should be encouraged instead of strict procedures.

Completeness of review:

Cross WG reviews of relevant chapters (e.g. cryosphere related) by authors from other WGs should be standard requirement and be fully documented. Further reviewers of related chapters should be encouraged and invited to review relevant sections of other WG reports. A mapping of sections could ease the burden of reviewers.

Confidentiality

A proposal for an IPCC policy under the Aarhus Convention is under preparation

11.4

The role of CLA/LA in the SPM and SYR approval process should be explained to show that the scientific facts determine what is in the SPM/SYR.

11.7

Guidance document should be anchored in the procedures and just provide further elaboration, or in case of e.g. uncertainty provide the opportunity for update based on new knowledge. In preparing guidance documents one should aim for consistency among WGs, while recognizing differences in disciplines.

### **Section 3 -**

Comments Organized by Task Group

## **General Comments for all Task Groups**

### **[General Comments]**

#### **Austria**

Austria thanks the TGs for their great effort to produce in such short time on quite sensitive topics such clear and helpful texts. This is definitely a strong signal to develop the IPCC further which is very much appreciated.

#### **Belgium**

We welcome the opportunity to comment upon the reports of the 4 TGs. The outcome of the TG meetings is an important step in responding to the IAC report. We believe now is the occasion for the IPCC to adapt to the ever increasing demand upon the IPCC and high expectations as well as to evolving requirements regarding quality control in management. However it will not be possible to decide upon everything at once the next plenary but adapting procedures, processes, management should be a continuous effort.

Some attention will have to be devoted to crosscutting issues in the different TG which require a coherent approach. Those will have to be identified and it would be nice to have some indications on a way of handling these. We are ready to work and cooperate more on this, in a good spirit.

#### **Canada**

It is clear that further work will be needed beyond the 33rd Session to continue the consideration and implementation of the IAC's recommendations. Canada suggests that the Bureau, [Executive Committee] and Secretariat be directed to implement or enact the Task Groups' proposals where complete guidance has been provided by governments and to report to the Panel with final documentation. In areas where guidance remains incomplete, such as governance and management, governments will need to continue to collaborate in developing a path forward to fully respond to the IAC's recommendations. It will be important to maintain the momentum gained through the Task Group meetings and IPCC-33 in order to finalize a robust IPCC response to the IAC report.

#### **China**

China holds that the decisions and actions on the IAC recommendations taken by IPCC at its 32nd session are timely, reflecting the IPCC needs for constantly improving its governance and assessment procedures. We appreciate the efforts made by those Task Groups set up at the 32nd session, and believe that the deliberations and proposals on related issues made by individual Task Groups will provide a good basis for Members to address relevant issues at the 33rd session of the IPCC.

However, we wish to emphasize that the release of the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) in 2014 is the most important task facing the IPCC. The reform of its governance and assessment procedures in accordance with the IAC recommendations should proceed in a gradual, practical, operable manner, and it should facilitate a smooth release of AR5.

We also noted that the discussions on the IAC recommendations by the Task Groups have not been completed yet, and we believe that IPCC should continue these discussions with an appropriate approach.

## Finland

The long-term development of IPCC should continue

The recommendations of the Task Groups contain many good ideas and advisable actions, but the whole process is hampered by the lack of a comprehensive and systematic overall consideration of what is the ultimate purpose of existence of IPCC, how the scope of the IPCC activities should be defined, and in particular, is the present form of operation best suitable for satisfying the ultimate purpose and covering the scope. It is understandable that such consideration cannot change anymore the basic process of preparing AR5, but these issues should be considered urgently, because some important choices in preparing the AR5 will affect the continuation of work after its completion. In the following "food for thoughts" on how to further develop the workings of IPCC.

The task of IPCC and what it requires

The purpose of IPCC is to provide governments and other decision makers with best possible science based background information on climate change, its consequences and on means of influencing its effects on human well-being and environment through mitigation and better adaptation. Best possible information means that the information should be as accurate as possible and its uncertainties should be described correctly, but it means also that the information should cover all important issues indicating where the present knowledge limits most severely the possibilities of rational decision making. When uncertainties on certain required information are very large, the presentation should avoid going too much into details, whose real relevance is insignificant taking those uncertainties into account.

The experience since 1990 has shown that different societies and different political systems use the information in different ways. IPCC should give much emphasis on these varying needs satisfying as equally as possible. The information should be formulated in such ways that its use is possible without unduly distortion.

Four assessment reports have been produced and the fifth is underway. Now it's time to look backwards and think, has the process been as good as it could have been, and now it's time to look forward and think, do we have the right model for the future needs. Is the regular five year interval optimal? Is it at all optimal to produce the whole set of reports regularly, or should the model be replaced by a continuous model as an example?

Is it optimal to have the same basic model for the three working groups? Does the current structure of three WGs serve the assessment work optimally? The reports of WG1, WG2 and WG3 look similar, but are quite different in content. Still they may be too alike as the problems considered are very different. WG1 describes the state of physical sciences basing its report on peer reviewed publications and having in most cases the possibility of comparing work of several research groups on the same issues.

WG2 describes a very wide and heterogeneous field. Many issues are covered by less scientific research reports only and very often only one research group has studied a specific problem. In addition the selection bias appears to affect strongly much of this research at all stages from initiating the research through funding to publishing.

WG3 has its own problems. Many of the central issues have a nature that is close to scenario analysis or futures research. These fields are not capable of producing reliable forecasts, rather projections selected by the authors. WG3 covers also areas, where direct economic conflicts of interest are important. That applies to all economic activities that may receive subsidies or direct benefits from regulatory actions or other policy decisions.

Perhaps the most difficult problem of all is estimating, how concrete policy decisions will ultimately influence the future. Will they have unforeseen large detrimental effects, or how the decisions of future decision makers will affect their significance. IPCC cannot expand much further towards decision making. On the contrary, it should be considered, whether IPCC should limit its task to be narrower than it has been, while some new bodies of different nature might be created to form a better interface between scientific knowledge collected by IPCC and the decision makers.



A possible alternative for the current workings of IPCC  
For the sake of discussion an alternative is sketched below:

- The WG1 is replaced by a continuing process that maintains a data base that covers all related scientific publications that fulfill some minimal requirements, and an continuously updated evaluation document, which describes a selection in a way similar to the present WG1 report. New publications are included and other updates made to this document based on a formal process similar to the present writing of the assessment reports. The advantage is in the better timeliness of the document and in savings in effort, when changes are made only based on need.
- From the WG2 and WG3 those parts would be processed in the same way as far as the level of scientific knowledge is comparable.
- For those parts of WG2 and WG3 where the lack of sufficient publications or the nature of the knowledge makes the above process less applicable, new modes of operations are developed. Part of that could still be included in IPCC activities while parts most directly related to communications with decision makers would be transferred out of the IPCC scope.
- Summaries of the status of science may be written for the policy makers as found appropriate, but the schedule of such summaries does not require similar schedules for the other activities. If the other activities keep their knowledge base continuously up-to-date, they are not affected by writing of summaries.
- It is unlikely that any single body could provide optimal support for areas where ethical questions, policy issues and very uncertain projections on future dominate. For these a number of parallel working groups could produce alternative solutions that take the scientific knowledge into account. They could propose alternative pathways for policy decisions avoiding better the lockup to a single solution that turns out to be unacceptable to many countries. The nature of these activities makes accommodating them within the IPCC framework questionable.

## **Germany**

Not all TGs have completely responded to their mandate. At IPCC-33 a decision should be made prolonging the mandates of the TGs as needed. The mandate should specify the issues to be addressed, going also beyond the IAC-recommendations if needed. --- A decision that the TG on Governance and Management is to establish terms of reference should be taken at IPCC33. The task of this TG according to the decision of IPCC-32 is the following: ".. to examine the role of the Secretariat in its relation with WMO, UNEP, the IPCC-Chair, the Vice-Chairs, Co-Chairs of the WGs and the TFI, and Technical Support Units. The Task Group is requested to review the responsibilities of key Secretariat positions and consider the issues associated with it and to make recommendations to the Panel at its 33rd Session." Terms of reference should be established for the secretariat, the bureau and all of its individual members including the government representatives, and for the TSUs. --- The documents should be more consistent in style, a common introduction should be added (the one from TG PRO could be used). The Explanatory Notes mentioned in TG CoI is missing. It would have been helpful if the secretariat would have supported the TG in formal editing issues, like addition of page and line numbers to the documents. An Excel Sheet for the provision of the comments - and for national coordination would have been helpful.

## **Italy**

The outcomes of the Task Groups are quite good and I do not find any big problem. I think IPCC Secretariat should consider the big challenge to address all these issue at the next IPCC Plenary and so I invite to allocate enough time in the agenda for the discussions among the government.

I find essential that the "new protocol for addressing errors in previous assessment report" is finalized before the IPCC Plenary in order to allow the government to agree on that.  
In this way IPCC finally can have a correction of the HIMALYAN GLACIER ERROR in AR4 WGII:

## Malaysia

Overall, the proposals from the four Task Group respond very well to the relevant recommendations of the Inter-Academy Council (IAC) in the 'Review of the process and procedures of the IPCC' and follow according to the decision, terms of reference (TOR) and within the mandate given by the 32nd Session of the IPCC.

## Netherlands

(1): The Netherlands welcomes the first results of the Task Groups. We remain fully committed to engage in discussions in these Task Groups with the aim to restore, improve and maintain credibility and authority of the IPCC as an unbiased and comprehensive scientific body that considers the full range of scientific views.

(2): Task groups should prepare clear draft decisions on all IAC recommendations for IPCC-33. In addition, they should interpret their mandate as not strictly limited to responding only to the recommendations of the IAC, if deemed important to support the broader context of IPCC reform. The Task Groups mandates give an opening to broaden the work of the Task Groups beyond the IAC recommendations, since they contain a sentence "The Task Group is specifically requested to address, inter alia, the issues listed in Annex I to this decision" (being the IAC recommendations, NL)

(3): All four task groups should fulfill their mandate completely. \*\*For each of the issues the Task Group should establish a timetable for action, consider resource implications and identify responsibilities for implementation\*\*. The Task Groups should complete their work in this regard including taking into account: - those recommendations that should be applied to the AR5. These should be implemented as soon as possible but in all cases before November 2011 (that is before completion and review of the first First Order Draft of WG I) - Recommendations that should be applied to subsequent assessment periods. These should be decided by the Panel at the latest by early 2014.

(4): The four Task Groups are requested to identify crosscutting issues and report how these are handled.

(5): We kindly request all four Task Groups to follow a comparable format for reporting and deliver clear draft decision texts with rationales for IPCC-33.

(6): In case there would be issues or proposals that need further work after IPCC 33, the Panel should extend the mandate of existing Task Groups at IPCC -33 or defining new mandates for one or more new task groups.

(7): The mandate does not exclude addressing the Principles Governing the IPCC work. Article 2 of the Principles describes the role of IPCC: "is to assess the information relevant to understanding the scientific basis of the risk of human-induced climate change, its potential impacts and options for adaptation and mitigation". We suggest a slightly different text that would better reflect the consideration of the \*\*full range of scientific views\*\* as recommended by the IAC: "the scientific basis of the risk of climate change, including human-induced influence, its potential..."

## Russian Federation

First of all, we would like to thank all TGs established at the 32nd IPCC Plenary session for their efforts on working out the recommendations and thorough preparation of the drafts.

However, we would like to suggest some amendments and additions aiming at the improvement of the drafts. Our comments concerning some aspects of the proposals from the TGs are given below.

## **Spain**

Spain welcomes the invitation by the TG Co-Chairs and the IPCC Secretariat to provide written comments to draft recommendations prepared by the Task Groups in preparation of the 33rd Session of IPCC in Abu Dhabi. Spain would like to express its gratitude to TG Co-chairs and members for the hard work made. Spain also highly appreciates the value proposals and recommendations contained in the TG documents

Spain is submitting its preliminary comments to the TG proposals and is looking forward to sharing its views with other governments during the next IPCC Plenary in Abu Dhabi.

## **Zambia**

we commend the working groups for the documents that they have produced that have provided a good basis for us to proceed and make progress. in general we support the outcome of the work of the task groups except for a few comments highlighted in our comments

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

Thank you to all TG members for their hard work. It will certainly help the IPCC to become even better. I hope you can consider some of the comments I made in the specific sections. I refrained from commenting on every issue, because I believe the opinion of governments matters most in an intergovernmental process such as the IPCC. However, I remain at your disposal should you have specific questions. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

Some general comments on the mechanics of the review:

- (1) for ease of reference and clarity during the review, it would have been helpful if each document had page numbers and line numbers as has been standard practice for IPCC products under review.
- (2) an uploadable Excel table for consolidating input among a number of co-workers would have been appreciated.
- (3) the usual IPCC notice on the drafts, warning not to cite, quote or distribute, is missing. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

# **Task Group on Procedures**

## **[1. General Comments]**

### **Belgium**

The TG report is well structured and in a useful manner. However, many recommendations still lack implementation or implementation details. Concrete text proposals for amending the 'procedures' are mostly lacking. To our understanding an additional step is needed to translate the TG recommendations into real procedures, that should then also be checked by an IPCC legal advisor.

### **China**

China holds that the proposals made by the IPCC Task Group on Procedures concerning the IPCC assessment procedures are positive for promoting the efforts to improve its procedures, and they are feasible on the whole. We have noted that it is still necessary to develop specific rules and guidelines concerning the responsibilities of the Review Editors and the procedures for error corrections in order to improve the IPCC assessment process. These rules and guidelines should be specific, operable, and helpful in maintaining the vitality of the IPCC assessment work. We also hold that the Task Group on Procedures should focus more attention on the discussions on how to handle IAC recommendations based on the mandates given by IPCC at its 32nd session.

### **Germany**

The amendments proposed will improve the transparency and robustness of IPCC deliverables. It should be decided to review the procedures after the end of the current assessment cycle. --- Spelling and language should be improved. --- Introduction: A general introduction for all TGs should be provided for IPCC33.

### **Malaysia**

1. General Comments:  
The 33rd Session of the IPCC should consider, discuss and make appropriate decision on the other issues noted by the Task Group (TG) stated in the Addendum.

### **Netherlands**

The opportunity should be taken to repair some technical flaws in Procedures in consultation with the Secretariat, such as:  
(1): adding the practice of the SPM review, overview chapters and/or Synthesis reports preceding approval sessions  
(2): ensuring the possibility of having more than 2 Review editors in a chapter

### **Norway**

The IAC review and the task group have identified a number of areas for potential improvements and Norway very much welcomes the proposals for improving the procedures of the IPCC. Still, it remains important to identify the

resources needed to implement the various recommendations and it would be important to secure that IPCC can work as efficient as possible.

Norway supports most of the recommendations listed in section 11 and suggests that most of them are included in the draft recommendations from the Task Group to the IPCC plenary. See detailed comments under section 11.

In order to enhance the transparency we propose that the IPCC Government Focal Points are kept better informed about the selection of participants at different kinds of meetings and in author teams as soon as the selection is done.

## **Spain**

We believe that the proposals made by the Task Group are very clear, detailed and cover very well all issues on procedures raised in the IAC report.

Concerning the additional issues raised by the Task Group, which are not strictly under the mandate given to the Task Group, from our perspective it would be very beneficial to continue working on them. Our suggestion is to discuss and decide on the way forward in the IPCC Plenary Session in Abu Dhabi. One option could be to extend the mandate of the Task Group with the view to submit a proposal with recommendations for consideration of the Panel in the next Plenary Session.

## **Sweden**

Sweden believes that the IPCC has a solid set of procedures even though there are always room to make them even better.

What is needed is to have a stern review process that can be monitored all through the work with the reports.

## **UK**

Where possible it would be useful to propose actual text that we can agree. There are quite a few areas where this would be possible. We should aim to minimise the number of issues that will require to be returned to subsequently.

What will be done with text/decisions on governance and management issues? How will this be written into the principles/procedures? Suggest text is prepared for the Plenary on this.

We dont yet have universal ToRs for the TSUs (WG2 has prepared a list) . Could these also be elaborated and included in the procedures? This could help with our response to other IAC recs, such as the selection of CLAs/LAs. We need to know more about how this is done currently. This may be for later?

In general we detect a lack of detailed guidance at WG level on how things are done. we should elaborate these on a longer time scale.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

The TG explored a range of interesting proposals, but still needs to transform them into operational ones. Textual proposals would be welcome before the Abu Dhabi Plenary for each topic, otherwise clear decisions will be very hard to make. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

(1) Should avoid being too prescriptive and detailed in the Principles and Procedures themselves. Given the plenary approval process, they may need to live for more than one cycle. Thus it would be better to use Annexes if more detailed or specific text is necessary, as is the case for the Use of Literature.

(2) The TG Procedures took a rather strict view of its mandate and did not make recommendations on topics that were not raised by the IAC Review. This means that some necessary adjustments to the Principles and Procedures to address other important issues such as confidentiality were not properly developed. This is potentially a missed opportunity.

(3) The draft makes an exception for Topic 10 Guidance Notes, a topic not raised by the IAC Review. WGI proposes that another exception should be made for confidentiality, which is a topic of great importance that was also discussed by the TG during its meeting in Geneva in February 2011. It is mentioned in the Addendum under the review process but clear guidance on confidentiality is needed in a broader context. It is part of the basic way in which IPCC goes about its work and is a necessary requirement for authors to be able to have a free and frank exchange of views. Interim discussions and communications during the preparation and finalisation of the assessment are \*pre-decisional\* information. As such, these remain confidential and related documents are not public, nor should they be cited, quoted or distributed, as is standard IPCC practice to indicate this on all documents under review. The ability of the WGs to produce an independent and unbiased assessment would be threatened if material that is in the nature of a draft and/or incomplete information to be further developed were to be released prematurely. It is increasingly clear that this needs to be specified in the Procedures, also showing that it does not contradict the current Principles of IPCC, which state that the assessment is carried out on a "comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis".

Therefore WGI proposes moving this topic into the first part of the TG report, between Topics 3 and 4. The preceding text in this comment can serve as the basis for the TG consideration and the recommendation would be as follows: "Section 4 of the Procedures should be amended to discuss the notion of the confidentiality of drafts and other interim documentation. Suggested text could be the following: "Drafts of the reports, interim discussions and communications, and other documentation created during the drafting and review process are considered pre-decisional materials and as such are confidential. Drafts and other documentation may not be cited, quoted or distributed. ""

(4) The Addendum is not very helpful as presented because it is not clear to a reader who was not part of the discussions in February 2011 in Geneva whether all these suggestions have a similar status in terms of degree of support, depth of discussion, etc. They are in fact highly variable and most of these suggestions will need to be discussed properly by the TG first. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

Specific wording for changes in the procedures should be suggested to P-33 to ensure that the AR5 is produced according to the revised procedures. In this context other issues not raised by IAC should be addressed to the extent feasible and deemed necessary. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings]**

### **Belgium**

(1) It should be made clear who could decide in case of a conflict: the Executive Committee? (coherence needed with TG governance)? The maximum number of participants has to be agreed on by the Bureau and/or WG Bureaus

(2) this topic should be consistent with f of the TG on G&M.

## **Germany**

The proposed selection process of the participants for scoping meetings is not consistent with proposal 3f of TG Governance for the tasks of the EC. We suggest amending the proposal of the TG Gov and agree with the proposal of the TG Pro. --- Add: The selection process must be transparent, a report must be provided to the Panel.

## **Malaysia**

2. Selection of participants to scoping meetings:  
The TG recommendation on the elements for the new step or new paragraph preceding paragraph 4.2.1 of the Procedure are sufficient enough to make sure that the process and criteria for selecting participants for scoping meetings will be more transparent.

## **Norway**

Norway supports the proposal. Furthermore the relevant IPCC Government Focal points should be informed about the selection of participants from their own country.

## **Russian Federation**

Scoping meeting is a very important initial point in the process of preparation of IPCC reports. As the IPCC is an intergovernmental body, the right to nominate participants should be limited and given to government Focal Points and IPCC Bureau members. The major criteria are to be scientific expertise, geographical distribution, and awareness of nominees on needs of governments in climate change related information.

## **Sweden**

it should read "in the first hand scientific expertise but also geographical distribution, gender etc."

While the selection procedure is also under discussion in the EC, it should be further elaborated on where this process shall take place.

## **United States of America**

The US supports this recommendation

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

The proposal is ambiguous: who decides: the Bureau (I plead for this option) or the WG/TF Bureau (they can prepare a proposal for the Bureau)?  
The case of the SYR scoping meeting is not treated explicitly, and it should. Through all these selection processes, one should attempt to keep an "IPCC-wide" perspective, which is broader than the usual WG or TF perspective. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

TG recommendation: Middle of last paragraph, what footnote is referred to here? [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

Section 2: For some Special Reports, Science Steering Groups have been established that work in coordination with the relevant Working Group Bureau(x) that select meeting participants. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

The Panel may wish to consider also clear rules about who can propose a report, whether a scoping meeting has to be done and who can decide (Panel but in case of urgency EC?) [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors]**

### **Belgium**

(1) Regarding 3:.1: the TG recommendation is not a sufficient implementation of the Plenary decision regarding enhanced implementation. We would like to remember that improvement of the selection procedure was also requested in the framework of the recommendations regarding participation of developing countries presented in document IPCC-XXXI/Doc.11, in particular recommendation 2 (Ensure that procedures for the nomination and selection of authors and reviewers are conceived in a way that facilitates the identification and selection of suitable experts from DC/EITs...). What the required reporting concerns, it could be useful to identify the minimal elements for such a report and a common format.

(2) regarding 3.2 we proposed an amendment in last sentence: WG reports as appropriate, including experts (on that specific region) from countries outside the region.

### **Canada**

The Task Group's recommendation for this section does not fully respond to the issues raised by the IAC with respect to the transparency of selection criteria for the scientific credentials of nominees. In the selection of authors for the AR5, the WG Bureaux applied the selection factors identified in the Procedures (e.g., geographic balance, etc), but also applied different qualitative or quantitative criteria to make decisions with respect to the relative expertise and scientific merit of the nominees. Canada suggests that the Task Group explore what criteria were used for the AR5 author selection, and discuss how these criteria should be developed, communicated and applied in future.

### **France**

Topic 3.1. IAC recommendation on criteria



The TG recommendations seem appropriate. However, as far as possible, the reflection on the criteria and processes for the selection of the CLAs, LAs and REs should be deepened.

## Germany

Add (if not already included in procedures): "The selection process must be transparent, a report must be provided to the Panel."

## Hungary

Process of selecting authors: Arguably, authors play the most important role in developing IPCC's main products, i.e. the various reports. It is therefore that the process of selecting authors is critical. This process should be improved as selecting the authors is not transparent enough, and may not be fully efficient, either. Additionally, of experts of similar quality, several have been selected many times (i.e., sometimes too many times), while others have not, which is not fair. Concerning the selection of CLAs, the same concern could specifically be made. It is not fair if there are always very few persons that are selected to be CLA in a certain field, and no others. That inevitably leads to inbreeding. Restricting the CLA office to one report would also be in line with the suggested and fair procedure of restricting the term of office of the IPCC Chair and Working Group Co-Chairs.

How to select Authors? It is suggested that a process of always including new people in the authors cycle is maintained, and thus, it can be ensured that all kinds of thoughts and approaches can be included. This, and only this could ensure an impartial development of science, and that it is avoided that some people or schools have too much influence on conclusions and statements. From a practical point of view, author selection could be done by explicitly requesting governments to always nominate new people, and to suggest a wider range of experts than before.

How to select CLAs? In case somebody that was a CLA in a previous report is suggested again by a country, it must be carefully checked by IPCC if indeed there is nobody else that could do the job.

It must also be transparently ensured that people from CETs and developing countries with good scientific record could have EQUAL chance to become CLAs.

One way of electing CLAs has been a decision by a few core people at a meeting. However, it could also work that CLAs are at least partly elected by the team itself, i.e. the team of LAs elected. The LAs could be more knowledgeable with respect to the scientific record or leadership capabilities of a CLA than a selection meeting by a few people. Also, once a CLA has been elected by his or her people, he/she would feel more responsible for the group to live up to their expectation.

## India

1. A condition should be stipulated that Regional Experts (or local experts) must meet the scientific capacity to assess and synthesize the scientific literature. The CLA and LA should have adequate scientific expertise and capacity for preparing the Assessment Report Chapters.

2. Also, the selection criteria should be displayed before hand on IPCC websites in order to increase the transparency. Including an open tracking

system on nominations received, their evaluations on selection criteria, and final selection should be made public. Sufficient reasons should be provided if a good candidate is not selected.

## **Italy**

I agree on the amendment of the Procedures in order to require a report on the selection process.

I am aware that each WG Bureau finalized a document with all procedures applied and statistics during the selection of AR5 authors last year.

These documents were never made available on the IPCC web site. I inquired about that by writing an email to the IPCC Chair on June 25, 2010.

So I am strongly in favor to have the reports of the selections public for increasing the transparency of the process.

I strongly ask you to make this documentation, in the correct public format, available on line on the IPCC web site.

## **Japan**

1. The IPCC should make the process and criteria for selecting participants for scoping meetings more transparent:

Japan support the recommendation by the TG on selection of experts for the scoping meetings and the authors.

2. (Not in the IAC recommendation) Process of selection of experts to invite IPCC workshops and IPCC expert meetings:

Similarly to the procedures to select experts for the scoping meetings and the authors, those for expert meetings and workshops held by IPCC should be clarified to ensure the transparency of the process.

3. The IPCC should make every effort to engage local experts on the author teams of the regional chapters of the Working Group II report, but should also engage experts from countries outside of the region when they can provide an essential contribution to the assessment:

Japan support the recommendation by the TG that IPCC should engage regional experts on the author teams of regional chapters on the Working Group reports (not only in WGII report).

## **Malaysia**

3. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors:  
All the TG recommendations are sufficient and acceptable.

## **Norway**

Norway supports these two recommendations from the TG. Furthermore the relevant IPCC Government Focal points should be informed about the selection of authors from their own country.

## **Sweden**

we agree on this recommendation

## **UK**

Prepare proposed text for 4.2.2 based on what is there  
Propose text on requiring a report.

an we define better what we mean by gender balance? For example Writing team gender ratio the same as ratio in nominations?  
The mandate is to make this process fairer and more transparent. The TG recommendation is to amend the current procedure text to reflect what we believe is current practice. It doesnt suggest ways forward to ensure transparency. Recommend a guidance note to TSUs on how to run the nominations process and ensure this is available on the IPCC website?  
one way to do this is to get the TSUs to prepare such a note that would be endorsed first by the Bureau and then agreed by the Plenary as a complete doc (ie not line by line) .

## **United States of America**

The US supports these recommendations.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

TG recommendation: Suggest rewording second point for clarity to read  
"Procedures shall be amended to reflect current practice, requiring a report on the selection process. " [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[4. Sources of Data and Literature]**

### **Austria**

Annex 2, para 4  
There is some contradiction with the suggestion under para 11.3 / Repository. It is suggested by Austria to establish such repository at the IPCC secretariat in Geneva. This would add a corresponding additional responsibility of the IPCC Secretariat.

### **Belgium**

In annex 2:

(1) We suggest clarifying by replacing: "Non-journal-based" by: "non-scientific-journal-based "

(2) Regarding 1: It is not enough to say that it needs to be done: some accounting is needed. We think that, for each such reference, authors should make a short note on (a) why the source is valuable and granted confidence, (b) why the source is needed and (c) if there is no summary or abstract in the document for any reason (and regardless of language), the note should include some information on the scope of the document. This should be part of the material made available by the TSUs or secretariat during the review process.

(3) still regarding1: Why "commercially available"? There are also freely available documents. The problem may be more obvious with documents protected by a commercial license or copyright. We suggest the TG should propose to create a

database of all publications that could be made available on request to all people that critically need these to support the work on the report, e.g. Review Editors.

(4) stil regarding1: language other than English : This is very restrictive: there could be useful documents that do not include a summary in EN. We would suggest establishing a mechanism by which an EN summary can be provided by the author; possibly with a signed declaration that he made all efforts to ensure that the translated summary actually reflects the content of the document.

(5) regarding 2. It seems logical that REs are involved, but they already have a lot of work. Either there should be more REs, or there should have some kind of help - e.g. by nominating young scientists as assistants in either the RE process or the checking of sources. The TG should address the means which will allow Review Editors to do a good job, particularly if their responsibilities are broadened. Otherwise it will become increasingly difficult to find volunteers.

(6) regarding 3: Please clarify which sources. All sources except those commercially available above? We find it annoying that this would mean that any source that cannot be distributed to anyone due to copyright restrictions could not be distributed at all. We believe that all sources should be made easily accessible (electronically) at least for some kind of "internal use".

## **Canada**

(1) The statement regarding the use of newspapers and magazines should be more carefully nuanced to ensure that research based on archival documentary evidence is not inadvertently excluded. While documentary evidence does not constitute a large source of information on historical climate change, there is serious research based on documented harvest dates, etc., as an indicator of historical climatic conditions; in these instances at least some of that documentary evidence has come from archived newspapers, and other similar sources. For example, in the first paragraph of the proposed Annex 2, Canada suggests replacing "In principle, newspapers and magazines are not" with "Except in rare instances, such as in studies of historical harvest dates or historical reports of weather impacts, newspapers and magazines are generally not." (2) Under item 3b, Canada suggests noting that making sources available to reviewers is conditional upon having permission from the owners of the grey literature to disseminate it to others. (3) Under item 3, Canada suggests that grey literature should also be accessible upon request to readers of the final report (conditional upon permission of the owners). Accessibility of the referenced sources is important for the users of these assessment reports.

## **Germany**

TG consideration: The reasons for the refusal of the IAC recommendation must be strengthened and explained more carefully as the issue of grey literature has been a major topic of the public discussion. A review of the new rules is needed after the end of each assessment cycles, as the way of scientific working changes. --- 4. Responsibilities of the secretariat, add a third point: "The IPCC Secretariat will (a) ..., (b)..., and c) will store these source after publication of an IPCC-report and make them available on request."

## **India**

1. It is important to note that the Reports of many agencies particularly that of World Bank, UNEP, FAO, WMO, IEA, Regional Development Banks, etc are in

most cases peer reviewed. Thus there is a need for a category that reports from such reputed multilateral institutions and agencies is treated appropriately.

2. It should be ascertained and possibly certified by CLA and LAs that non-journal-based information is not available in journals, and that it would add value to the IPCC report in reflecting a new point of view. In case inclusion of such unpublished and non-peer-reviewed literature changes the context and nature of discussions/inferences, certification by CLA/LAs should be mandatory. In any case, unpublished and non-peer-reviewed literature should not date more than 2 years than the last allowed reference citing date for any IPCC report, since if it were such an important work, why was it not published in these two years, which is a reasonable time for any journal publication.

## **Japan**

### 4. Sources of Data and Literature:

Japan support the recommendation by the TG. Additionally, submitting a brief description of the nature of medias in which non-English literatures are presented would be preferable. (For example, descriptions such as "a local journal of Japanese Economic Association", or "its targeted readers are ...", etc.)

## **Malaysia**

### 4. Sources of Data and Literature:

We agree with the new proposed Annex 2 of the Procedures ('Procedure for using non-published/non-peer-reviewed sources in IPCC reports'). However, the IAC recommendation for unpublished and non-peer-reviewed literature to be appropriately flagged in the IPCC Report should still be considered if any relevant source of data and literature is deemed important/ useful. This "flagging" procedure shall be considered in the implementation after taking into consideration to the additional procedures (1 to 4) as stated in the newly proposed Annex 2 by the TG.

## **Netherlands**

it should be emphasized that newspapers and magazines are in no circumstances valid sources of scientific knowledge. We suggest adding the possibility to refer to both sources only in case it is necessary to note media attention to climate events relevant for the report.

## **Norway**

(1) Norway supports the recommendation from the TG

(2) The TG says: The TG, after consulting the WG /TFI TSUs, found that the implementation of this IAC recommendation regarding the appropriate flagging of unpublished and non-peer reviewed litterature would not be practical.

Would it be wise to include an explanation of why this is not practical?

## **Russian Federation**

1. Acceptable sources of information, besides scientific journal papers, should be limited to a) scientific monographs having an editorial board or a scientific

editor, b) scientific reports prepared by governmental agencies and national/international scientific organizations, and c) proceedings of scientific conferences having an editorial board. All such publications must have ISBN. Use of information sources of any other type in the IPCC reports is unacceptable.

2. It remains unclear who will store the archive collected by a given TSU after the assessment cycle is ended.

## **Sweden**

We agree to the text in the box on Annex 2, but we would like to remove "In principle" in the last row on page 4.

In page 5, bullet 1, Responsibilities, second para: Authors who wish to include information from a non-journal based source that is not commercially available. Does that mean a commercially or publicly? Or commercially or non-commercially?

## **UK**

In the suggested Annex 2, recommend adding the word technical to the list of reports that are acceptable. Do we really want to include NGO reports or other docs emanating from advocacy organisations? Also we would want to make it explicit that policy documents shouldn't be included.

Suggest we put together a more rigorous list of what literature is acceptable and what isn't.

Recommend an easy mechanism for flagging non journal based vs. journal based.

Para 4. can we refer to peer reviewed and non peer reviewed literature.

Splitting the world into journals and others is not quite the issue.

## **United States of America**

On the updated Annex 2, the US believes the first paragraph of Annex 2 as worded is still too ambiguous to provide guidance to authors as they consider information for assessments. Furthermore, we would prefer the emphasis to be placed on assurance of quality of the non-peer-reviewed literature, (i.e. Was the data used in the report from a reliable source? Have previous reports from this source been subsequently verified as consistent with the peer-reviewed literature? Has any data presented been validated and/or is of such a nature that authors have high confidence in its validity? Are the findings presented from a climate change subject area that normally presents new findings in peer-reviewed journals e.g., observations in fields of natural science, or in a subject area that uses other valid avenues to present information e.g., case studies of adaptation or mitigation policies through government publications?) rather than on a differentiation of specific sources. We do not think it is useful to reference specific sources in a general policy.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

TG consideration: In second sentence, for clarity suggest inserting "the part of" before "this", so it reads "the implementation of the part of this IAC recommendation "

Box on Annex 2: In first sentence under point 1, replace "a non-journal based" in the second line by "any", so it reads "from any source. ". Then insert "non-journal based" after "each" in the next line, so it reads "validity of each non-journal based source. ". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

Annex 2, first paragraph: The parenthetical examples, currently placed at the end of the sentence on non-journal-based sources, could be interpreted as giving examples only related to adaptation and mitigation activities as opposed to being general examples of nonjournal-based sources. Consider making the parenthetical a new sentence, e.g., "Nonjournal-based sources include reports from governments...".

Annex 2, section heading 1: It could be better to use "Coordinating Lead, Lead, and Contributing Authors" here.

Annex 2, section 1: Please correct the unconventional paragraph structure used in this section. In addition, here and elsewhere the Task Force should be referred to as the "Task Force," not the "Task Force Bureau."

Annex 2, section 1, second paragraph: It would be more appropriate to direct authors to provide sources that are not commercially available to the relevant Working Group/Task Force TSU, rather than to the Co-Chairs.

Annex 2, section 1, third-to-last sentence of section: It might be clearer to say that an executive summary or abstract in English "must be provided" rather than "is required" to better clarify where responsibility falls for providing this summary.

Annex 2, section 1, last sentence: The current phrasing could imply that these sources will appear in some separate reference section. It does not seem that this sentence adds clarity, so it could be removed.

Annex 2, section 2: It would be clearer to say "are selected and used following the procedures in this Annex."

Annex 2, section 3: The previous comment on reference to the Task Force and on TSU vs. Co-Chairs collection of sources apply here as well. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **[5. Handling the Full Range of Views]**

### **Belgium**

The TG recommendation to change "to aim for a range of views" by "to consider a range of views" seems a very superficial change and does not fully implement the IAC recommendation: ("explicitly document that a range of scientific viewpoints has been considered"). The changes suggested here by the TG, in addition to be minor, are about the selection of authors: something additional is required about how they work. While avoiding adding unnecessary burden on authors, it would be important to implement the IAC recommendation by requiring that for each controversial scientific issue the text would explicitly document the range of scientific viewpoints that have been considered.

## **Germany**

TG recommendation: In the IPCC32 decision it says "the full range of scientific views", the TG recommendation now reads "the range of scientific views". The reason for this change of the language of the IPCC32 decision should be explained carefully as the issue of potential biases in IPCC has been a major topic of the public discussion.

## **Japan**

5. Handling the Full Range of Views:

Japan support the recommendation by the TG.

## **Malaysia**

5. Handling the Full Range of Views:

The TG recommendation is sufficient and acceptable.

## **Norway**

Norway supports the recommendation from the TG

## **Sweden**

we agree to proposal in changeing in language

## **[6. Report Review]**

### **Belgium**

We found no implementation options. Implementation is necessary, but may require further investigation/ or leave some flexibility, for the time being, to TSUs. A simple implementation may be to add the text proposed by the IAC to the procedures for RE work; we suggest rewriting and supplementing this text as follows:

"RE shall identify priority issues within the list of review comments, and send these together with a short summary of their evaluation of the needs for further action. The secretariat and/or TSU is required to support this process by providing software tools that facilitate the review process." The rationale for this proposition is to respond to the recommendation regarding "a more effective process for responding to reviewer comments". We believe that supporting tools are needed to facilitate the work of authors and RE, resulting in a more effective use of the reviewer comments.

### **Canada**

(1) In the first sentence of the Task Group's recommendation in this section (last paragraph, page 6), Canada suggests the replacing "common practices" with "CONSISTENT practices." (2) Canada suggests that the Task Group use a different term than "guidance material" for the input that is being requested under this recommendation. Elsewhere in the Task Group's proposal, it is



suggested that "guidance material" be approved by the Bureau, rather than the Panel. However, the input requested by this recommendation is expected to be returned to the Panel/Task Group for future deliberations. Specifically, the first sentence of the recommendation could be modified as follows: "The IPCC should DOCUMENT AND ANALYSE THE CURRENT review process in order to UNDERSTAND WHETHER the process is targeted and effective..."

## **China**

Taking into account the fact that the Review Editors of each chapter may need to handle several thousand comments during the review process, China believes that the advices of IAC to enhance the role of Review Editors are useful. However, comments on an IPCC assessment report should be handled by Lead Authors, Coordinating Lead Authors and Review Editors altogether rather than completely relying on Review Editors alone. A possible assignment of tasks among them is suggested as follows: (1) Lead Authors are responsible for handling the comments relating to their responsible sections under review, and submitting their individual reports on treatment of the comments to CLAs concerned; (2) Coordinating Lead Authors are responsible for handling the comments relating to a chapter as a whole, and submitting their reports on treatment of the comments to relevant RE; (3) Review Editors are responsible for reviewing the reports on comment treatments, examining the comments, and commenting on significant issues when identified.

## **Germany**

Agreed

## **Japan**

6. Report Review:

Japan support the recommendation by the TG.

## **Malaysia**

6. Report Review:

The TG recommendation for the IPCC to develop guidance material and the required revision to the current Section 4.2.4 is supported.

## **Netherlands**

The review editors may be easily overloaded with work. It is important to involve the whole writing team in handling the review comments. In addition, we suggest to add to the author team young scientists as chapter assistants helping with basic quality checks, such as correct referencing

## **Norway**

Norway supports the recommendation from the TG

## **Sweden**

we agree to a staged process

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

TG recommendation: needs clarification because it seems to be a curious reversal of the normal sequence of events where the WGs provide guidance notes to their authors to assist in the implementation of the current IPCC Policies and Procedures, not provide guidance notes on current practice to inform the Panel with the intention of revising Policies and Procedures. If the guidance note proposed has to be "consistent across the WGs/TFI", it would only be able to cover the fraction of the process that is common. The TG should also note that, depending on the timing, any Panel changes to the review process may be too late to be applied consistently to the WGI AR5. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

The review process could be improved by more targeted review efforts. That is, the Co-Chairs should identify important and/or contentious issues in the report, identify experts for these particular pieces and request the experts to specifically review these instead of the whole report. [Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, WG III]

## **[7. Summary for Policymakers]**

### **Austria**

Austria supports to clarify the current practice. Such clarification should clearly state that all the amendments agreed by the Panel need also be fully supported by the authors (Lead Authors). Any disagreement by those shall be documented in the SPM.

### **Belgium**

The existing Procedures should be amended to clarify the current practice. If the recommendation is not accepted (as suggested here), there should be at least an attempt to take into account the underlying motivation in the IAC report. This motivation (see p. 25 of the IAC report) is to reduce differences between the content of the SPM and that of the full report, in particular differences due to political influences on the content. This remark is not out of topic, considering the criticism that the IPCC received and could receive in the future. Having this in mind, the clarification of the procedures may involve:

- (1) making clear that authors have the final word on scientific issues and may thus reject changes that have no scientific basis (We believe such an addition to the procedures would be very important for the credibility of the IPCC);
- (2) creating "guardrails" regarding choices of content in SPMs : requesting that it is made clear that the balance of viewpoints and issues from the report is adequately reflected in the SPM, especially when changes are made during Plenary meetings.

### **France**

Topic 11.4 Approval and Acceptance of SPMs (section 4.3 of the Procedures)

We particularly support the proposal of the Task-Group. The role of the CLAs, which is, in practice, strong, should be reflected in the procedures : the CLAs have the right of a veto based on scientific grounds, regarding the proposals made by the governments.

## Germany

Task Group recommendation for decision by the Panel:

We do not understand, how the existing Procedures could be amended to clarify the current practice. As the procedure is clearly described, there is no need for clarification.

## Japan

7. The IPCC should revise its process for the approval of the Summary for Policy Makers so that governments provide written comments prior to the Plenary:

The current practice has a problem that the panels would not have enough time to read the final draft of WG reports in detail because the final drafts is available only at the session to approve these reports. For non English-native panels, it is essential to have enough time to read through the final draft before the discussion on the floor. Therefore, the final draft should be submitted to the governments at least few weeks before the Session of the Panel that adopts/approves the WG assessment reports, similarly to the current practice for the SYR.

## Malaysia

7. Summary for Policymakers

The current IPCC practice already allows for governments to provide written comments on the Summary for Policymakers prior to the Plenary. However, a more transparent selection of the drafting committee of the Summary of Policymakers should be implemented.

## Norway

Norway supports the recommendation from the TG

## Sweden

We support the TG recommendation to clarify the current practice in the procedures

## UK

Agreeing the SPM. If the process needs clarifying would be helpful to have some text that can be agreed.

## Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32

The TG proposes that "The existing Procedures should be amended to clarify the current practice.". Where is the clarification? I suggest that, at least, the procedures contain an explicit sentence indicating that the relevant CLA's & LAs, and not the government delegations have the last word about the scientific content of an SPM. [\[Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair\]](#)

## **IPCC Secretariat**

Clarification is required about the third review stage (government review of SPM) and the duration thereof. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

### **[8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors]**

#### **Canada**

(1) In the recommendation, Canada suggests including the following two additional points: 1. Errors should be addressed in a timely manner; and 2. Errors will be addressed in consultation with the IPCC's Senior Communications Manager. (2) Canada suggests that the Task Group further elaborate (or direct the authors of the error protocol to elaborate) on how error reports will be assessed and re-directed when first reported through online mechanisms. The protocol currently suggests that all error reports will be directed to Co-Chairs, other Bureau members, or CLAs. However, these individuals are volunteers in the IPCC process, and the procedures should be developed with a view of minimizing their potential burdens where possible. We are concerned that the process as currently described leaves the IPCC and the scientific community vulnerable to concerted "denial of service" attacks that could lead to thousands of error reports.

#### **China**

China holds that the decision made by IPCC-32 on the establishment of a procedure for handling potential errors is appropriate. However, due attention should be given to both the efficiency and operability of the specific operating procedure under development.

#### **Germany**

We urge the responsible persons to provide a finalized version of the protocol on error handling to the Panel at its 33rd session for decision. ---

This is a cross cutting issue with TG Gov and Com, decisions should be amended accordingly. ---

We note that additional personnel would be required to maintain a public web site for error submission. We suggest to mention these budgetary implications in the decision.

#### **Japan**

8. IAC discussion and suggestion in the Box analyzing the Himalayan glacier error (IAC report page 22). Discussion of time required for a response on Himalayan glacier error (IAC Report page 54):

[[[a]]]The decision making processes by the panel meeting, which are included in the current guidance note, should be amended to the decisions by the Executive Committee to make quick response.

[[[b]]]In the cases of 5a) and 9a) of the Guidance Note, in which it is concluded that there is an error, the fact should be posted by the IPCC web page in timely manner.

[[[c]]]Even in case of an important error, the necessary procedure should be done in timely manner (with a time limit) by Executive Committee, without waiting for the decision by a panel meeting.

## **Malaysia**

8. Procedure for the handling of potential errors  
The responsible body for handling potential errors shall be addressed in the recommendations of the Task Group on Governance and Management. In this respect, Cross-Task Group review is important in the 33rd Panel of the IPCC.

## **Netherlands**

To date, no correction has been posted on the IPCC website about the Himalaya error that started the IPCC crisis more than one year ago. The Panel IPCC-32 has urged the IPCC Chair and co-chairs to finalize the error protocol and implement it. IPCC 32 also decided that further analysis to be considered by the Task Group on Procedures with the view to submit a proposal for a decision at IPCC-33. We request the TG on Procedures to fulfill this task and inquire about the progress in finalizing the error protocol in the Executive team.

## **Norway**

Norway supports the recommendation from the TG

## **Russian Federation**

According to IAC recommendations, IPCC should work out a mechanism for correction errors that may be found in approved IPCC reports. However, the error correction process ought to be initiated by a formal letter from a government, a national/international institution dealing with climate change issues, or an IPCC Bureau member. Request of individuals should be first considered by the IPCC Bureau or respective WG Bureau (this could be made through electronic discussion).

## **Sweden**

We are concerned about a procedure that invites for potential errors. It could lead to a huge amount of extra work load for the IPCC to deal with formally. It has to be defined what is meant by "potential error".

## **UK**

Process for handling of errors

1. This is a cross-cutting issue and should be treated as such
2. What is the current status of the document on the error protocol? Recommend that the TG PP considers it and comes up with recommended text to take to plenary. Otherwise this risks delaying decisions on this recommendation. Can a new section 4.5 be proposed? The outcome is not particularly clear.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

This is a very important issue. The draft procedure presented in Busan has still not been finalized, preventing the correction of errors such as the "Himalayan glaciers" errors raised at the end of 2009. The TG is encouraged to engage with those in charge of finalising the procedure so that progress can be made. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

TG recommendation:

Bullet 1 is too elaborate. Suggest rewording as follows "The procedures should be updated with mention of the agreed protocol to address potential errors and develop errata as appropriate. ". The detail of the protocol should be in an Annex, if included at all.

Bullet 2: replace "a mechanism" by "the procedure".

Bullet 4 is not consistent with the protocol for handling errors, which is currently being finalised, where the responsibility is with the Chair and Co-Chairs. There is only a role for the Executive Committee in issues that arise beyond the WG and TF level. This is a cross-cutting issue that needs to be consistent with TG Governance. Edit text by inserting "that arise beyond the WG and TF level in the context of the assessments and other relevant IPCC products." at the end of the sentence. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

It is unclear what is meant by the Panel implementing a system to deal with potential errors. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **[9. IPCCs Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty]**

### **Canada**

(1) It is unclear why the Task Group's recommendation suggests that the Procedures make reference to a specific guidance document on uncertainty when this document is intended to be transient in nature. Canada suggests deleting the last line of this recommendation, which states: "...with reference to the guidance note on uncertainty when completed." (2) The Panel's decision and the Task Group's consideration are vague with respect to why the guidance note is being presented to the Panel at its 33rd Session. Canada reiterates its preference that this document is to be provided for the Panel's information only. In addition, Canada suggests including the approval of guidance documents in the Bureau's Terms of Reference (to be developed by the Governance Task Group), which would be consistent with the text on "guidance documents" proposed in the Addendum.

### **Germany**

Agreed. The guidance notes on Uncertainty have been published in the mean time. The text should be adapted accordingly.

### **Japan**

9. All Working Groups should use the qualitative level-of-understanding scale in their Summary for Policy Makers and Technical Summary, as suggested in IPCC's uncertainty guidance for the Fourth Assessment Report. This scale may be supplemented by a quantitative probability scale, if appropriate:

The Guidance Note should be written with consideration that different treatments (types/levels) of uncertainty among Working Groups are desired, since WGI handles pure natural science while WGIII includes policy matters.

10. Typo:

8.1-8.5' should be '9.1-9.5' in the first line of 'Task Group consideration'.

## **Malaysia**

9. IPCC's Evaluation of Evidence and Treatment of Uncertainty

The final guidance note on evaluation of evidence and treatment of uncertainty to be presented to the 33rd Panel of the IPCC should be a common approach to the treatment of uncertainty in all the three Working Groups.

## **Norway**

Norway supports the recommendation from the TG

## **Russian Federation**

1) Very often, complexity and non-linearity of processes in nature and socio-economic sphere lead to enormous difficulties in accurate estimating/assigning probabilities for particular parameters to be assessed in the IPCC reports. Therefore, the probabilistic approach should be applied very cautiously and only in cases where it is crucially needed (e.g., in comparative analysis, in attribution exercises, etc.) when a result even cannot be formulated with no confidence statement. In other cases it would be just an unnecessary additional load for the authors.

2) Probabilistic evaluation and confidence statements are generally understood with difficulties by decision makers and the public. They also very often lead to ambiguous conclusions. Therefore, such information should be given in the IPCC products as clear and simple as possible. It is expedient to have a unified scale for characterizing uncertainty/confidence throughout all IPCC products.

## **Sweden**

We are satisfied with the work done on the draft guidance not by WG Co-chairs and a coming inclusion in the procedures, in the end leading to a common approach in the WGs.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

TG recommendation: Replace "when completed" at end of last sentence by "which has been finalised and is being implemented by the WGs." [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[10. IPCC Guidance material]**

### **Austria**

Austria supports the additional suggestions included in para 11.7 related to guidance documents.

### **Canada**

Canada supports the Task Group's continued efforts to resolve the status of "guidance material." The text proposed in the Addendum on this issue is generally consistent with Canada's views on this issue, but it would benefit from further explanation with respect to the distinction between "guidance material" and "supporting material." Canada supports guidance material being the purview of the IPCC Bureau (and not subject to approval by the Panel); this will need to be clarified both in the Procedures and in any future terms of reference for the IPCC Bureau.

## **Finland**

Not all guidance material is issued out of specific Working Groups or in association with an assessment. Some guidance (specified as Technical Guidelines) is also produced out of the Task Group on Data and Scenario Support for Impacts and Climate Analysis (TGICA). This is also designated as IPCC Supporting Material. It would be useful for the procedures to be more specific on the types of guidance being referred to. TGICA is currently reviewing its own procedures directed to authors preparing technical guidelines. These guidelines build on information contained in IPCC assessment reports, offering guidance and illustrations of how to apply data and scenarios generated out of those reports. (see also p.12 Guidance documents)

## **Germany**

agreed

## **Japan**

11. IPCC Guidance material:

Japan supports the recommendation by the TG. The status of the guidance notes should be "living document" which may be amended when needed.

## **Malaysia**

10. IPCC Guidance material

All the IPCC guidance material need to be classed as supporting material, and this should be further considered by the Panel of the IPCC.

## **Norway**

Norway supports the recommendation from the TG and also suggests that the concrete suggestions in 11.7 are included in the recommendation to the IPCC Plenary.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

TG recommendation: This was not part of the IAC recommendations and it is probably not clear to an outsider what group of materials is meant here. Suggest rewording as follows: "The Panel may wish to give further consideration to the use of guidance materials developed by the WGs in order to clarify current practice." [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]



## **IPCC Secretariat**

Essential rules have to be incorporated in the procedures, only further elaboration should be in guidance documents. These guidance documents have to be referenced in the procedures. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

### **[11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures]**

#### **Austria**

Austria supports all additional suggestions, except those related to cross-cutting issues as that topic should be individually handled in every deliverable of the IPCC, as appropriate.

#### **Canada**

Canada notes that the issues raised in the Addendum have not undergone sufficient analysis by the Task Group and require much further discussion. There are a number of issues in section 11.3, such as the proposals under "cross-cutting issues" and "range of scientific views," that would pose significant implementation challenges. It is suggested that the Task Group recommend that during IPCC-33 the Panel focus on the body of the proposal only. Canada would support an ongoing process after IPCC-33 for governments to consider other issues identified by the Task Group (in conjunction with the Bureau and TSUs).

#### **Germany**

The TG on procedures should be mandated at IPCC33 to continue its work in consultation with the EC. The mandate should specify the issues to be addressed.

#### **Hungary**

Archiving data and procedures: It happened before that after developing data for an IPCC methodology report that was published, colleagues identified potential problems and the source data and the procedure of processing them was needed to be analyzed. Unfortunately, fellow authors were unable to recover what they did, and also refused to uncover their approach. This is not a good practice. For the sake of transparency, we suggest to develop procedures for archiving data and approaches of developing data that are used in the development of a report. This procedure might even include publishing source data, as well as publications analyzed by authors.

#### **India**

The IPCC Task Group on Procedures, in consultation with IPCC Secretariat, may consider documenting the addendum on Issues for further discussion on Procedures separately to put up to IPCC appropriately

#### **Malaysia**

11. Addendum: Issues for further discussion on Procedures

Since the Task Group members do not have the mandate given by the 32nd session of the IPCC to consider the issues as noted in the Addendum, therefore, the matters must go back to the Panel of the IPCC for consideration - the 33rd Panel of the IPCC should further discuss those issues and make decision.

## **Morocco**

\* Guidance documents:

In section 10 of this document, the Task Group recommends that the Panel may wish to give further consideration of this group of guidance materials with the aim of developing appropriate procedures. These guidance documents are important for each group/individual. However, we are not sure of the effectiveness of these guidance documents that ultimately will be used or converted into final procedures. Many documents might not be practical for an efficient process.

## **Netherlands**

We believe this addendum contains very useful suggestions which are all within the mandate of the Task Group given the inter alia clause - and we urge the Task Group to develop draft decision texts for consideration by the Panel for all of these suggestions. We particularly wish to highlight the following suggestions:

- (1): making expert reviews anonymous; we request the TG also to list the pros and cons (11.3)
- (2): making review comment responses available for expert and government reviewers during the assessment process (11.3)
- (3): document the range of scientific views if there is no consensus (11.3).
- (4): strengthen the role of the CLAs at the SPM approval sessions;
- (5): defining guidance notes and guidance documents and its relation to the IPCC Procedures

## **New Zealand**

1 Anonymous expert review: We do not support anonymous expert review. Under the general IPCC principles of transparency the names of the expert reviewers should be available to the lead authors who are deciding how to address their comments, and should also be available in the archive of review comments. 2 Role of Coordinating Lead Authors at the SPM Approval Session: we agree with the Task Group's comment that "changes in the SPM text are adopted only if the relevant CLAs can ensure that these changes are consistent with the scientific findings in the underlying report"

## **Norway**

### 11.1 General comment

Norway regards most of these issues relevant to the IPCC treatment of the IAC review. We suggest that most of them are included in the recommendations from the Task Group to the IPCC Plenary for their consideration.

### 11.2 Nomination and selection process

Norway supports the development of thorough and publicly available descriptions of both the scoping process and the nomination process. We suggest that these proposals are included in the recommendations from the TG to the IPCC Plenary.

There is a word missing between "current" and "by" in the first sentence under the subtitle "Nomination process"? For instance "practice"?

### 11.3 Review process

Availability of review comments and responses:

Norway supports making review comment responses files available to the reviewers as soon as possible after their completion. We suggest that this proposal is included in the recommendations from the TG to the IPCC Plenary.

Anonymous expert review:

Norway would like to see an evaluation of previous practices with anonymous expert reviews before moving on with this proposal. Further, we find it unnecessary to treat the Governments' comments anonymously.

Improving quality and completeness of review:

Norway finds it important that the review process is organized so that it covers the full report. We also see the need for including cross checking by lead authors from other Working Groups. We suggest that this proposal is included in the recommendations from the TG to the IPCC Plenary.

Range of scientific views

Norway supports that this proposal is put forward to the IPCC Plenary for their consideration.

Repository

If establishing a repository the IPCC should prioritize non-journal based literature as this is more difficult to get compared to journal based articles.

### 11.4 Approval and acceptance of summaries for policymakers

Norway supports the procedures to be amended so that they reflect the current practice and role of Coordinating Lead Authors in the SPM approval sessions. In our view the CLAs are doing an excellent job in assuring the SPMs to be scientifically correct.

### 11.5 Synthesis report

Norway supports that the procedures should include a specification of the SYR review process along the lines of current practice.

### 11.6: Workshops and expert meetings

Norway supports clarification of the procedures describing the processes for selecting participants for Workshops and Expert meetings. Furthermore the relevant IPCC Government Focal points should be informed about the selection of participants from their own country.

### 11.7 Guidance documents

Norway finds the development of such guidance documents useful and underlines that such guidelines should serve to enhance transparency and support common rules. We suggest that this proposal is included in the recommendations from the TG to the IPCC Plenary.

## **Sweden**

Improving quality and completeness of review, page 11, second para: Cross checking in this manner is very important

## **UK**

Some of the proposals in Para 11. Addendum are helpful and can be dealt with now.

11.2 agree. Recommend preparing decision text

11.3 we should move to anonymous comments now - best way to remove bias

11.4 I can't see anything needs to be changed here

11.5 not clear what is being proposed here

11.6 Worth revisiting but not before IPCC 33

11.7 Important area which is too big to resolve now but definitely needs revisiting.

## United States of America

on 11.3

Crosscutting issues: The function of the tasks of coordinating lead authors has tended to evolve in each assessment and need not be included in the procedures.

Anonymous expert review: the suggestion of evaluating the disadvantages related to the process proposed by the Special Report on CCS is a good suggestion.

Improving Quality and completeness of review: The suggestion of including cross checking by lead authors of other WGs where relevant in the expert review process is a good suggestion. CLAs could specify subject areas that require expert review as part of the process of developing regional chapters.

## Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32

The confidentiality component of the IPCC work is partially mentioned in page 11 of the Draft Document provided by the TG on Procedures under the topic 11.3: Review Process. In my opinion, confidentiality deserves a section in itself to consider not only confidentiality needs during the IPCC review process, but also confidentiality needs during other stages of the IPCC work, such as LA meetings and the internal exchanges of mails and draft documents among the authors, contributors, etc., during the drafting processes. In my view, the required intellectual privacy during these intermediate stages of the IPCC work is a core element of the enabling conditions that the Panel should ensure to those in charge of the preparation of the IPCC reports. The drafts of the reports, review comments and responses to review comments could be accessible after the completion of the reports.

Therefore, confidentiality needs and transparency / openness provisions should be properly defined and effectively combined in the IPCC Procedures. [Ramon Pichs-Madruga, Co-chair, WG III]

Topic 11.3 Review process (Five comments)

(a) Comment on Availability of review comments

WGI does not support this proposal. There was little consensus on this proposal in the TG discussions in Geneva. Therefore, to be more balanced, the text should be edited as follows. Insert "It has been proposed that " at the start of the last sentence. Add a new last sentence that reads "However there are concerns that this could be open to abuse and would affect the independence of the authors. It would also require a change in the planned internal schedules of the WGs."

(b) Comment on Anonymous expert review

WGI believes that making the expert review anonymous decreases the openness and transparency of the process and is unnecessary because the comments are dealt with by a team of authors. Coupled with the role of the Review Editors, this ensures that any "bias" of one individual to another is filtered out without this new step. Furthermore, there was little consensus on this proposal in TG

discussions in Geneva. Therefore, to be more balanced, the possible disadvantages that were mentioned should be specified as well as the purported advantages. The text should be edited as follows: Replace "need to be evaluated" at the end of the last sentence by the following addition: "include the lack of transparency in relation to the authors by withholding information from them, and the potential for abuse when reviewers do not have to put their name on their comments. The fact that the comments are dealt with by the author team, coupled with the role of the Review Editors, ensures that any "bias" of one individual to another is filtered out without this step."

(c) Comment on Improving quality and completeness of review

It is not clear what is meant by "Crowd sourcing " techniques and how they would be consistent with an open expert review.

(d) Comment on Confidentiality

Clear guidance is needed on confidentiality but this is not solely in the context of the review process. It is part of the basic way in which IPCC goes about its work. Therefore, propose moving this topic into the first part of the TG report as described in the general comments. Interim discussions and communications during the preparation and finalisation of the assessment are pre-decisional information. As such, these remain confidential and related documents are not public, nor should they be cited, quoted or distributed. Looking only at the text here, it should be edited for clarity by splitting it into two sentences after "openness" and inserting "report" after "draft" in the second sentence which now reads as follows: "Different versions of the draft report should be accessible after the completion of the report. "

(e) Comment on Repository

The suggested comprehensive repository is neither practical nor possible and would have considerable problems with copyright. Delete.

Topic 11.6 Workshops and Expert Meetings

"IPCC Expert Meetings and Workshops...[are part of the] work plan of a WG..." and, as Paragraph 4.2 of the current IPCC Procedures states, the "Co-Chairs are responsible for implementing the work programme" . Therefore, the Procedures, if changed, should reflect that Expert Meetings and Workshops are under the WG/TFI Co-Chairs/Bureau.

Topic 11.7 Guidance documents (Three comments)

Edit bullet 2 for clarity. Line 1 "Work Group" should be "Working Group"; line 2 "expert workshop" should be "IPCC Expert Meeting or Workshop".

Bullet 3: Guidance Documents are IPCC Supporting Material so it seems unnecessary to define a new subclass.

Bullet 5: these actions are all at the level of the WG Bureau, so insert "Working Group" before "Bureau" at end of first sentence. Delete second sentence.

[Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

Availability of review comments and responses 11.3

Under the current regime the drafts are reviewed by experts (and Governments in the 2nd round) who, with their comments and expertise, discuss the text thereby helping to improve the draft. That is, the text is still in the realm of science and there is a need for room for discussion among experts, sharing ideas etc, without being displayed in the public sphere. Publishing the discussion on a not yet finished draft is therefore unlikely to facilitate the drafting process or to improve the quality of the report. Transparency is already ensured with the current handling of publication after the process has ended. It may be more helpful to better communicate the process to the public.

Anonymous expert review 11.3

The anonymous review is also regarded as not helpful to the process. The situation is different from scientific journals where the review process is double-blind, i.e. where not only reviewers but also authors are treated anonymously. The current proposal leads to an imbalance as only authors are held

accountable for their writing. Instead, a more targeted review would be more useful to improve the review process (see nr 6).

### Repository 11.3

The idea of transparency behind this proposal is welcome but the proposal seems to encounter insurmountable copyright problems when journal-based literature or commercially available literature (e.g. IEA reports) are freely accessible on e.g. a TSU website. [Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, WG III]

Page 11, anonymous expert review: It is not clear that an anonymous review process would be more objective. An important component of the consideration of a specific review can be the context provided by the expertise of the reviewer providing the comment, which would not be available in the case of anonymous comments. The increased emphasis on the role and responsibilities of Review Editors already implemented for the AR5 will help ensure the objective consideration of all review comments.

Page 11, improving quality and completeness of review: The increased emphasis on the role and responsibilities of Review Editors will help ensure a comprehensive review of the Report. In addition, an increased emphasis on review by authors from other chapters and WGs will help ensure that individuals with the full range relevant expertise review chapters.

Page 12: The preparation of guidance documents, particularly those treating scientific subjects, is usually coordinated by the relevant Working Group Co-Chairs and TSUs, involving core writing teams as appropriate. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## IPCC Secretariat

### 11.2

See comment on point 2 about who can propose a report and scoping meetings. In this context it is suggested to import some provisions from the framework for Special Reports and Methodology Report into the procedures.

To ease burden on FPs and WG Bureaux it is suggested to have a comprehensive nomination exercise at the beginning of an assessment round. For any further tasks with the assessment process FPs can be invited to submit further nominations, but in principle the WG Bureaux could rely on the nominations received at the beginning of the process. Currently only nominations for CLA/LA/RE are available. Clarity is also required regarding identification of expert reviewers and credentials.

### 11.3

Last phrase of para 1 "during the assessment process" is not clear.

#### Cross cutting issues:

Cross cutting issues are to highlight key issues that have to be addressed by WGs in a consistent and comprehensive manner. However, strict procedures on CCTs may limit the awareness for other cross cutting matters. A general culture of cooperation should be encouraged instead of strict procedures.

Completeness of review:

Cross WG reviews of relevant chapters (e.g. cryosphere related) by authors from other WGs should be standard requirement and be fully documented. Further reviewers of related chapters should be encouraged and invited to review relevant sections of other WG reports. A mapping of sections could ease the burden of reviewers.

Confidentiality

A proposal for an IPCC policy under the Aarhus Convention is under preparation

11.4

The role of CLA/LA in the SPM and SYR approval process should be explained to show that the scientific facts determine what is in the SPM/SYR.

11.7

Guidance document should be anchored in the procedures and just provide further elaboration, or in case of e.g. uncertainty provide the opportunity for update based on new knowledge. In preparing guidance documents one should aim for consistency among WGs, while recognizing differences in disciplines. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **Governance: General Comments**

### **[General Comments]**

#### **China**

China holds that proposals made by the Task Group on establishment of the Executive Committee could serve as a good basis for further discussion. The major Terms of Reference for the Executive Committee are to coordinate and facilitate decisions taken at IPCC Plenary and to handle emergencies during intersessional periods. The current proposals made by the Task Group on the TOR of the Executive Committee and mode of its operation are relatively appropriate, which provide IPCC Plenary with a good basis for further elaborations.

#### **Germany**

A decision that the TG on Governance and Management is to establish terms of reference should be taken at IPCC33. The task of this TG according to the decision of IPCC-32 is the following: ".. to examine the role of the Secretariat in its relation with WMO, UNEP, the IPCC-Chair, the Vice-Chairs, Co-Chairs of the WGs and the TFI, and Technical Support Units. The Task Group is requested to review the responsibilities of key Secretariat positions and consider the issues associated with it and to make recommendations to the Panel at its 33rd Session." Terms of reference should be established for the secretariat, the bureau and all of its individual members including the government representatives, and for the TSUs.

#### **Japan**

5. The roles and responsibilities of IPCC Bureau:  
As to the roles and responsibilities of IPCC Bureau, too strict criteria should not be applied and the balance of regions, gender and disciplines etc., should be considered.

#### **Malaysia**

All members of the proposed Executive Committee must be elected by the Plenary and serve until their successors are in place. We do not support the ex-officio committee member mechanism.

#### **Netherlands**

(1): There should be periodical audits of the performance of IPCC by an external body - like the InterAcademy Council has done with its review  
(2): these may be staggered for the different WGs and TFI or before decisions are taken for a next assessment period. These audits should be seen as a part of the quality management of a large organization.  
(3):The IPCC needs a full time chairperson, as a step in further empowerment of its organization, in order to meet its increased governance and management demands. Current practice is a part-time chairmanship.  
(4): The Task Group should present terms of reference for Chair, cochairs, vice chairs, WG vice chairs , TFI board.  
(5): All decisions other than those with regard to the terms of office should be implemented as soon as possible but no later than November 2011



## Norway

### General comments

Norway welcomes the proposals from the Task Group and is in general very happy with the draft document. We still find the document to be a bit short about the motivation or rationale for various proposals, in particular we would like to see the motivation elaborated when the recommendations are not in line with the recommendations of the IAC.

We have noticed that a few issues in Annex II to the decision to establish the Task Group so far are not dealt with by the Task Group. We therefore suggest that the Task Group develops a proposal about the need to clarify the roles and responsibilities for all Bureau members, including the IPCC Chair as noted in Annex II ch 4.3 in the decisions from the IPCC plenary (ToR for the Task Group on Management). Furthermore we would like this to include a clarification of the role of the TSUs..

Increased transparency is a priority in the IAC review. Norway therefore suggests that the minutes from IPCC Bureau meetings, WG Bureau meetings and Executive Committee meetings should be sent to the IPCC Government Focal Points and the members of the IPCC Bureau and (the secretariat and TSUs).

The TSUs are not dealt with by the Task Group and Norway would like to stress the importance of TSUs functioning as secretariats for all Co-Chairs in their respective Working Group / Task Force.

## Zambia

The country supports the recommendations of the task group particularly on the following issues:

1. Establishment of an executive committee to provide a formal coordination mechanism to ensure timely and effective implementation of IPCC decisions
2. IPCC to elect an executive director to lead the secretariat and handle day to day operations of the organisation. However, the proposed term of 8-10 years for the Executive Director needs further consideration as the period may be considered too long on account that the position should be rotational.

## Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32

(1) What other topics does TG Governance feel should be considered? There is no discussion of the role of the Secretariat and its relationship to other actors; also the qualifications and roles of all Bureau members. Have these topics that were part of the Decisions at P-32 been deferred and, if so, until when? The need for this discussion may be satisfied by reviewing and further developing Terms of Reference for the elected senior officials (Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs, Co-Chairs); for the Bureau as a whole; for the Secretariat and the TSUs.

(2) The "modular" format is quite convenient for the review but before the TG sends its report to the Panel, please add a cover page and an introduction to let the Panel know what can be found in this report and what has been deferred, with an indication of the timeline for the next steps. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## IPCC Secretariat

Important aspects of the IPCC governance and management structure have not been addressed at all. This includes the problems arising due to the temporary and informal nature of the TSUs. Clarification is required inter alia what is a TSU, what is the role and responsibility of a TSU, who can establish a TSU, the

relationship with the respective developing country Co-chairs and WG Bureau as well as with the Secretariat and formal hand over procedures from one TSU to the next/to Secretariat. Strengthening of the Secretariat has not yet been addressed. The role of the IPCC Bureau and its relationship with the new Executive Committee (EC) should be further elaborated and clarified. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **Governance: Executive Committee**

### **[General Comments]**

#### **Canada**

Canada is pleased by the work undertaken thus far by the Task Group on this issue. Canada's main objective regarding the establishment of an Executive Committee is to ensure the creation of such a body fills genuine gaps in the IPCC's current management system. To do so effectively, the Task Group would benefit from further analysing the roles and responsibilities of the IPCC Bureau and the relationships and accountabilities between the Panel, the Bureau, the Executive Committee and the Secretariat. The Task Group should consider and reflect in its report whether current gaps are genuine or result from existing bodies not being managed or used effectively to fulfill tasks that they could address. The lack of Terms of Reference for the Bureau prevents clear understanding of this dynamic, and should therefore be developed to complement the work being done on the Executive Committee. The Task Group should be mandated by the Panel at its next Session to continue its work in that regard.

#### **France**

Recommended date of implementation : as early as possible.

#### **Malaysia**

As recommended by the IPCC, an Executive Committee is to act on its behalf between Plenary sessions. The membership of the Committee should include the IPCC Chair, the Working Group Co-chairs, the senior member of the Secretariat, and 3 independent members, including some from outside of the climate community. However, we suggest that the 3 independent members must be from outside of the IPCC, either from climate or non-climate community, as appropriate and elected by the Planery.

#### **Netherlands**

The performance of the Executive Committee should be evaluated by the Panel after a trial period of 2 years after its inception  
(1): its mandate and mode of operation may be adjusted.  
(2): The Executive Committee should become operational in 2011 in order to effectively fulfill its mandate.

#### **New Zealand**

1. A role of Chief Financial Officer with budget accountability should be included on the Executive Committee 2. Consider the need to introduce additional management capability in the Executive Committee (This could be via a representative of WMO or UNEP) 3. Establishment of an Executive Committee will require some redefinition of the roles and accountability of the existing Bureau, TSU and secretariat

#### **Russian Federation**

We support the TG recommendations on this subject in general. However, some details certainly require clarification and/or correction:

1. The specification "in particular with respect to the production of IPCC reports" (item 2) is misleading and it should be deleted. It is the IPCC Bureau that should mainly supervise and coordinate the preparation of scientific reports, not the Executive Committee.
2. We do not agree that the Executive Committee should have power "... to provide guidance to the Chair, other members of the Bureau ..." (see TG recommendation 3e). The Bureau members are IPCC top level scientists elected by the Plenary and reported to the Plenary. Therefore, we suggest this part of the phrase should be deleted.
3. Item 3f: We believe Executive Committee would be very helpful in selecting participants for inter-group IPCC meetings. However attendees of group meetings should be selected by respective WGs' Bureaux.
4. Size and composition of EC: it seems reasonable to include IPCC Chair, all WGs' Co-Chairs, IPCC Vice-Chairs into Executive Committee as voting members, and a Head of the IPCC Secretariat as an ex-officio member. While WGs' Co-Chairs are fully responsible for the preparation of IPCC scientific reports, IPCC Vice-Chairs could take specific responsibility on other important activities, in particular, they would help the IPCC Chair in the development of communication strategy and the involvement of experts from developing countries into IPCC work, as well as in representing the IPCC scientific findings and views to the world community.
5. It should be emphasized that EC is to be composed of elected IPCC Bureau members and the Head of the IPCC Secretariat (ex-officio) with no additional elections.

## Sweden

IPCC has to be careful not to make the processes too bureaucratic. Sweden finds most of the suggestions good or acceptable, although believing that the IPCC already has very solid rules and procedures but need a better process for rechecking that the material in the reports are in compliance with these. The establishment of an Executive Committee could be a step in that direction. On the other hand, It might be timely to update the role and mandate of the Bureau. Why was the E-Team established, when there already was a Bureau? The mandate of the Bureau is to select authors and assist Co-Chairs, which is now discussed for the EC. Further, will the EC replace the E-Team? If not, is there room enough for three different bodies where the IPCC Chair and Co-Chairs are involved? Will it be possible to find time for meetings? How to avoid unnecessary overlapping? Specific general comment: Should members of the panel simply be mentioned as the panel? Is it time for re-evaluation of the role of the IPCC Bureau in light of the establishment of an Executive Committee?

## United States of America

The US broadly supports the proposals in this document. The US has noted our preference where options are identified.

## Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32

The proposals of the TG for the Executive Committee should not conflict with the current IPCC Procedures where paragraph 4.2 states that the "WG and TFB Co-Chairs are responsible for implementing the work programme..." [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

The proposal does not specify who organizes the meetings of the Executive Committee. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

The relationship of the new EC with existing structures such as IPCC Bureau, any Task Force Bureau, the FiTT and its role in communications activities need to be clarified. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

### **[1]**

#### **Germany**

Agreed

#### **Spain**

We support to establish an Executive Committee as well as the purpose reflected in the TG proposal (proposals 1 and 2), but we would like to stress that particular attention should be paid to ensure that the establishment of the EC will not undermine any of the functions and responsibilities of the IPCC Bureau. Therefore we suggest to add some text mentioning it. One option could be to add at the end of para 1. or para 2. the following sentence:

The EC will not undermine any of the functions and responsibilities of the IPCC Bureau

#### **Sweden**

We support the proposal to establish an Executive Committee. However, we believe it is necessary to distinctly define the roles for the EC and the Bureau and possibly close down the E-Team.

### **[2]**

#### **Germany**

Agreed

#### **Sweden**

It has to be more elaborated on what is really included in the mandate of the EC to act on behalf of the IPCC between sessions.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

The proposal for establishing the EC should include an explicit reference to the operational relations between the EC and the IPCC Bureau, with a clear distinction of their mandates. [Ramon Pichs-Madruga, Co-chair, WG III]

May add The Executive Committee would be chaired by the Chairperson of the IPCC. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

2. Experience has shown that what is really needed is an intersessional decisionmaking body that is formally accountable to the Panel. Coordination may be too narrow. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

### **[3a]**

#### **Germany**

Agreed

#### **Sweden**

OK but how is the relation towards and between the Bureau and the E-Team? There should not be overlapping between these three bodies.

## **IPCC Secretariat**

3. The EC may also exercise financial authority or have a formal relation with FiTT to address financial issues that go beyond the current authority of the Head of the Secretariat or to address doubt in the implementation of financial decisions by the Panel. This is in particular relevant since according to the IPCC Financial Procedures the UNEP/WMO joint IPCC Trust Fund is managed according to the WMO Financial Regulations. These however refer to the WMO SG, EC, and Congress as authority, and thus do not reflect appropriately the highly developed and detailed decision making structure on financial matters in the IPCC though Panel and FiTT. It is suggested that the Panel at its next session looks into that matter to ensure that the IPCC Trust Fund can be used effectively consistent with decisions by the Panel and financial regulations. A revision of the Appendix B to the Principles Governing IPCC Work may be required. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

### **[3b]**

#### **Austria**

Austria suggests identifying possible issues that could require prompt attention. Such examples could facilitate decisions by the Executive Committee to this end.

#### **Canada**

Consideration should also be given to how the Bureau could be managed more effectively to address non-urgent issues that arise between sessions of the IPCC (see General Comments).

#### **Germany**

Agreed

## **Sweden**

EC shall act on behalf of the Panel but giving notice to Focal Points when so has been done

## **United States of America**

This sub-paragraph could be read as overly broad, and could encompass activities that would fall to the head of Secretariat, the Chair, or other IPCC leadership. To the extent that other sub-paragraphs cover the functions identified for the Executive Committee, this sub-paragraph may not be necessary.

## **[3c]**

## **Germany**

Agreed

## **Sweden**

Agree

## **United States of America**

We would propose to amend the sub-paragraph as follows " Ensure coordination in the effective and timely implementation of communication and outreach activities."

We will need to clarify the relative role of the Executive Committee and Secretariat in executing communication and outreach activities. This sub-paragraph could be combined with sub-paragraph 3(a)

## **[3d]**

## **Canada**

(1) Consideration should also be given to the role of the Executive Committee vis-a-vis the Bureau on issues related to assessment reports (see General Comments). (2) As it is important that the Senior Communications Manager remain informed of issues that can attract public inquiry, such as errata, Canada suggests adding to the end of this section: "...in consultation with the IPCC's Senior Communications Manager."

## **Germany**

Agreed

## Sweden

Agree

### Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32

The protocol for handling errors, which is currently being finalised, clearly assigns responsibilities to the IPCC Chair and WG or TF Co-Chair for the respective IPCC products. There is only a role for the Executive Committee in issues that arise beyond the WG and TF level. Edit text to read "Address issues, including handling of errors, that arise beyond the WG and TF level in the context of the assessments and other relevant IPCC products." This is a cross-cutting issue that needs to be consistent with TG Procedures. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

It is not clear why these proposed tasks for the Executive Committee would be handled by the Executive Committee and not the relevant Co-Chairs and the relevant Bureau(x). Consistency should be checked with the recommendation of the Task Group on Procedures. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

### [3e]

## Germany

Agreed

## Sweden

Agree

### [3f]

## Belgium

should be coherent with 2. of the recommendations of the TG on procedures

## Canada

Canada does not support the inclusion of section 3f. The Procedures for Preparing IPCC Reports identify author selection as the role of the IPCC Bureau. Decisions on the selection of authors (including for the SYR) and meeting participants requires a broader diversity of expertise and geographic representation than is provided in the proposed Executive Committee. Author selection was managed effectively by the Bureau for the AR5. This role should be included in the Terms of Reference of the Bureau (see General Comments).

## Germany



NOT AGREED: As suggest by TG Pro (section 2), the selection of meeting participants should be done by the IPCC Bureau or the respective Working Group Bureau/Task Force.

## Netherlands

this should be brought in line with the recommendation of the Task Group on Procedures that states for scoping meetings: "Participants should be selected by the IPCC Bureau or the respective Working Group Bureau/Task Force".

## Spain

On the Terms of Reference of EC , we propose to delete the paragraph f (in brackets) as we support that participants for scoping meetings, including Synthesis Report, should be selected by the IPCC Bureau or the respective Working Group Bureau/task Force, as it is mentioned in the document on the recommendations by the IPCC Task Group on Procedures (page 3, section 2, last paragraph).

## Sweden

This is quite delicate and shows very clearly that the line between the Bureau and the EC is diffuse. EC will have an enormous strategic power if they shall select participants, on the other hand if this power stays in the Bureau, some Governments will have a much greater possibility to influence on selecting participants than others.

## United States of America

This sub-paragraph may be more clearly constructed to read: "...such scoping meetings, workshops, and expert meetings that involve all three working groups."

## Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32

Implementing this would increase transparency in the selection process, and encourage an "IPCC-wide" approach. I very much welcome this proposal. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

Paragraph 4.2 of the current IPCC Procedures states that the "WG and TFB Co-Chairs are responsible for implementing the work programme...". Together with the WG/TF Bureau, they select participants for scoping meetings, workshops and expert meetings, including when the meeting involves all three WGs, as for example the current EM on Geoengineering. There is only a role for the Executive Committee for meetings that are related to the Synthesis Report.

This is a cross-cutting issue that needs to be consistent with TG Procedures.

If included here, edit text to read: "Select participants for scoping meetings, workshops, expert meetings related to the Synthesis Report, from the nominees in accordance with IPCC procedures and decisions of the panel and the Bureau. "  
[Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

Participant selection for expert meetings (EM) and workshops (WS) is in the realm of the Co-Chairs of the respective Working Group(s) and the Scientific

Steering Group that is formed for each EM/WS. That is, the expertise is in the respective Working Group(s) that organize the EM/WS and there is no reason why the Executive Committee as a whole shall decide upon participation. [Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, WG III]

It is not clear why these proposed tasks for the Executive Committee would be handled by the Executive Committee and not the relevant Co-Chairs and the relevant Bureau(x). Consistency should be checked with the recommendation of the Task Group on Procedures. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **[3g]**

### **Germany**

Agreed

### **India**

Terms of Reference may be too demanding and could lead to increase in the non-scientific work load of the authors and distract the attention from scientific to political and procedural aspects.

## **[4]**

### **Austria**

Austria supports that the Executive Committee currently has a size of 10 persons with voting rights. The vice chairs of the IPCC should not be members of the Executive Committee, even not ex-officio members in order to facilitate communication and speedy decision making. The identified 10 persons should allow for a fair and balanced representation of the various groups/regions.

### **Belgium**

We would like to see the IPCC Vice Chairs as members of the E.C. According to the current rules, the IPCC Vice Chairs should assist the chair in performing all his tasks (that are described in the rules of procedures. Since the IPCC chair cannot always be 'full time chair', the support and help by Vice Chairs is very important. In the past some Vice Chairs played an active and constructive role in particular focusing e.g. on cross cutting issues, which are not a priority for Co- chairs since their main responsibility is the work in their working group and this is a very heavy workload. Vice-chairs have been elected by the Plenary. We do not see any reason why they would not be full members of the EC and with the same voting rights as other elected members. Until now, a more specific description (beside 'to assist' the chair) has been lacking, and would be very helpful, as also a specific description of the roles of the other Bureau members.

A definition of the tasks of the Vice Chairs could include: (1) To assist the Chair in performing his duties: in (a) advising him, (b) representing him, (c) performing specific tasks that the Chair delegated to the them, e.g. in the past such as Co chairing of the Task group on the Future of IPCC which produced a dozen draft decisions building on the government submissions at the start of AR5; Producing a report on how to increase the participation of Developing

country/EIT scientists in the IPCC. This report provided the background in which the AR5 author selection was made. Help the secretariat survey the views on these before the Venice scoping meeting - Supporting and promoting the reflection on cross-cutting issues in the AR5. Among those cross-cutting issues, the Belgian Vice-Chair invested significant energy to improve the treatment of regional information in AR5. This contributed to split the AR5 WGII contribution in two parts, with the second (regional) part benefiting from WGI and WGIII contributions. (5) to help to build bridges across the Working groups. Their knowledge of the IPCC "across the board" can often help the Chair to find consensus or compromises when there are diverging views, or to advise Co-chairs in a friendly and discrete manner on issues related to the overall coherence of the IPCC, or on difficulties they meet in their WG. VCs may help to "put oil between the cogs" when needed, and it may be particularly useful in times of crisis. -(6) to contribute to the representation of IPCC in front of public audiences, and communication about IPCC in a cross-cutting manner, complementing the Chair by providing sometimes a different, even if coherent, voice to communicate about the IPCC as a whole. (7)to sit in the Science board of the IPCC Scholarship programme, to contribute to the steering of the programme and help selecting the applications that will benefit from a grant.

## **China**

China holds that proposals made by the Task Group on establishment of the Executive Committee could serve as a good basis for further discussion. The major Terms of Reference for the Executive Committee are to coordinate and facilitate decisions taken at IPCC Plenary and to handle emergencies during intersessional periods. The current proposals made by the Task Group on the TOR of the Executive Committee and mode of its operation are relatively appropriate, which provide IPCC Plenary with a good basis for further elaborations.

## **Germany**

Agreed

## **India**

The Executive Committee should include additionally 3 independent members, from outside of the climate community in order to bring perspective into the functioning of the committee.

## **Italy**

SIZE and COMPOSITION:

The Executive Committee must include:

- 1) IPCC Chair
- 2) Working Group and Task Force Co-Chairs
- 3) Head of Secretariat (ex-officio)
- 4) One or more IPCC Vice Chairs
- 5) The Heads of the TSU as ex-officio members

## **Malaysia**

We do not support the inclusion of "one or more IPCC Vice Chairs as ex-officio members," as this is unnecessary and redundant to the Bureau Members. However, we support the inclusion of three (3) independent "normal" members (not ex-

officio), which are to be from outside of the IPCC (external to the IPCC). All members must have the same rights to debate, making formal motions, and have the right to vote. We do not support the ex-officio member structure since officio members will abstain from voting. All members of the Executive Committee must be elected by the Plenary and serve until their successors are in place.

## **Netherlands**

(1): the IPCC Vice chairs should be part of the Executive committee including voting rights.

(2): **ex officio** means by virtue of ones office. Consequently, all proposed members of the EC are ex officio, with the possible exception of members from outside IPCC, which might be appointed in a personal capacity. We suggest to distinguish between elected and appointed, and/or between voting and non-voting members of the EC and not to use the term **ex officio**

## **Norway**

Norway welcomes the proposal of establishing an Executive Committee. We would like to see the committee composed of the IPCC Chair, the Working Group and Task-Force Co-Chairs, the Vice-Chairs of the IPCC and the Head of the Secretariat. Other representatives should be invited to the meetings of the Executive Committee when needed.

We are however concerned about the danger of establishing another large and potentially inflexible structure within the IPCC. We therefore support a certain flexibility regarding the quorum - still ensuring that all Working Groups are represented before decisions are taken.

## **Republic of Korea**

We recommend that the Executive Committee include IPCC Vice-Chairs along with IPCC Chair, Working Group and Task Force Co-Chairs, Head of Secretariat. IPCC Vice Chairs should be voting members of the Executive committee; IPCC VCs are elected official by the Panel.

The IPCC Bureau reflects balanced geographic representation with due consideration for scientific and technical requirements, as provided in paragraph 5 of the Principles and Procedures of the IPCC. The IPCC Vice-Chairs should be included in the Executive Committee with full membership not as ex-officio members.

## **Spain**

Regarding size and composition (proposals 4 and 5) we consider that the Executive Committee must include: IPCC Chair, the three IPCC Vice Chairs, Working Group and Task Force Co-Chairs and Head of Secretariat (ex-officio). It could also be useful that WG/Task Force Co-Chairs could be accompanied by the Heads of the TSU as advisors. However, we do not support to have members external to the IPCC in the EC as we do not see any need or advantage on it.

From our perspective the role of the IPCC Vice Chairs in the EC could be mainly focussed for cross cutting issues and for the implementation of the IPCC communication strategy.

## Sweden

OK but we would like to add also the Vice Chairs, in accordance with both WG Co-Chairs being in the EC. Sweden's view is that no ex-officio, except the Head of Secretariat, should be in the EC.

We believe that the EC could be composed of  
IPCC Chair  
Vice Chairs  
WG and Task Force Co-Chairs  
Head of Secretariat

## Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32

Comment on Proposals 4 and 5: Those who have an elected responsibility to produce an IPCC product (Assessment Report, Special Report, Inventory Guidelines), i.e., the IPCC Chair, WG and TF Co-Chairs, must be full members of the Executive Committee. Other elected members of the current E-team, i.e., the IPCC Vice-Chairs, who do not have such responsibility may be ex-officio but non-voting members of the Executive Committee. Those who are responsible for the implementation of the operational and administrative aspects of any decision, i.e., the head of Secretariat and the heads of the WG and TF TSUs must all be present on an equal basis as ex-officio but non-voting members of the Executive Committee.

Edit text: move "The heads of the TSU as ex officio members" from Proposal 5 to Proposal 4. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

Just as the Head of Secretariat, the Executive Committee must also include the heads of TSU (ex-officio) as these are running the day-to-day business of the Working Groups. [Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, WG III]

## [5]

## Belgium

These members are usually appointed because of the position they hold and not because they have expressed particular interest in the IPCC. It seems however useful to better define what additional expertise would be needed for the day to day management of the IPCC and to set a framework and limits for this possible external intervention.

## Canada

(1) Given that Vice-Chairs are not directly accountable for the preparation of IPCC reports, Canada supports their inclusion in the Executive Committee as ex-officio members, noting that this would also help to maintain the streamlined nature of the Executive Committee. (2) Canada agrees with the Task Group proposal to include the Secretary as an ex-officio member on the Executive Committee, rather than a voting member. However, as this proposal differs from the IAC's recommendation, we would suggest that the Task Group provide a clear rationale to support this proposal. (3) Canada also encourages the Task Group to elaborate on its proposal to include the IAC's recommendation to include ex-officio members external to the IPCC on the Executive Committee (e.g., role envisioned, advantages and disadvantages with their participation).

## China

Chinas believe that the Heads of TSUs may attend the meetings of Executive Committee on the issues related to their own Working Groups as technical assistants to Co-Chairs of appropriate Working Groups. In order to limit the size of the Executive Committee, the Heads of TSUs should not be formal members of the Committee.

The major Terms of Reference for the Executive Committee are to coordinate and facilitate the implementation of the decisions taken at an IPCC Plenary, address emergency matters during the intersessional periods. The IAC recommendation on the inclusion of external members in the Executive Committee will confront practical difficulties in terms of selection criteria and procedures.

In order to strengthen the linkage between IPCC routine work and its two parent bodies (WMO and UNEP), it is worthy of consideration to include one representative from WMO and one from UNEP in the Executive Committee, as external members.

## France

Regarding the options on Size and composition :

- inclusion of the IPCC Vice-Chairs, without voting rights : approved ;
- inclusion of the Heads of the TSUs : not approved ; the Heads of the TSUs should be invited when needed, for consultation ;
- inclusion of members external to the IPCC : not approved ; the Executive Committee will be a place for executive decisions that will be taken during intersessional periods of the Bureau and of the Plenary, most often via a teleconference and it will practically not allow extensive oral debates ; for these two reasons, it could probably not benefit of advices from participants external to the IPCC.

## Germany

All Vice Chairs should be members of the EC. They need to be informed in order to fullfill their function to act as a substitute for the Chair in his/her absense. They should not have a voting right, except for the one Vice Chair who is acting as a substitute for the Chair in his/her absense. See also our proposal for a rule for deputyship. --- The heads of TSUs should be included. --  
- External members can be invited as advisors as needed.

## Netherlands

(1): the IPCC Vice chairs should be part of the Executive committee including voting rights.

(2): **ex officio** means by virtue of ones office. Consequently, all proposed members of the EC are ex officio, with the possible exception of members from outside IPCC, which might be appointed in a personal capacity. We suggest to distinguish between elected and appointed, and/or between voting and non-voting members of the EC and not to use the term **ex officio**

## Sweden

We do not agree on a large EC.

The EC should have a close collaboration with the Bureau and therefore TSUs participation in this group is not necessary. While the Bureau also contains

several Government representatives at the Bureau meetings, the EC should be kept small and focussed.

Regarding External to the IPCC we are hesitating. Representatives from WMO and UNEP could be an option, but it has to be discussed which competence these persons should have.

## **United States of America**

As a general matter, the Executive Committee should be comprised of members who have significant executive responsibilities for delivering the basic products of the IPCC to the Panel. The US notes that the IPCC Chair and Working Group and Task Force Co-Chairs are tasked with these responsibilities. The US believes there is value in Vice Chairs and Heads of TSUs participating on the Executive Committee in an advisory role.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

As I explained orally at the TG meeting in Geneva and a written answer to request (copied below), the role of Vice-chairs is quite broad, and they have been elected to assume those roles, and not to become non-voting observers in the EC.

About the external members recommended by the IAC: the proposal lacks clarity, and cannot be implemented as such: who are they, how would they be selected, how would some kind of geographical balance be respected, what would be their mandate, who would cover the cost of their participation ?

Copy of my email answering a question about the role of, e.g., IPCC Vice-chairs:

Dear Christiane,

Thank you for the question.

I leave the Secretariat answer about the existing texts describing the TOR for the IPCC Vice-chairs.

Here are the main roles I see for the three IPCC VCs:

- Assist the Chair in performing his duties. This may involve advising him on sensitive issues, representing him when he is not available (I believe by default, the Chair should be represented by a VC in official meetings the Chair cannot attend), or performing specific tasks that the Chair delegated to the Vice-chairs.

- As example of the latter, I would like to remind the Task group on the Future of IPCC, which I co-chaired with China, and which produced a dozen draft decisions building on the government submissions at the start of AR5. Most of those draft decisions became decisions at the Antalya Plenary. There was also the report Vice-chair Hoesung Lee and I prepared for the Bali Plenary on how to increase the participation of Developing country/EIT scientists in the IPCC. This report provided the background in which the AR5 author selection was made. I was also tasked by the Chair to accompany the reflection about the cross-cutting issues in the AR5, and helped the secretariat survey the views on these before the Venice scoping meeting.

Among those cross-cutting issues, I invested significant energy to improve the handling of the treatment of regional information in AR5. This contributed to split the AR5 WGII contribution in two parts, with the second (regional) part benefiting from WGI and WGIII contributions, which should decrease the risk of further "Himalayan" mistakes (and this was decided BEFORE the crisis erupted). I also chaired a "small group" about the regional division, and played a key role in the establishment of a specific "Oceans" chapter in this regional part of the AR5 WGII.

- Vice-chairs can help build bridges across the Working groups. Their knowledge of the IPCC "across the board" can often help the Chair to find consensus or compromises when there are diverging views, or advise Co-chairs in a friendly and discrete manner on issues related to the overall coherence of the IPCC, or difficulties they meet in their WG. They help to "put oil between the cogs" when that is needed, and it may be particularly useful during times of crisis.

- I also think VC can contribute to the representation of IPCC in front of public audiences, and communication about IPCC in a cross-cutting manner, complementing the Chair by providing sometimes a different, even if coherent, voice to communicate about the IPCC as a whole. I have done a lot of that since my election, working closely with the IPCC Communication advisers to deliver the most policy-relevant but not prescriptive messages to a wide variety of media. I have addressed a few hundreds of journalists as IPCC Vice-chair, either through interviews or training sessions for media, organized by UNFCCC, UNESCO, the European Commission, or other organizations. If there was a decision to task a member of the Executive body to oversee the IPCC communications activities in close cooperation with the Senior Communication officer, I volunteer to take that responsibility, if the framework is clear.

- Vice-chairs also sit on the Science board of the IPCC Scholarship programme, to orient the programme and help select the applications which will benefit from one of the grants.

I am sure I have forgotten some aspects, and hope my colleagues can complement or correct what I said above.

I copy this message to the E-team (using the list server I maintain precisely to facilitate communication among all E-team members), so that other members of the E-team can comment.

Best regards,

Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, IPCC Vice-chair

Christiane.Textor@dlr.de a Ã©crit , le 3/02/2011 11:33:

> Dear Colleagues,

>

> The Task Group on Governance and Management is working on the Terms of Reference of IPCC-leadership. We would like to ask for the following information:

>

> Can we have the ToR for the WG-co-chairs, co-chairs of the TFI, the Vice chairs, and the WG-Vice chairs, which would identify your current functions and roles?

> Please let us know if such ToRs still have to be developed.

>

> We would be very grateful to receive your responses as soon as possible - hopefully by today.

>

> Many thanks,

>

> Christiane Textor

> Rapporteur of TG Gov&Man [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

Comment on Proposals 4 and 5: Those who have an elected responsibility to produce an IPCC product (Assessment Report, Special Report, Inventory Guidelines), i.e., the IPCC Chair, WG and TF Co-Chairs, must be full members of the Executive Committee. Other elected members of the current E-team, i.e., the IPCC Vice-Chairs, who do not have such responsibility may be ex-officio but non-voting members of the Executive Committee. Those who are responsible for the implementation of the operational and administrative aspects of any decision,



i.e., the head of Secretariat and the heads of the WG and TF TSUs must all be present on an equal basis as ex-officio but non-voting members of the Executive Committee.

Edit text: move "The heads of the TSU as ex officio members" from Proposal 5 to Proposal 4.

Comment 5.1 Edit first bullet by deleting possibly as so now reads "One or more IPCC Vice Chairs as ex officio members".

Comment 5.2 Do not agree that external members are appropriate in an Executive Committee. External members do not have the operational, up-to-date knowledge required in the Executive Committee. Their input would be very valuable for long-term, strategic questions and issues, which are typically dealt with through an Advisory Board. Therefore, delete last bullet. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

It would not be desirable to have Heads of the TSUs as ex-officio members. The Executive Committee should be confined only to those elected or appointed on behalf of the IPCC as a whole and not employees of any unit such as the Working Groups or the TFI.

It would not be desirable to induct members external to the IPCC. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

If the IPCC Vice Chairs are included in the Executive Committee, they must be ex-officio as they don't carry any direct responsibility (unless they replace the chair in his absence and act upon his behalf). [Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, WG III]

## **[6a]**

### **Canada**

Canada suggests adding to the end of this sentence: "...and act in accordance with the principles set forth in the 'Addressing Potential Conflicts of Interest' section of the Communications Task Group Strategy."

### **Germany**

Agreed

### **Spain**

Concerning the mode of operation (proposal 6), in the proposed text it is not mentioning who should be the EC Chair. In our opinion, the IPCC Chair should also be the EC Chair.

So, we propose to add in 6., after paragraph a., a new one:

abis) IPCC Chair shall act as the Chair of the EC

### **Sweden**

Should go without saying

## **United States of America**

If this paragraph is specified, care will need to be taken to ensure that functions assigned to the Executive Committee are not functions more appropriately taken by individuals responsible for IPCC leadership.

### **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

It would be operationally impossible for any member of the Executive Committee to act and speak on behalf of the Committee. This would have two major handicaps.

1. It would be impossible for any member of the Committee to provide a rapid response on any issue or dispute concerning the IPCC, because valuable time would be lost in getting the agreement of all the members of the Executive Committee. This would, therefore, go against the interests of rapid and efficient communication as laid down by the recommendations for a communications strategy.

2. If every member is required to act or speak on behalf of the Committee, individual initiative would be lost completely. Every member of the Committee must be regarded as responsible and empowered to speak on behalf of the IPCC, and it would be best to allow a broad approach on communications to be adopted by the Executive Committee and allow individual initiative to the elected members to speak on behalf of the IPCC depending on the needs of the situation and their own judgement which would be exercised in the interest of the IPCC. If we wish to pursue communication by common agreement, the IPCC would stand to lose due to lack of initiative on the part of IPCC officials. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

## **[6b]**

### **Germany**

Agreed

### **India**

1. The clause for taking decisions through simple majority should be removed as it results in providing voting rights to a few which infringes on the spirit of the IAC of non-discrimination between the members.

### **Sweden**

OK

### **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

Since there is a provision for voting by simple majority the membership of the Executive Committee should be an odd number. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

If consensus is not possible, decisions should be adopted by a two third majority rather than simple majority. [Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, WG III]

## **[6c]**

### **Austria**

Austria supports that the Executive Committee currently has a size of 10 persons with voting rights. The vice chairs of the IPCC should not be members of the Executive Committee, even not ex-officio members in order to facilitate communication and speedy decision making. The identified 10 persons should allow for a fair and balanced representation of the various groups/regions.

### **Germany**

The Vice Chair should not have the right to vote. Only in the absence of the Chair his selected substitute should have the right to vote.

### **Italy**

Members with the right to vote should be the Chair, Co-chairs and vice chairs. Ex-officio members do not have the right to vote.

### **Malaysia**

Under the Mode of Operation, all members of the Executive Committee must have the right to vote (ex-officio members in the Executive Committee is not necessary). All members must be elected by the Plenary and serve until their successors are in place.

### **Netherlands**

**ex officio** means by virtue of ones office. Consequently, all proposed members of the EC are ex officio, with the possible exception of members from outside IPCC, which might be appointed in a personal capacity. We suggest to distinguish between elected and appointed, and/or between voting and non-voting members of the EC and not to use the term **ex officio**

### **Republic of Korea**

IPCC Vice Chairs should be voting members of the Executive committee; IPCC Vice Chairs are elected official by the Panel.

### **Sweden**

Sweden believes that the EC should only consist of elected persons except the Head of Secretariat.

### **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

I believe Vice-chairs have not been elected to be observers in the EC, with no voting right. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

Delete "[and Vice-Chairs] " as they would be ex officio members. Add "TSU Heads may vote on behalf of their Co-Chairs if no Co-Chair is present."

In order to preserve the balance of the WGs, the voting of the WG Co-Chairs will have to be weighted due to the exceptional decision for AR5. Suggest adding "Each Co-Chair shall have one vote with the exception of the two developing country Co-Chairs of WGIII AR5. Due to the exceptional decision for AR5, they shall have one vote between them. " [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

6.c) While it is understood that the head of the Secretariat will be ex-officio member of the EC it is suggested that he/she has a veto power in case a decision by the EC is violating IPCC principles and procedures (standard procedure in many government administrations) [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[6d]**

### **Germany**

Given that the number of members might not be n\*3 votes should be rounded.

### **Sweden**

OK

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

May have to consider proxy or other forms of absentee voting. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[6e]**

### **Germany**

NOT AGREED: Modify 6e and join with 6f, delete current text and add rule for deputyship:

"In case of absence of the Chair he/she will be represented by a Vice Chair nominated by the Chair as deputy. In case of absence of the head of the Secretariat he/she will be represented by the Deputy Head of the Secretariat. The deputy has the full power to act on behalf of the Chair or Head of the Secretariat in his/her absence."

### **Sweden**

One of the Vice Chairs should replace the IPCC Chair if he/she cannot be present

### **United States of America**

This sub-paragraph should be amended to read: "If the Chair cannot be present, he/she may nominate a chair from among the members."

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

I suggest that the sentence be a bit more affirmative and precise: "If the Chair cannot be present, he or she nominates a chair for the duration of the meeting among the elected members of the EC" [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

### **[6f]**

#### **Germany**

NOT AGREED: Modify 6e and join with 6f, delete current text and add Rule for deputyship:

"In case of absence of the Chair he/she will be represented by a Vice Chair nominated by the Chair as deputy. In case of absence of the head of the Secretariat he/she will be represented by the Deputy Head of the Secretariat. The deputy has the full power to act on behalf of the Chair or Head of the Secretariat in his/her absence." --- As a fall back option we request to modify the current formulation as follows: "The Deputy Head of Secretariat may substitute for the Head of Secretariat in his/her absence."

#### **Sweden**

OK

### **[6g]**

#### **Germany**

Agreed

#### **Sweden**

OK. We see this possibility to be a better option instead of having external persons onboard as regular participants

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

It is not clear why a formal signed invitation by the Head of Secretariat should be required. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

### **[6h]**

#### **Canada**

These materials should also be shared with the full Bureau.

## **Germany**

Agreed

## **Sweden**

OK

### **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

The provision of an agenda to the Panel before each meeting of the Executive Committee seems to be micromanaging. The agenda should be an Annex to the documentation provided for information to the Panel after the meeting is held.  
[Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

The Secretariat will have to prepare a draft agenda in consultation with the Chairperson of the Executive Committee with provision for any changes at the start of the meeting where the first item on the agenda would be the acceptance of the draft agenda. Operationally it would be totally unworkable if an agenda has to be prepared in consultation with all the members of the Executive Committee. In no management board or committee is this procedure followed. The agenda is always prepared between the Chairperson of the Committee and the Secretary of the Committee. If we allow for consultation with all the members of the Executive Committee, we would only be creating a situation that would not allow efficient functioning of the Executive Committee. Any member of the Committee would have the option of suggesting a change in the agenda at the start of any meeting. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

## **[6i]**

### **Canada**

These materials should also be shared with the full Bureau.

## **Germany**

Agreed

## **Sweden**

OK

### **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

The conclusions and decisions of the Executive Committee should only be distributed after approval by the Committee and this should be \*for information\* of the Panel. Edit text to read "... to IPCC members for information as soon as possible after approval by the Executive Committee but not later than ... "  
[Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

6.i) Please clarify how the conclusions and decisions will be made available to members of the IPCC. Shall it be on the web or formal correspondence? Further, a sequenced approach is suggested by which the notes are sent to EC members within two weeks, approved within the next one or two weeks and only then circulated to IPCC members. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

### **[6j]**

#### **Germany**

Modify text: The Executive Committee meets normally four times per year

#### **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

This may not be practicable as written so split first sentence and edit text to read "The Executive Committee meets at least four times a year. Meetings may be held in person or via web or teleconference. In addition, on request of the Chair or of at least three elected members of the Committee, a web or teleconference will be held within two weeks of the request if meeting in person is not practicable." [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

Add in the last line after the words Bureau meetings [or any other meetings].  
[Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

### **[6k]**

#### **Germany**

Agreed

#### **India**

2. Sufficient clarity should be provided on the jurisdiction of the Executive committee. The committee is not supposed to be a power beyond the Plenary and is only supposed to act on behalf of IPCC between Plenary sessions. Further it the role of this committee during plenary sessions should be elaborated to include whether it would it formally provide a brief report on its work during the two IPCC plenary.

#### **Norway**

We would like to see the development of Terms of Reference for the Executive Committee - and would suggest that the Bureau updates these Terms of Reference upon the start of each mandate period.

We will underline the importance of transparency related to the work in the Executive Committee and would recommend inclusion of a point stating that the minutes from the meetings in the Executive Committee should be sent to the IPCC Focal Points and the IPCC Bureau members.

## Sweden

It is important that the EC is transparent and that the availability of conclusions and decisions (6i) will keep Panel members updated between the yearly meetings.

## IPCC Secretariat

6.j) Face to face meetings with a notice of 2 weeks may not be feasible [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]



## **Governance: Executive Director**

### **[General Comments]**

#### **Austria**

Austria fully supports the rationals 1, 2 and 3.

#### **Belgium**

The IAC Panel specified that the ED should be able to act on behalf of the Chair if needed. Some members of the TG saw in the activities of the head of the secretariat the potential for greater emphasis on communication and maintaining external relations as well as overall management. These responsibilities are way beyond the normal management of the Secretariat. If the head of secretariat is to keep his/her current role as now proposed by the TG, we suggest that these other tasks identified by the IAC be attributed to elected senior scientists such as the Vice-Chairs in particular for the following tasks: (1) fostering cooperation and information exchange between Working Groups (2) assisting the Chair regarding communication and external relations, and representing the Chair when he is not available

#### **China**

China holds that the proposals made by the Task Group with regard to the Executive Director of the Secretariat are appropriate.

#### **Germany**

no comment

#### **Japan**

2. The secretariat:  
To ensure the improvement in effective operations, tasks to be out-sourced should be identified by an external review or other methods.

#### **Malaysia**

We support the recommendation given in the TG Proposal, in keeping with UN practice.

#### **Russian Federation**

We support the Task Group recommendations on this subject in general. With regard to the limits on the term of the head of Secretariat, we suggest that the IPCC should follow the current WMO practice.

#### **Sweden**

Sweden supports all bullets proposed by the TG, but see further 4a.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

The IAC recommendation was made because the Secretariat assumes an essential role in the good working of IPCC, and because the IAC perceived that the Secretariat had not worked ideally during and after the crisis of 2010. To avoid the repetition of such situations, it would be good practice to organize regular management audits/reviews of the Secretariat, so that its working can be improved. Such audits/reviews would need to be done by an external firm, to have the most objective view. It would be useful for the TG to consider this proposal in the context of the reform of the Secretariat and of its management positions. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

This document uses the term "IAC Panel," which may be confusing given that the IPCC Panel is usually referred to as the "Panel" elsewhere. Perhaps it would be clearer to change this to "IAC Report" throughout the document; this also would make this document consistent with other Task Group documents. The document does not clarify whether the head or deputy head of Secretariat should have "senior scientist" credentials as recommended by the IAC. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **[Rational 1]**

### **Germany**

Agreed

### **Norway**

Norway supports that the IPCC head of Secretariat should continue to be an appointed position.

### **United States of America**

The US supports this proposal, with the head of Secretariat appointed to support the Parties and the elected leadership of the IPCC.

## **[Rational 2]**

### **Canada**

Canada is comfortable with the direction taken by the Task Group with respect to the issues related to the Head of the Secretariat, but would encourage further clarity on the recommendation not to follow the IAC proposal for an Executive Director position. The Task Group elaborated on some details associated with creating such a position and made comparisons across the UN system, but did not address all the issues that were raised in the IAC report (e.g., the IAC proposed that there was a need for a representative equivalent to the WG Co-Chairs who could act and speak on behalf of the Chair, etc.).

## **Germany**

Agreed

## **United States of America**

The US supports this proposal.

## **[Rational 3]**

### **Germany**

Agreed

### **United States of America**

The US notes that the Task Group considered the title of "Executive Director" is more often used for an institution that develops programs, whereas the titles of "Secretary" or "Executive Secretary" are most often used for the head of a secretariat.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

Line 4: please add "should" after "individual" [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

The IAC recommendation that "the individual should be able to act on behalf of the Chair as needed" is not picked up in these recommendations and needs to be consistent with the recommendations for the Executive Committee. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

Add at the end of the para [and report to the Chair and be accountable to the Chair]. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

## **[Rational 4]**

### **Austria**

With regard to rational 4 Austria prefers option b) because this would allow not renewing the contract of the secretary every 2 years, which could be a vital option in case of substantial communication problems between the secretary and the chair. In addition Austria suggests that the IPCC head of Secretariat should not only be appointed by WMO and UNEP but also by the IPCC chair. This construct allows that the IPCC head of Secretariat might change with the IPCC chair if a new IPCC chair has been elected.

### **Canada**

It would be useful for the Task Group to be provided with the current job description for the position of the Secretary as supplementary information to share with and support the Panel's decision on this issue.

## **Germany**

Terms of Reference for all higher secretariat's positions should be established to make sure that the secretariat fulfills the needs of the EC, the bureau, the scientists, the TSUs, and the members of the IPCC.

## **Italy**

limits on the term of the head of Secretariat:  
The Head, following WMO two year contracts, should be limited to 8 years.

## **Norway**

Norway would prefer that the term of the IPCC head of Secretariat should be limited to a certain number of years, however for continuity reasons the maximum total period should be longer for the Head of the Secretariat than for the IPCC Chair and the Co-chairs. Norway also sees the potential for greater emphasis on communications and maintaining external representation, as well as overall management.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

The TG notes that "these functions and qualifications are broadly consistent with the job description for the current post of Secretary". This seems to be a very different conclusion from that of the IAC review. In order to support the TGs conclusion convincingly, it would be helpful to append the job description for the current post of Secretary to the report of the TG. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[Proposal 1]**

### **Germany**

Agreed

### **Spain**

From our point of view, there is not a need for the creation of a new post for an Executive Director, in fact, as mentioned by the Task Group, the functions and qualifications specified in the IAC Report are broadly consistent with the job description for the current post of Secretary. We also agree that the title of "Executive Director" would not be appropriate of the IPCC Head of Secretariat of IPCC. In this context, we support TG proposals specified in para. 1 and para 2.

## **[Proposal 2]**

## Germany

Terms of Reference for the head of the secretariat should be established to make sure that the secretariat fulfills the needs of the EC, the WGs, the scientists, the TSUs, and the members of the IPCC. The TG on Governance and Management should propose such TOR in consultation with the EC, the bureau and the members of the IPCC.

## Netherlands

the Executive Committee or its members should decide what messages to convey to the media. Both the senior communication officer and the Secretary have an advisory role. Please specify their tasks and responsibilities

## Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32

In order to support the recommendation that "The functions of the IPCC head of Secretariat should remain largely as presently defined", it would be helpful to append the job description for the current post of Secretary to the report of the TG. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

In defining the functions of the IPCC Head of the Secretariat it should be specified what the reporting arrangements of the head of the Secretariat should be. Currently, the head of the Secretariat reports to the WMO which is an operationally unworkable arrangement. A clear line of reporting to the IPCC is essential for the efficient functioning of the IPCC. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

This sentence is not clear whether a change is proposed in the emphasis on external relations and communication. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **[Proposal 3]**

## Germany

The TG should provide suggestions for the titles for the senior secretariat's post that better reflect their functions, in line with the recommendation of IAC to strengthen the secretariat's role.

## Madagascar

3- Révision des titres ou appellations des postes : les titres devraient être conformes aux pratiques aux sein des organismes des Nations Unies auxquels sont rattachées ces catégorie de personnel, par exemple l'OMM ou l'UNEP si tel sera encore le cas.

## Netherlands

We suggest including the position of the senior communication officer in addition to the two other senior posts, including specification of their tasks and responsibilities.

## **Spain**

Regarding para 3, . we recognize that it will be valuable that the Panel review the titles of the two seniors posts with a view to accurately reflecting their positions and responsibilities. But, we believe that for the review it would be important the participation of WMO and UNEP representatives, in particular for the evaluation of the potential implications that different options could have. In addition, it is also important for the review to complete all the work on the roles of the Secretariat and Bureau, that the TG can not finished due to time constraints.

## **[Proposal 4a]**

### **Austria**

Austria suggests that the term of office of the IPCC chair should be limited to 5 years as the maximum. Austria also sees some merits in more focused thematic reports instead of primarily preparing overall assessments. The "Chair Elect" process is fully supported in order to give smooth transfer from one chair to the next.

### **France**

This position is a key-position within IPCC. The TG might be more precise and say that the two-year contracts should only be renewed with explicit consideration and approval ; it could propose that the renewal should receive prior approval by the Executive Committee with advance notice e.g. 6 or 9 months.

The term should be limited to 10 years.

### **Germany**

"The limit of terms should also apply to the Deputy Head of the secretariat. --- Option 4a is supported - exchanging important management staff should be avoided during critical assessment phases. The head and the deputy head should not be exchanged at the same time. "

### **Japan**

1. The terms of the senior posts of secretariat:

As to the terms of the senior posts of secretariat, not only that of Head of secretary but also that of Deputy Secretary should be prescribed.

### **Madagascar**

4- Durée du mandat : la durée devrait se conformer aux pratiques au sein de l'organisme de rattachement et nous pensons qu'il serait mieux de limiter le renouvellement de contrat à 3 ou 4 fois pour un contrat de 2ans.

### **Peru**

Peru supports option a with a slight modification. Shall read: "The term should be limited to 10 years, starting from the next assessment cycle"

## **Spain**

Concerning the limitation on the term of the head of Secretariat in principle we recognize benefits on fixing a term limit, but in order to avoid risks and undesirables gaps in the current Secretariat functioning, further discussions will be needed about implications, numbers or years, and on the most appropriate time for applying the limits on the term.

## **Sweden**

We support the term to be limited to 8-10 years.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

I assume this overall limit to the term would come in complement to the present WMO renewable two-year contract basis? Please clarify. In any case, I believe that the renewal of such an important position cannot take place without an appropriate consultation of the EC, and without regular management audits, made by an external firm, at regular interval (4 years ?). [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

Comment on Proposals 4a and 4b: Do not agree to a term limit if the functions of the IPCC head of Secretariat remain largely as presently defined. This person can provide important institutional memory, not only of Panel business but also of operational matters. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

Please reflect that the IPCC is a joint UNEP/WMP programme, that the two senior positions are provided by UNEP and WMO and that recruitment and reporting has been done jointly for the past 10 years. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[Proposal 4b]**

### **Germany**

not supported

### **United States of America**

The US notes that there are pros and cons to both of these options, but prefers option 4(b), on the understanding that contract renewals are considered by WMO every two years in consultation with the Executive Committee, as specified in paragraph 5 below.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

Comment on Proposals 4a and 4b: Do not agree to a term limit if the functions of the IPCC head of Secretariat remain largely as presently defined. This person can provide important institutional memory, not only of Panel business but also of operational matters. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[Proposal 5]**

### **Germany**

This should be tightened. Add: "The senior secretariat posts should report to and be fully accountable to the Chair of the IPCC." In the current situation, the secretariat is reporting to WMO, who is not practically involved in the work of IPCC.

### **Netherlands**

include the senior Communications position.

### **Spain**

With regard to para 5, from our perspective it is essential that any WMO consultation to EC on the senior posts of the secretariat is made in a transparent way ensuring the participation of all members of EC. In this regard, it could be useful to add some text to the current one for more clarity.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

It is welcome that the TG proposes a consultation of the EC, but the proposal should clarify what the weight of this consultation is, and how and by whom is the final decision made (for recruitment and renewals). Could a recruitment or renewal take place without the support of at least a 2/3 majority of the EC? Regular management audits, made by an external firm should also be organized at regular intervals (every 4 years ?). [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

This is a good proposal that should bring a necessary improvement. Suggest inserting the words "in due time" after "WMO is requested to consult". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

This again is an unworkable arrangement because you cannot have the Executive Committee as a body being consulted by the WMO. Consultation should take place with the IPCC Chair who speaks on behalf of the Executive Committee, in case the WMO remains as the authority responsible for the head of the Secretariat. No mention is made of the reporting arrangements for the head of the Secretariat. The current set of recommendations appear to skirt this issue. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

There could be clarification on whether the process of selecting the head and deputy head of Secretariat should be open and transparent, including the process for contract renewal and what the role of the Executive Committee is in the process. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]



## **IPCC Secretariat**

Please reflect that the IPCC is a joint UNEP/WMP programme, that the two senior positions are provided by UNEP and WMO and that recruitment and reporting has been done jointly for the past 10 years. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **Governance: Terms of Office**

### **[General Comments]**

#### **China**

China holds that the current proposals made by the Task Group in terms of tenure of the IPCC Chair and Working Groups Co-Chairs are appropriate, as TG has given comprehensive consideration to both IAC recommendations and reality of the IPCC work.

#### **France**

The recommendations of the TG are approved.

#### **Germany**

It is important to maintain institutional knowledge and memory. As chairs might change we suggest that this memory should be mainly with the secretariat.

#### **Malaysia**

We fully support the IAC Recommendations for the term of the IPCC Chair and the Working Group Co-chairs should be limited to the timeframe of one assessment.

#### **New Zealand**

The term of office for Chair and Co Chairs should be limited to five years with provision for possible extension of up to 2 years. (This will address the issue of a potential move away from a single large assessment process to a more ongoing process)

#### **Russian Federation**

We support the Task Group recommendations on this subject in general. With regard to IPCC Chair and WGs' Co-Chairs term, it would be expedient to define the term precisely as one assessment cycle, because assessment reports are and will be the most important IPCC products in the foreseeable future.

#### **Sweden**

Sweden support the Option no 1 (one term). The rationale for this is that keeping the same organisation for more than 10 years will have a conservative effect. It is also part of the critique to the IPCC that there is a certain party that manage/influence/steer the IPCC results. We suggest a change in the last sentence: with the provision of possible extension for exceptional cases if the Panel so decides. In option no 2, which we do not support, the roles between Chair and Chair Elect is not defined. The Bureau shall be consulted, but what happens when Chair and Chair Elect have different opinions?

## **[Rational 1]**

### **Canada**

While Canada supports an ongoing dialogue on the mode of work for the IPCC and believes that this dialogue is important when discussing proposed changes in IPCC governance, indicating a preference for one mode of work over another without a more fulsome analysis of this issue is not in keeping with the Task Group's mandate. Canada therefore suggests deleting the following section: "...such as the production of regular thematic reports instead of an overall assessment..."

### **Germany**

Agreed

### **Italy**

the term of office for the IPCC Chair and Working Group Co-Chairs must be restricted to one term (the assessment cycle or another time period as defined by the Panel) without the provision of possible extension for individual cases if the Panel so decides.

### **Madagascar**

Madagascar approuve et soutient les approches 1 et 2 du TG

### **Norway**

Terms of office, the IPCC Chair and Working Group Co-Chairs  
Norway supports the proposals from the Task Group, including the proposed model to ensure the institutional memory and transfer between the outgoing and incoming chair.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

To avoid the appearance of prejudging the outcome of future decisions by the Panel, suggest changing "possible changes in the overall mode of work" to read "any significant changes in the overall mode of work". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **[Rational 2]**

### **Germany**

Agreed

### **Italy**

It is a good idea to make working in parallel for 6 months the CHAIR and CHAIR ELECT.

## **IPCC Secretariat**

Experience has shown that very often the outgoing Bureau/Co-chairs are no longer involved in outreach and dissemination of the reports they have prepared after the new Bureau is elected. It is therefore suggested to consider also some overlap whereby the outgoing Bureau/Co-chairs focus on outreach and dissemination while the incoming Bureau concentrates on the next assessment round. This may even make shorter intervals between reports feasible. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[Rational 3]**

### **Germany**

Terms of offices of all elected IPCC members should be addressed by the TG Governance. It should be decided at IPCC33 to mandate the TG to make proposals on this matter for IPCC34.

## **[Proposal 1]**

### **Belgium**

On the decision to limit the mandate of the Chair to one with 'the provision of possible extension for individual cases if the Panel so decides' it should be clear that an extension would be an exception rather than the norm and thus allowed only in very specific situations that need to be defined

### **Germany**

Agreed

### **Japan**

3. The term of the IPCC chair and WG co-chairs:  
It should be prescribed that what kind of "individual cases" are allowed to be considered possible extension. If not, the original TG proposal would be not effective, because it would be essentially the same as conventional rules of election of the IPCC chair.

### **Madagascar**

1- La limitation à un seul mandat ( cycle du rapport d'évaluation ) devrait s'appliquer à tous les membres du bureau. Des considérations de cas individuels ne devraient pas exister.

### **Malaysia**

We support the recommendation to restrict the term of office for the IPCC Chair and Working Group Co-Chairs to one term (the assessment cycle or another time

period as defined by the Panel), with the provision of possible extension for individual cases if the Panel so decides.

## **Spain**

we agree with the proposal to restrict the term of office to one term, only in the case that this limitation will be applied after the completion of the AR5, for the next assessment cycle or another time period as defined by the Panel.

Even though it is mentioned in the TG Comentary/rational, we consider that for more clarity it should also be explicitly mentioned in the recommendations to the IPCC Panel, therefore we propose to add in the proposals a new paragraph

1(bis) the limitation of the term of office shall be applied after the completion of the AR5

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

Speaking as a WG Co-Chair, I can agree with the proposal to limit the term of office for the IPCC Chair and WG Co-Chairs to one term. Consideration should also be given to term limits for the other members of the Executive Team, i.e., IPCC Vice-Chairs and TF Co-Chairs. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

To add at the end of the para [However, the decision if implemented on this recommendation should apply only with effect from the next election of the Bureau as decided by the Panel in Busan.] [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

The phrase "possible extension for individual cases" could be amended to further specify how frequently and for what reasons such extensions would be made. Without such clarification, the restriction has little meaning. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **[Proposal 2]**

### **Canada**

Canada is supportive of the proposed process to maintain continuity through a "Chair Elect" system. We suggest that this mechanism be extended to all elected and voting members of the proposed Executive Committee.

### **Germany**

Agreed

### **Japan**

4. The continuity of knowledge and experiences:  
To ensure the continuity of knowledge and experiences, IPCC chair and co-chairs should be allowed to stay in the IPCC Bureau, if necessary, after stepping down.

### **Madagascar**

2- En pratique, une passation de pouvoir et de travail s'effectue entre le Président sortant et le Président nouvellement élu. Au lieu de l'idée d'un Chair Elect , Madagascar suggèrerait que le Président sortant siège au sein du Comité Exécutif pour une durée de 6 mois à titre consultatif et sans droit de vote.

## **Malaysia**

We support on allowing a "Chair Elect" process to give a smooth transfer from one Chair to the next and guaranteeing institutional memory. We agree that, a Chair Elect could be elected from six months to one year before the end of the term of office of the Chair. This must be ensured so that the Chair and "Chair Elect" could have distribution of tasks in consultation with the Bureau.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

It would be hard to organize an election for the new Chair separated in time from the new Bureau. Therefore, I would rather suggest that the past Chair remains available in the function of "Past IPCC Chair" with a purely advisory role for an overlap period with the new Chair in order to provide a smooth transition and guarantee institutional memory. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

The last sentence [Both the Chair and [Chair Elect] would agree upon their distribution of tasks in consultation with the Bureau] should be modified to read [The Chair would delegate to the Chair Elect specific tasks in consultation with the Bureau]. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

# **Task Group on Conflict on Interest**

## **[General Comments]**

### **Belgium**

The general effort behind this policy must be welcomed and encouraged. Indeed, it is sound to seek for a better transparency and a clear management of conflicts of interests in the functioning of the IPCC, without pretending to avoid them. That being said, this policy must be real and effective and must not serve as screen or an alibi to deny legitimate transparency through a too restrictive application or implementation of its principles. It must not be ignored that the fact that the review of the relevance of the interest as well as its declaration, rests with the individual is as such a source of conflict of interest. In other systems, individuals are expected to provide all information requested by their employing organisation which remains the sole responsible for identifying conflicts of interest.

There are two issues we would like TG to consider (1) Confidentiality of the interests: Should (and can) the information related to "interests" of IPCC Bureau members and CLA / LAs be "confidential"? We suggest that at least the direct (personal) interests are made public. We think that this would be very useful for enhancing public perception of the independency of the key individuals that contribute to the work of the IPCC. Even if not entirely comparable with the IPCC, some organisations make such declarations available to the public. (2) Membership of the Management of interest Panel: Who should be member of the "Management of Interests Panel", and should this panel be in charge of the Conflict-of- Interests - process.

### **Canada**

(1) Canada would appreciate if the Task Group could elaborate on the extent of its consultations outside the IPCC on this policy and disclosure form. (2) Canada would encourage the Task Group to seek legal advice via legal services in WMO/UNEP on the policy and its disclosure form as they are further elaborated.

### **China**

China holds that the work by scientists for IPCC assessment is entirely voluntary. Therefore, the development of the conflict of interest policy needs to keep sound balance between maintenance of IPCC credibility on one hand, and attraction of excellent scientists on the other. While the conflict of interest policy is designed to enhance the IPCC profile and the credibility of IPCC reports, it must ensure that a great number of outstanding scientists worldwide will actively participate in the work of IPCC assessment report. We noted that both WGI and WGII have already initiated interest disclosure issues of the people who are involving in relevant work of each Working Group. But their individual enforcement criteria are not the same. We believe that IPCC should quicken the pace to develop its conflict of interest policy in order to harmonize the management on conflict interest and disclosure system for all working groups.

### **France**

The development of an explicit policy as initiated by the TG is very positive.

Such a policy, based on management of conflict of interests, and not aiming at exclusion of any conflict of interest, will allow to maintain the diversity and plurality of contributors to the IPCC.

Recommended date of implementation : as early as possible.

## **Germany**

The Explanatory Notes mentioned in TG CoI is missing. --- Man of Interest Policy: should apply to both the secretariat's and the TSUs senior positions. --- The Man of Interest panel should be the decision making body in case of violation and choose sanctions according to bullet 8. --- 2a: is occurring twice. --- 3h: should read: Compliance the the policy is obligatory. --- 4a, 4th line: should read: involved in report AND OUTREACH MATERIAL preparation --- 6a: The legal aspects both in international and national law should be checked. --- 7b: the TSUs should be mentioned here. --- 7b: We support Option 3 --- 8: The rules should take into account the different roles individuals have in the IPCC. For example, the elected, leading IPCC team should be treated differently from authors and reviewers. This should especially include the consequences of non-compliance to the policy.

## **India**

1. The procedure seems to be elaborate and may discourage genuine scientists from participating in the assessment process. The disclosure form should only ask for them to declare all relevant potential issues of conflict, focusing only on those issues that are relevant to Climate change related activities.
2. Background and Key considerations, item # 2 states that "The policy is intended to encourage the participation of individuals from developing countries". While the encouragement of individuals from developing countries may be a desirable ideal, it is not clear what the differences in circumstances of "conflict of interest" are for developing country individuals, nor how the manner of application of the policy will encourage their participation.
3. The issue of transition from existing CoI policies in different WGs needs to be clarified

## **Japan**

1. Interests Policy:  
Japan supports overall policy delivered by the TG referred in the "Task Group Commentary on the Proposals". However, senior IPCC leadership should take the most care because of their influence on the IPCC reputation. Thus, guidance on "do not" shall be provided for those people, and clear guideline on non-compliance and its consequences shall be prepared.
2. Timeline and Future work (referring to "Cross-cutting Issues"):  
How will the issues referred as "Cross-cutting issues" be dealt with? When will these issues be discussed, and how will the member governments be engaged in the development process?

## **Madagascar**

Madagascar approuve et soutient les principes et approches 1 à 4 du TG en matière de considérations des conflits d'intérêt au sein du GIEC.



## Malaysia

The Explanatory Note, which is not included in the TG Report should be made available together with the Management of Interest Policy document.

## Morocco

We support the Task Group's proposition that the policy is entitled a Management of Interests Policy to signal that interests are inevitable and conflicts have to be managed rather than completely avoided. We think this is a very good step so as to underpin the credibility of IPCC.

## Netherlands

(1): Please present one proposal without options to ensure decision making by the Panel.

(2): 'management of interest panel': please do not provide 4 options but a clear recommendation; please do not submit bracketed texts in the final Task Group report.

(3): Make clear who should report their relationships to whom

## Norway

Norway welcomes the work of the Task Group on Management of the Conflict of Interests: We find this work crucial to ensure a more transparent IPCC.

## Peru

Key points of the Proposals

In paragraph 5, 2nd line, replace the word "body" for "IPCC Plenary Committee constituted by members from all WMO regions not participating in the IPCC Bureau."

## Russian Federation

The proposal is too complex. A simple "IPCC Disclosure of Relevant Interests Form" seems to be sufficient. "Register of Interests" and special "Management of Interest Panel" appears redundant. The disclosure forms should be stored by the IPCC Secretariat.

WGs' Bureaux could be responsible for the management of interests within respective WGs including TSUs.

IPCC Vice-Chairs (as members of Executive Committee) could be responsible for the management of interests with regard to IPCC Bureau members and the IPCC Secretariat.

All problems should be reported to the IPCC Bureau. In all the cases an ultimate decision in regard to concrete individuals should be endorsed by the IPCC Plenary.

Specific comments:

Subject: item 2 "Definitions".

In section "2. Definition", subsection "a. Conflict of interest": The definition can be shortened: "A "conflict of interest" refers to any current financial or other interest of an individual which could negatively influence, or could be seen as negatively influencing, the individual in carrying out his or her duties

and responsibilities for the IPCC in accordance with "Principles Governing the IPCC Work".

The rest of the section is unclear, because the notions "real", "perceived", "potential", "direct", "indirect" are ambiguous, and some of those notions may be conflicting with "current" - see above.

Subject: section 2, subsection "a. Disclosure".

Our proposed additions are given in capitals: "Disclosure in the context of this policy means making known any interest OF AN INDIVIDUAL ASSOCIATED WITH THE IPCC which might conflict with the capacity of IPCC to fulfil its role or undermine its credibility. SUCH Interests are TO BE declared via the "IPCC Disclosure of Relevant Interests Form".

Subject: item 3 "Principles", section h).

While reforming the IPCC, one should not forget that IPCC authors and review-editors are volunteers. They bring very valuable scientific knowledge to decision makers and the public. They work for free for the IPCC, with no contracts and salaries. So, one should be very cautious with proposals on "obligatory" declarations.

## **Sweden**

Sweden does not have any special comments on this section

## **UK**

Generally overall very clear and well thought through. Needs more information on the functioning of the CoI Panel. How the policy will be implemented is unclear.

It would be good to see an affirmation that a simple clear explanatory note, with examples, that could be easily understood by people whose first language is not English is needed. Also there is an issue as to whether this explanatory note is part of the policy or a side document.

## **United States of America**

1) We would like to see the term "conflict of interest" retained as the title of this element, rather than "management of interests." The focus of the policy should be on minimizing and eliminating conflict of interests, in keeping with IAC recommendations and policies governing similar bodies; the term "management" could be interpreted to suggest that conflicts of interest could as a general matter be tolerated, which we understand is not the intention of this policy. We think the terms "potential" and "perceived" conflicts of interest should be avoided, so it is clear we are applying an objective standard. We think the conflict of interest policy and form should be as short and understandable as possible.

2) We would see the policy of conflict of interest primarily or exclusively covering financial interests, along the lines of the 2003 National Academies conflicts of interest, which was referenced by the IAC as a possible model for IPCC, and which ordinarily deals with financial conflicts of interest. The National Academies policy identifies certain specific other circumstances that present conflicts of interest (e.g., particular circumstances where an author's work is a central focus of a review; or where an author is responsible for an organization with a policy that relates centrally to the subject matter assessed); however, its primary thrust is ensuring that situations that do not compromise the integrity of the IPCC as a result of financial interests of authors and other key officers involved in the development of NRC IPCC products.

3) We would like to see consideration of the adjudication of conflicts of interest as a professional function under the Secretariat, accountable to the Executive Committee. This is analogous to the professional application of the conflict of interest policies that exist in other bodies (such as the National Academies). We could also envision a role for working group and other bureau members in identifying potential professional conflicts of interest in the author selection process (e.g., through CVs) and in engaging the secretariat in the implementation of the conflict of interest policy as it relates to authors and reviewers of IPCC products.

4) We think the policy should be as explicit as possible about protecting the confidentiality of the disclosure documents, and should note that these documents will be destroyed when an assessment is completed. If the person in charge of adjudicating conflicts is based in Geneva, Swiss law will be invoked in protecting confidentiality.

5) With regard to the form, consideration needs to be given as to whether disclosure includes all financial and professional interests an individual has or whether it is limited to those interests where the individual disclosing deems an interest may present a conflict.

6) We think a waiver system, akin to that of the National Academies, should be more fully developed.

7) In the revision of this draft, we suggest building around the main elements addressed in the Working Group 2 guidance:

- explanation of the distinction between bias and conflict of interest, and an explanation of the management of such issues by the Panel;
- reference that conflict of interest applies to current interests, and not to past or possible future interests;
- reference that financial interests of close relations (family and business partners) are pertinent to the scope of conflict of interest of an IPCC author or officer;
- reference to specific examples of potential financial conflicts of interest, and non-financial conflicts of interest, drawing from the examples provided in the National Academies policy.

8) Provision should be made for regular updating of disclosure forms by authors and others.

9) Appropriate mitigation action and procedures spelled out, in particular for financial matters, as the policy will ordinarily cover financial conflicts of interest. Where a conflict of interest is found, the appropriate mitigation measure will in general involve elimination of the conditions giving rise to the conflict of interest, disclosure through the waiver process, or withdrawal from participating as part of the IPCC.

10) Guidance should be developed to ensure uniform, informed, and balanced application of this guidance by individuals involved in conflict of interest review.

11) Certain issues that have arisen in the context of conflict of interest guidance may be more appropriate for a code of conduct (e.g., author treatment of draft IPCC findings, author participation on IPCC delegations), as distinct from a conflict of interest policy. Some generality may be of help here, perhaps avoiding situations in which, "a reasonable person would conclude judgment is impaired" or "a reasonable person might question the ability to act solely in the interests of the IPCC."

12) As a matter of presentation, it may be preferable to include major substantive elements of the guidance in the body of the policy.

## Zambia

However, on the proposed name for the body that would be overseeing conflict of interest issues, the name, Management of Interests Panel should be changed. Particularly, the panel should be replaced by another word so that it does not appear to have the same status as the IPCC, being a subordinate body under the IPCC. In this context, we wish to propose that the name be changed to Management of Interest Unit (MIU) or something like that.

### Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32

(1) The IAC Review recommended that "The IPCC should develop and adopt a rigorous conflict-of-interest policy". This is the basis for WGI's insistence that the policy cannot be voluntary and cannot be applied in a less than rigorous manner.

(2) It is hard to comment on the Policy without having the Explanatory Note available, which contains not just examples but also more detail about the implementation of the Policy. It is important that the Panel has sufficient time to review this important part of the documentation. What is the timetable for its delivery?

(3) The Explanatory Note should contain concrete examples. In implementing the rigorous policy of WGI, we found that such examples are very helpful in outlining and describing the spirit and intent of a CoI regulation. With clear guidance, such as provided by the WGI Guidance Note on CoI, we found that authors are very cooperative and forthcoming in addressing real, perceived, or potential CoIs.

(4) The Policy mentions the Working Groups but not the Task Force on Inventories, which I assume should also be covered by the policy, even though it was not mentioned by the IAC Review. Therefore, wherever "Working Group" appears, add "and Task Force".

(5) Having recently completed the first CoI exercise for WGI, I note the need for consistency of implementation across the WG (and TF) Bureaux and the Management of Interests Panel. I am concerned to know how this consistency will be ensured.

(6) The following comments are on the section on pp. 3-4, which is headed Task Group Commentary on the Proposals:

#### Comments on Background and Key Considerations

Point 2 does not signal a rigorous policy. Suggest strengthening the first sentence by inserting "using appropriate strategies" after "the challenge is to manage these interests". The second sentence seems out of context in a CoI policy. Perhaps what is meant is more about cultural sensitivity, so suggest replacing the second sentence by "The TG noted the need for sensitivity to different cultural approaches to the management of interests. This policy is intended to encourage cooperation from all individuals participating in IPCC.". Point 3: the confidentiality of information is critical. Suggest strengthening the sentence and making it more specific so that after the comma it now reads "the specific information pertaining to each individual will remain confidential.".

#### Comments on Key points of the proposals

Point 2: it is important to be able to review the Explanatory Note. For instance, does the guidance on completing the Disclosure Form require information about the interests of close family members? WGI would disagree with this. The specific examples are an important component and, if chosen correctly, may very well have drawn significant comments.

Point 3 does not signal a rigorous policy. Suggest strengthening by inserting "using appropriate strategies" after "conflicts have to be managed".

Comment on Cross-cutting issues

Point 3: also relates to selection of future Chapter teams. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

It is unclear whether the "IPCC Explanatory Note on Management of Interests" appears in this document, or has yet to be drafted. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

Background and key considerations: You may further elaborate under this item (possibly point 2.) that IPCC reports and author teams should reflect a range of views and wide range of expertise. Participation of experts from business and industry is explicitly welcome. You may also wish to distinguish at the outset between elected office holders (members of the IPCC Bureau, TFB and staff) and CLA/LA/RE. Key points and approach: The distinction made in points 5 and 6 may lead to inconsistencies in the application of the policy. To avoid that you may wish to consider a larger management of interests panel where certain members focus on CLA/LA/RE and others/all on Bureau and staff. It is suggested not to use the term panel to prevent misunderstandings. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[Policy Statement]**

### **Austria**

Para 8)

Consistent with a mandatory compliance with the conflict of interest policy, para 8 should include the requirement that any candidate for the executive committee shall deposit his/her filled in and signed IPCC Disclosure of Relevant Interests Form somewhere before elections and that the election becomes only operational in case that after the election the existence of a valid form has been confirmed by a [Management of Interest panel].

If a member of the Executive Committee fails to adhere to the conflict of interest policy the election is not valid according to the rules of procedure.

In order to avoid any conflicts of interests for the IPCC chair Austria suggests that in the future (after the termination of the current IPCC bureau) the IPCC chair should be a well paid full-time job located in Geneva, corresponding to the qualification appropriate for an IPCC chair. Such amendment would probably even better correspond to the intentions of the IAC related to the suggestion to introduce an Executive Director.

### **Belgium**

#### 1. Section (2) - Definitions

Paragraph "a": "Conflict of Interests" - last sentence: As other kinds of conflict can be direct or indirect (for instance family involvement), it would be better to remove the word "Financial". The last sentence would then read: "Conflicts may be related to direct or indirect interests".

It might also be useful to add a definition of what direct and indirect means e.g.

A direct interest is an interest which affects the IPCC member in his/her own patrimony (income, access to higher position, recognition, etc.) An indirect interest is an interest which may affect the IPCC member by affecting one of his/her family members or another person with whom he/she has economic dependence (a customer, etc.), or which may have an impact the relationship that he/she has with this family member or other person and the possible influence that can be exercised on the IPCC member due to this relationship.

Paragraph "c" on Relevance (after correction of the numbering): last sentence: It is not clear what is meant by "general share holdings or property ownership". The relevance of the interest is not only determined by reference to the nature of the interest but also by the context, the circumstances and the surrounding facts. Mentioning these two kinds of interest as non-relevant per se would exclude them from the relevance review without even considering potential conflict due to the circumstances. We would therefore suggest amending the sentence the following way: "An interest that does not have a bearing on IPCC's role or credibility is not relevant and need not be declared".

## 2. Section (3) - Principles

Paragraph "b": Although we understand that this principle (the involvement of individuals from developing countries) constitutes a very important basis of the work of the IPCC, such a statement seems a little bit odd in the context of the interest policy. It gives the impression that this policy should not be applied with the same degree of adherence and compliance to individuals from developing countries. This would be a very unfortunate understanding of the text. Therefore, we suggest either to remove paragraph "b" or to rephrase it in a manner that it doesn't appear in contradiction with the other principles and the objectives of the policy. There is a need to clarify what "encouraging" means in this context, otherwise this "principle" could be confusing

Paragraph "h": As the credibility of each and every individual working for the IPCC is a condition for the credibility of IPCC as a whole, it seems preferable to avoid statement such as "compliance with the policy is voluntary". We suggest either to opt for the first proposal (obligatory nature), or simply to remove the entire paragraph since the effect of the non-compliance is already dealt with in Section (8). A sentence that is compatible with section 8 may also be used in these general principles, such as e.g. non-compliance could result in individuals not being able to participate in the full range of assessment activities ~~À,À»~~ (deleting the first part of the second proposition)

## 3. Section (6) - Register of Interests

It is not clear who may request access to the Register of Interests and to whom this information may be disclosed, as Section (6) uses the same term "individuals" for both parties (the one that is due to provide the information and the one that requests the information). We suggest using the term "third parties" ("Interests may be disclosed to any third party authorized by the [Management of Interests Panel]"). As stated in our general comments we would prefer that at least the declarations of direct interests of participating individuals are made available to the public, for reasons of public perception and transparency of the process.

## 4. Section (7) - Management of Interests

paragraph "a": Since it is provided for in Section (6) that disclosure to third parties of information related to interests is under the responsibility of the Management of Interests Panel (MIP) and since no mention of disclosure is made in Section (7), paragraph "a", it may be deducted that MIP is responsible for the disclosure of information related to interests declared by individuals mentioned under paragraph "a" (Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Review Authors, members of Technical Support Units). If it is indeed the case, this should be made explicit. A suggested phrasing could be to add at the end of

Section (7), paragraph "a" the following sentence: "In accordance with Section (6), any disclosure of interests will be requested to and authorized by the Management of Interests Panel". Another option could be to establish a double degree mechanism applicable to request for disclosure concerning individuals mentioned in paragraph "a". At the first degree, the request would be addressed to the Bureau of the Working Group. Appeal of its decision could be submitted to the MIP. In addition, we think that it would be more efficient to have only one centralised register for all declarations of interests (for practical and continuity reasons, e.g. managed by the secretariat under the supervision of the MIP).

Paragraph "b": In order to establish a proper mechanism of management and disclosure of interests, it is essential that the MIP itself would be exempt from any conflict of interests, while protecting the general interest of IPCC. Therefore, we would like to suggest as a fifth option in addition to those presented, a mix of Option 1 en Option 2. Also, all potential interests from members of the MIP should also be declared and registered.

5. Section (8) - We prefer the first proposal. Since the notion of Conflict of Interests is defined as including potential or perceived conflicts, it doesn't appear coherent to require its realisation for sanctions. Harm to IPCC is done from the very moment the conflict of interests (as defined) is revealed. Moreover, the credibility of IPCC's work through this Interests Management Policy is directly connected to its mandatory nature.

Should the second proposal be taken into consideration, some editing might be useful for grammatical purposes.

## Canada

(1) Overall, the Policy does not present sufficient clarity on how the conflicts will be "managed." The Policy proposes a "Management of Interests" panel, but does not provide guidance on how this panel would evaluate or enforce resolution of conflicts that arise. (2) The Policy also does not sufficiently reflect the importance of potential scientific conflicts of interest. There are scientific conflicts that could have significant impacts on the integrity of the IPCC's work and that would require action to resolve (e.g., a Co-Chair or CLA serving in a chief editor role of a major journal where publication decisions and directions strongly influence the material available for the IPCC to assess). Canada suggests that the importance of scientific conflicts be reflected more prominently throughout this proposal, with a view to ensuring the integrity of the report production and review process. (3) Key Points 1: Has the Explanatory Note been developed? The Policy as it stands currently is difficult to interpret, so perhaps what was intended to go into the Explanatory Note actually needs to form part of the Policy. (4) Section 1: Suggest that the Purpose focus specifically on the purpose of the Policy, and not on reiterating the role of the IPCC. (5) Section 2a: Suggest deleting "financial or other" from first sentence. When reading the definition of a conflict of interest, the wording seems to place undue emphasis on financial conflicts compared to other conflicts of interest. Suggest also deleting "financial" from last sentence in this section, as non-financial conflicts can also be both direct and indirect. (6) Section 2a: Suggest replacing "significantly impair, or could be seen to impair" with "impair, or be seen to impair". "Significantly impair" implies that lesser impairment is acceptable, while keeping "significantly impair, or be seen to impair" would literally mean that the appearance of impairment - whether significant or not - is unacceptable, but actual impairment is acceptable, as long as it is not "significant". (7) Section 2a: Canada would prefer the term "apparent" instead of "perceived," as it is more consistent with the terminology used in the Government of Canada's conflict of interest policies. (8) Section 2b: The term "relevance" is defined, but is not actually used in accordance with this definition anywhere in the Policy. (9) Section 2b: Is the Task Group certain that issues like property ownership and general shareholdings will never have a bearing on the IPCC's role or credibility? This explanation is not required to define "relevance", and could cause confusion with respect to

interpretation of the policy. (10) Sections 2b and 4a: Suggest deleting the word "advice", as providing advice is not the role of the IPCC. (11) Section 3b: It is not clear how this statement is to be interpreted in this policy. Does it mean that the rules of the policy will be applied differently for individuals from developing countries? If so, further explanation is needed. (12) Section 3c: Suggest deleting the first sentence, as the issue of who the policy applies to is fully defined later in the Scope section. (13) Section 3f: Suggest deleting "...so that the efficient operation of IPCC is not impeded." This implies that exceptions to the Policy will be made whenever difficulties enforcing the Policy are encountered. (14) Section 3h: We suggest: "Compliance with this Policy is obligatory. Non-compliance may result in individuals being barred from participation in assessment activities." (15) Section 4a: The term "any other individuals" could include contributing authors, expert reviewers, government reviewers and government delegations - please clarify specifically who is included here. (16) Section 5a: This paragraph should clarify that it is not necessary to disclose all interests, only those posing a real, apparent or potential conflict in the context of the IPCC. (17) Section 5b: If the Policy cites the Explanatory Note, one can no longer claim, as "Key point 1" does, that "the Explanatory Note would not form part of the Policy" (18) Section 5d: We suggest: "In the event of any change in their relevant interests, that may give rise to a real, apparent, or potential conflict of interest situation, individuals must complete and submit a new Disclosure of Relevant Interests Form to the appropriate Working Group Bureau in a timely manner." (19) Section 6a: With what individuals would the Management of Interests Panel authorize sharing this information? This clause may not inspire confidence on the part of those disclosing their personal information. (20) Section 6a: The policy should specify the length of time information about interests should be stored (e.g., number of assessment cycles). (21) Section 8: We suggest a modified version of the second option: "Where a conflict of interest is identified, anyone failing to take appropriate mitigating measures may be excluded from any related IPCC activity or from the IPCC altogether."

## **China**

China holds that we should trust the moral quality of the scientists involved in the IPCC work, and therefore the principles for interest management and disclosure system should be voluntary and non-mandatory.

## **France**

The TG should envisage that the scope includes the domain of external Communication : the Secretariat-Communication-staff, and the contractors and contracts, as well as temporary and occasional contributors to the external Communication.

The TG might explicitly address the contribution of e.g. Bureau members to the COPs of the UNFCCC : the recommendation to restrict "within some limits" their presence and contributions. The idea is not to exclude the participation of these individuals as experts e.g. in a national delegation but to avoid a first-rank participation in the negotiations.

## **Germany**

no comment

## **India**



1. Section 2 (a) states "Financial conflicts may be direct or indirect". It is not clear what "indirect" means. Some example(s) of situations might be helpful
2. Sections 2(c) "Relevance" states "... such as general shareholdings or property ownership, is not relevant and need not be declared". However, the "Declaration of interest form" provided does not make that distinction leading to lack of clarity on this matter.
3. Section 9: Since the "assessment cycle" is itself under discussion in terms of how IPCC might function in the future, this should be changed to something more general.

## Japan

3. Compliance (referring to "IPCC MANAGEMENT OF INTEREST POLICY, 8" ): Considering that the participation to the IPCC activities are voluntary basis, no penalties should be given to individuals those involved in the preparation of IPCC reports, if the violation of the policy is trifle. However, senior IPCC leadership (Chair, Vice Chairs, Working Group Co-Chairs and other members of the IPCC Bureau) should be stringently treated, and in the case of non-compliance, such treatment as refusal of the participation in the process afterwards or dismissal shall be applied.
4. Management of interest (referring to "IPCC MANAGEMENT OF INTEREST POLICY, 7)b" ): Concerning the composition of the Management of Interest panel, Japan recommends the EC (excluding the person in charge) to take the role.

## Norway

- 3b: Norway finds it very important to encourage the participation of individuals from developing countries in the work of the IPCC. We are still wondering if it is through the Conflict of Interests policy such participation should be encouraged.
- 3h: Norway would like to see that compliance with the IPCC Management of Interest Policy is made obligatory.
- 5a: If a mechanism to manage potential conflicts of interest is established we would like to reserve the term "Panel" to the IPCC itself and are therefore proposing to rename the structure to a Management of Interest Board or Group.
- 7b: Norway would like to underline that the members of the Management of Interest Panel/Board/Group will have to be highly professional. We also find it beneficial if the panel members are not too closely linked to the IPCC. We would therefore prefer either option 1 (representatives of the parent organizations) or option 3 (external representatives).
- 7c: If the Panel decides to establish such a body, the role, mandate and procedures of the body must be described thoroughly in publicly available documents. Furthermore we would like to reserve the term Panel to the IPCC itself and are therefore proposing to rename the structure to a e.g. Management of Interest Board IPCC Management of Interest Group
- 8: Norway would suggest to find another term than "in extreme circumstances" or to take this part of the sentence out.

## Peru

### IPCC Management of Interests Policy

In paragraph 7 b. Peru supports Option 2, that shall read: "Representatives from the IPCC Plenary from all WMO regions and not participating in the IPCC Bureau".

In paragraph 8, the text shall read: "Failure to make a disclosure will result in a call for appropriate mitigating measures. Failure to undertake the

requested appropriate mitigating measure may result in an individual being excluded from certain activities or processes or, in extreme circumstances, being asked to step down."

## **UK**

It would be good to see an affirmation that a simple clear explanatory note, with examples, that could be easily understood by people whose first language is not English is needed. Also there is an issue as to whether this explanatory note is part of the policy or a side document.

Para 3b) Why focus on Developing Countries? this may be perceived as prejudicial. Suggest deletion.

Para 3c) Why just highlight reports. Surely this is true for guidelines to and indeed any IPCC activity.

Para 3h) It is hard to escape the logic that this has to be universal.

Para 7b) Suggest calling it a committee to avoid confusion with the IPCC as the Panel.

More substantively we suggest that more will need to be agreed on this committee  
What are its terms of reference?

What powers would it have?

To whom does it report? the Panel?

How will members be chosen?

Should it have a chair or co-chairs?

What size should it be?

Should there be a time limit on how long people serve on it?

Para 8 How will decisions be taken on individuals? By majority voting? Consensus?

Will anyone transgressing the rule have a right of appeal?

Will expulsions be publicised in any way?

Is there a role here for the Executive Committee (noting they are subject to the same rules of course)?

## **United States of America**

Paragraph 2a.

- It would be useful to distinguish here between "bias" and "conflict of interest." As the National Academies policy indicates, these are distinct issues, managed in different ways.

- The National Academies NAS policy characterizes conflict of interest requirements as objective, and does not refer directly to "perceived" or "potential" conflict of interest, and we think it may be helpful for us to do the same.

Paragraph 2b. We think there is no need for a 'register of interests' independent of an author's form.

Paragraph 3a. The second sentence should be amended to read: "This policy is intended to encourage the participation of these individuals while ensuring that the integrity of IPCC processes and products is not compromised."

Paragraph 3a. framework for addressing conflicts of interest...

Paragraph 3d. This is not as strong as National Academies NRC guidance, which calls for prompt and public declaration of a conflict of interest in these exceptional circumstances; we believe that such a disclosure is important.

Paragraph 3h. is this sentence necessary?

Paragraph 5c. One month is a very short time. We would suggest two months unless strong reason not to.

Paragraph 6 We think the register should be eliminated.

Paragraph 7a. Please see comment 3 above.

Paragraph 7b. Please see comment 3 above. We note that the Secretariat is already subject to WMO conflict of interest policies.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

3b. Delete this sentence or edit as follows: "The policy should be applied in a culturally sensitive way that encourages the cooperation of all individuals participating in IPCC. "

3g. First sentence "observed" seems vague. Suggest rephrasing: "Information disclosed will be kept confidential".

3h. A rigorous policy cannot be voluntary, although it can rely on self-disclosure. Delete "Compliance with the policy is voluntary but" and begin a new sentence with Non-compliance .. "

4a. Include TF Co-Chairs. Be more specific about who is meant by "any other individuals directly involved in the development of IPCC products or advice."

5a. In line 3, insert "via the Technical Support Unit" following "relevant Working Group Bureau".

5c. In line 4, following the 2nd sentence, insert "TSU and Secretariat staff should submit a Disclosure of Interest form within [one month] of taking up their appointment. "

6a. The third sentence is far too vague when the next sentence says "Information about interests will be treated as confidential. " Suggest deleting the third sentence and rephrasing the next to read: "Specific individual information about interests will be treated as confidential. "

7b. The preferred composition of the panel is option 2, or a mix of options 2 and 1. Option 3, external representatives, brings questions about what is a credible organisation, who selects, etc.

7d. Insert "and Technical Support Units" after "The IPCC Secretariat" at the start of this sentence as they would logically be the ones to assist the WG Bureaux. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

Management of Interests Policy, Item 3c: This statement does not make it clear whether conflict of interest standards will be defined and/or applied differently depending on an individual's position within the IPCC.

Management of Interests Policy, Item 6a: It is unclear what is meant by, "Interests may be disclosed to individuals authorized by the Management of Interest panel." This could be viewed as conflicting with the subsequent statement about interests being treated as confidential. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

1.c) Be clear what is meant by its members? Members of IPCC are governments and therefore not subject to this policy. 3.b) It is not clear why developing countries are singled out as special case. If you want to emphasize the encouragements of special groups in this context then maybe authors from business and industry. 3.c) specify higher office, e.g. members of the Bureau/TFB, the Head of the Secretariat etc. 3.h) It is suggested to distinguish between elected office holders (Bureau/TFB) and authors (CLA/LA/RE). 4.b) add Methodology Reports 7.a) Regarding management please see comments made under key points and approach. Different management structures for different groups carry the risk of inconsistency and therefore a larger management of interest structure is suggested. Due to the fact that Working Groups do not provide for a continuous structure it is suggested to establish a central register. 7.b) An independent specialized organization/company as is used by the UN system may be considered as option. Note on Secretariat - Senior staff is currently subject to UN and WMO policy [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[Disclosure Form]**

### **Belgium**

Comments on the Form:

The Form should be modified accordingly our remarks on 2) a. Replace 'Financial conflicts may be direct or indirect' by ' Conflicts may be related to direct or indirect interests' and add a definition of what direct and indirect is e.g.:

A direct interest is an interest which affects the IPCC member in his/her own patrimony (income, access to higher position, recognition, etc.) An indirect interest is an interest which may affect the IPCC member by affecting one of his/her family members or another person with whom he/she has economic dependence (a customer, etc.), or which may have an impact the relationship that he/she has with this family member or other person and the possible influence that can be exercised on the IPCC member due to this relationship.

### **Canada**

(1) Second paragraph, first sentence: Suggest changing "called for" to "required." (2) Second last sentence of disclosure form: Suggest deleting "...will not be released more widely except with my authorization." We do not foresee any reason why the IPCC should be responsible for releasing this information other than as required by law.

### **Finland**

Please, add "Mail address" to the required contact information at the end of the form.

### **Germany**

no comment

### **India**

1. With regard to making Compliance with the policy obligatory, while making it obligatory it may be better to give some flexibility for authors to disclose only relevant issues.
2. Section 3(h): A "voluntary disclosure" would have a better chance of attracting people with the necessary skills rather than an obligatory one where people are likely to shy away from taking on an already onerous responsibility.
3. Currently, WGI advises an annual disclosure by persons involved. It may be worthwhile putting down some frequency at which disclosure is made.
4. The last sentence of the penultimate paragraph reads "I understand that information about interests will be treated as confidential, unless required to be disclosed by law, will not be released more widely except with my authorization." The part "unless required by law" is not discussed anywhere in the draft policy document and is very worrisome. It leads to questions like which law?, what jurisdiction?, etc. as many countries have various degrees of disclosure mandated under laws such as RTI in India, or "Freedom of information Act (FOIA)" in the USA, etc.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

It is important to introduce an element of self disclosure by including a caveat after "I disclose all my current and relevant interests" (last bold sentence) as follows: "that may constitute a real, perceived, or potential conflict of interest ". Otherwise the entry will be a CV and impossible to scrutinise and assess for hundreds of authors.

II. The topic of "government representation including membership of international delegations" should be expanded in the Explanatory Note.

First paragraph on page 9 (cont. from p.8): More discussion is needed about what is behind the phrase "unless required to be disclosed by law". This may also need to be expanded to explain what is meant, e.g., national or international law. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

# Task Group on Communications Strategy

## [General Comments]

### **Austria**

In general those recommendations are welcome by Austria. However, given the importance of the IPCC and its high profile in the media some suggestions should be further strengthened.

### **Belgium**

We appreciate the work done by the TG, which will contribute to provide clarifications and useful guidelines regarding communication.

### **Finland**

The effort to improve communication strategy is very welcomed. It is important that the new strategy will be implemented without delay. Production of easily understandable information material, especially graphs and figures, will help the communication of IPCC results at national level, too.

### **Germany**

The roles of responsibilities of the head of the secretariat and the deputy, the sen. comm. man. must be clarified, consistent with the proposed decisions from the other three TGs. --- The head of the secretariat and her/her deputy can be a spokesperson on issues concerning the principles governing IPCC work, IPCC rules of procedures etc., but not on scientific content. --- The sen. comm. man. should focus on strategic issues development of outreach material, in consultation with the EC and according to the rules of IPCC and panel decisions, but not speak on behalf of IPCC. He/she should be responsible for preparing and issuing coordinated messages from IPCC. He/she should actively support the spokesperson and the focal points in their outreach activities. --- The strategics of any communication actions proposed by the sen. comm. manager must be approved by the panel. --- A report on communication and outreach activities must be provided by the sen. comm. man. on an annual basis to the panel.

### **Japan**

#### 1. Future work and nature of documentation:

The revised documentation should be used as a guide for the senior communication manager for the development of the Strategy. Then the time flame of the complement of the communication strategy document should be clarified. Also the approval process of the document (who will approve, panel or Bureau?) should be clarified.

#### 2. Role and responsibility of the senior communication manager:

The role and responsibility of the senior communication manager should be described in the document.  
Japan's recommendation on the outline of TOR of the senior communication manager is as follows:

[[a]]Implementation of enhanced and effective communication activities under guidance of the Panel/Bureau/EC  
[[b]]Strengthen outreach activities through collaboration with stakeholders including governmental focal points  
[[c]]Management of the entire public relations and communication activities including quick responses  
[[d]]Review the communication activities and report the outcomes to the Panel and the Bureau

### 3. Development of Communication strategy:

Communication has two different vectors: enhancement of presence through active communication while ensuring self-discipline. A guideline concerning self-discipline (e.g. treatment of conflicts of interests) shall be severe and clear, but communication with public and media relation should be active. Based on this principle, IPCC's communication activities shall be implemented effectively and strategically, and this requirement should be clearly described in this report.

## Malaysia

We consider an appropriate communication strategy is very important step in promoting the IPCC reports and information. However, we feel that communication would be more effective if it is organized by national authorities at national level, guided and supported by the IPCC.

## Netherlands

(1): We request the Task Group to provide the Panel with a transparent and critical analysis of the crisis in 2010 and what lessons can be drawn, without finger pointing at individuals.

(2): The text should be more concise - clear draft decision texts are needed. We suggest to follow format: IAC decision - rationales - draft decision texts, while avoiding trivial statements and focusing on what has to change related to current practices

(3): The suggested responsibilities of the senior communications manager are too big. Please note that this individual formally reports only to the IPCC Secretary. The Executive Committee or its members should decide on what messages to convey to the public media. The terms of reference of the senior communication manager should be coordinated with the TG on Governance and Management.

## Norway

Norway is in general happy with the draft recommendations from the Task Group on Communications. It is important that in the next step, during the development of the actual communications strategy, the goals of IPCC communications activities are further defined.

Further, a separate crisis communications strategy must be put in place.

## Russian Federation

We support the proposed approach in general. However, some aspects should be formulated more distinctly and in a simpler way. It would be expedient, if two key persons were responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the IPCC communication strategy, namely,  
- an IPCC Vice-Chair responsible for communications and

- a communication manager, officer with the IPCC Secretariat.

The communication manager monitors the publications and statements related to the IPCC work, including negative ones. He/she collects and systematizes external inquiries submitted to the IPCC, and prepares a monthly draft note highlighting the IPCC current work and responding to the above publications, statements and inquiries. WGs' TSUs and Bureaux are to be involved in the preparation of the note, if an issue relates to their sphere. After approval of the draft by the IPCC Vice-Chair responsible for communications, the communication manager makes the monthly note publicly accessible through the open IPCC website.

Once in three months the IPCC Vice-Chair responsible for communications with assistance of the communication manager calls a press-conference where a three-month summary of the IPCC current activity and responses to publications and statements related to the IPCC work, including negative ones, are to be presented. Other IPCC officials and experts may be involved if necessary. After the press-conference the summary is to be published through the open IPCC website.

No publications or statements, including negative ones, should be answered by the communication officer or any other IPCC official hastily or carelessly, it being not a proper style for a serious scientific organization like the IPCC.

## **Sweden**

Sweden supports the proposals by the Task Group and acknowledge that communications is a very important part of the IPCC work. Therefore, to finalise the communication strategy should be one of the first priorities.

The process for handling errors has to be developed in close connection with the Executive Committee.

## **UK**

Preamble. We suggest adding the following text on the role of the Executive Committee and how this relates to the Senior Communications Manager: The Executive Committee will be ultimately responsible for ensuring that IPCCs Communications are appropriate, and that the Strategy meets the requirements of the Panel and is being delivered suitably. The Senior Communications Manager will work within the IPCCs Secretariat, but should also be considered an expert advisor to the Executive Committee on issues of communication.

## **United States of America**

On the Preamble:

The last paragraph of the Preamble should be amended to read as follows: "This document provides guidance to the head of Secretariat, who is expected to develop, in consultation with the Executive Committee, and deliver a holistic communications strategy that reflects the expectations of the Panel in respect of outreach and media communications."

It is customary to ask the head of Secretariat to undertake activities, and to delegate those activities accordingly. The responsibility for secretariat functions rests ultimately with the head of Secretariat.

## **Zambia**



In line with the mandate of the Task Group on Communication, reflected on page 2 of the draft document, bullet point 3 highlights the need for the task group to articulate a set of objectives for IPCC communications. While this requirement has been satisfied in the draft document, it would have been more helpful to have a separate or stand alone chapter highlighting the objectives of the IPCC communications. In this regard, I wish to recommend that a chapter on objectives be included in the draft document and it should come before the section on principles. The chapter on objectives should generally state the overall purpose of the IPCC communication and can read as proposed below:

"The overall objective of the IPCC communications strategy is to provide a framework for the transparent, effective, rapid and audience specific communication of IPCC products and processes in a timely and coherent manner"

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

Thanks to the TG members for their hard work.

One subject that is not really addressed in this document is the needed transparency of the IPCC process.

Everybody agrees on the surface to say it is very important, but most meetings of the IPCC are closed to media. Is this really justified ? Could the TG address this point, and make recommendations about how to improve on this? The practices of other international bodies (e.g., UNFCCC) could be used as a reference. In those bodies, media have a much larger access to the process, while some parts of the proceedings remain of course out of scope. [Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, Vice Chair]

In the Preamble on p.3, line 3 in last para., replace "a holistic communications strategy" by "a comprehensive communications strategy", to be more understandable. [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

General:

General objective of IPCC communications is to support disseminating of the results of IPCC assessment work. IPCC communications should also improve the understanding of who we are, how we work. UN organizations and IPCC observer organizations should be recognized as partners to disseminate knowledge to specific user groups and audiences. Journalists are also very important because they regularly convey messages to the general public whose opinion is crucial for decision makers.

The draft strategy falls short of addressing a number of points raised in the IAC review and have been unclear in the past and thus lead to problems. Clarity is essential to allow consistent implementation, e.g communications material and how it will be authorized, stakeholders and audiences, who identifies spokespersons and who develops and approves the line to take and communicates to spokespersons. There are a number of inconsistencies which would prevent a rapid response in case of unforeseen circumstances.

Many sections refer to activities that have been carried out successfully in the past more than 10 years without referring to experience gained. The role of the IPCC Secretariat in communications in the past 12 years should be recognized as well as the need to have a centrally coordinated communications strategy where the Secretariat plays a key role. Specific comments will be made under the specific sections.

Preamble:

While communication is mentioned a key issue it should be noted that only 5% of the Trust Fund budget is allocated to it. This included distribution costs for reports and staff.

Para 4 should move before the reference to the 2008 task group, because these activities were implemented much earlier. The Information Officer was recruited in 2006.

Comments on the last para of preamble: The IPCC Secretariat is recruiting a Senior Communications Manager. He/she will be reporting and be under the direct supervision of the Secretary of the IPCC.

Reference should be made in the preamble that following the award of the Nobel Peace Prize the communication requirements for the IPCC had changed dramatically, but the resources for communication remained unchanged. This led in part to the inability to address the criticism raised in 2009 and 2010 in an efficient manner. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[Principles]**

### **Belgium**

Bullet 1 Objective and transparent

Comment: Transparency is indeed very important, but most meetings of the IPCC are closed to the media. This document does not address that point. We think that the IPCC needs to reflect on how to increase the transparency of its work, being inspired by the practices of other international bodies, such as the UNFCCC.

Bullet 2 Recognizing IPCC as a unique organization

we suggest to replace assessment and review is central by assessment by scientists and review by the scientific community, governments and stakeholders, is central. Explanation: To make clear that the assessment itself is a process led by scientists, with a separate reviewing role for stakeholders and governments.

### **Germany**

Agreed

### **Malaysia**

The essential quality of the IPCC's findings and conclusions should remain policy-neutral and maintain scientific balance, which is policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive. It is important to fully ensure that the IPCC's communications approach and activities should be consistent with these qualities.

### **Netherlands**

Third bullet: please delete "supporting material" is not accepted or approved by the IPCC

### **Spain**

Spain considers crucial the implementation of an effective communications strategy in IPCC and, in general, agrees with the recommendation of the Task Group. The recommendations establish clearly the essential principles and cover most of the issues.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

On p.4, 2nd bullet, line 3, to be clear, suggest replacing "The presentation of its findings and conclusions should ... ", which are words often associated with research results, by "The presentation of its assessments/reports should ... "

On p.4, 3rd bullet, line 3, supporting material is a specific term in IPCC and is characterised as NOT having been subject to IPCC's review process. Therefore, in line 3, delete "and supporting material". In line 4, it should be "adopted or approved by" rather than "adopted and approved by". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

Add response strategies in the chapeau.

Bullet 3 - clarify terms. Supporting material has a specific meaning in IPCC context.

Bullet 4 - the term unique appears a bit arrogant and may not be helpful in the context of communicating the IPCC as user-oriented organization. Maybe - organization with specific characteristics - could be used instead.

Bullet 5 - audience appropriate communication has been the challenge in the past, but this strategy does not yet sufficiently address this need. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[Defining the scope of IPCC communications (overall IPCC & report-specific)]**

### **Belgium**

(1) We feel that the manner by which content is divided between Sections 2 and 3 is unclear. In addition, Section 2 suggests a target audience that is more limited than in section 3. We think that the structure could be made clearer, perhaps by merging Sections 2 and 3 under the title Scope and audience of the IPCC communications, and including the current section 3 as a subtitle above the bold subtitle Global engagement.

(2) Technical Reports: Please correct to Technical Papers

(3) The wording engagement with wider audiences as they develop their reports requires clarification: what is the wider audience in connection with reports development?

### **Canada**

(1) Page 4, paragraph 3 states that the scope of wider communications activities is to support good understanding of IPCC reports, and the processes that generated them. However, the bullets below this paragraph do not explicitly state that the IPCC should undertake to communicate the key conclusions of its reports. Canada suggests adding some text to the first bullet that would clarify this, as follows: "Raising awareness of new reports, AND THE MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

THEREOF, among IPCC's primary audiences." (2) On page 5, second bullet, the following sentence should be clarified: "Working Groups are encouraged to continue their ongoing efforts to explore engagement with wider audiences as they develop their reports." Canada is not aware of what communications and outreach activities the WGs conduct during the development of IPCC reports; this should be elaborated.

## **France**

The main media of scientific communication by IPCC are the reports produced by IPCC.

Other communication objectives are, mainly, about the IPCC processes and procedures.

## **Germany**

Change 4th bullet: "Continuous provision of information and responding to media queries (including on short notice) about IPCC's activities and processes, and the content of published IPCC reports."

## **Japan**

4. Defining the scope of IPCC communications:

IPCC Communication strategy should focus to rule its own activities, and in terms of activities implemented by member countries, IPCC's role shall be limited to support efficient enhancement of such outreaches. Scope of IPCC's communication should not be excessively expanded.

In the section titled "Global engagement", it is written that "the senior communications manager should ... consider capacity-building relating to the role of focal points in communication and outreach activities." Japan agrees that capacity-building is important to effectively implement IPCC's communication activities, but would like to clarify that this sentence does not mean that IPCC will provide media training or other activities to the focal points using IPCC resources.

## **Malaysia**

We consider outreach as an important step in promoting the IPCC's findings. However, we feel that outreach would be more effective if it is organized by national authorities at national level. We propose that the scope of communications needs to also consider at national level, by providing IPCC materials early to members for effective communication strategies at the national level.

## **Morocco**

\* Target audiences:

The major target audiences of the communications efforts of the IPCC are governments and policy-makers. Engaging with the Media is an important way in which the IPCC can communicate its findings, processes and procedures. Speaking of broader audiences, we think that the IPCC should ensure that information is available and accessible for these audiences, particularly the kids through its website and/or via specialized organizations.

## **Netherlands**

Engagement of focal points may not always be effective given time and resource constraints.

## **Norway**

First paragraph: Would it make sense to replace "physical sciences" with "natural sciences"?

Global engagement

As the outreach capacity of the IPCC as such is limited Norway finds it important that the IPCC supports the IPCC Focal Points and ensures that they are in a position to assist in the outreach and communications activities of the IPCC. This must be taken into consideration when developing the actual communications strategy of the IPCC.

The last word in the second paragraph: Is "positions" the right term?

Web presence

The IPCC should prioritize a well-functioning website directed at targeted audiences which also serves the IPCC Focal Points in their own communications and outreach activities.

## **Spain**

We welcome the proposal on the engagement of national focal point as they could play an important role not only in the communication strategy of their countries but also to harmonize and ensure the consistency of the IPCC communication strategy as a whole. In this context, the development of some guidelines could be beneficial.

In addition, in order to increase the presence of outreach and communication of the countries in the framework of the IPCC communication strategy could also be beneficial to incorporate in the IPCC Web specific material that can be produced by the different countries members of the IPCC or institution, indicating that the material has been prepared under the respective country or institution.

## **UK**

Under Global Engagement, recommend extending the document to note that the IPCC Senior Communications Manager should also consider which external organisations and stakeholders should be kept aware of the activities of the IPCC, for example by receiving copies of relevant press notices. This Stakeholder List could be kept updated through time

Under Communication Responsibilities of the IPCC (page 4 to 5), we propose making one addition to this list of IPCC communication responsibilities: Respond effectively to incorrect representations of the IPCC and its processes, where these could be damaging to the IPCCs reputation.

## **United States of America**

On Global Engagement:

First paragraph: "senior communications manager" should be replaced with "IPCC Secretariat"

On Web Presence:

Second paragraph: "senior communications manager" should be replaced with "individuals in the Secretariat responsible for communications"

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

On p.4, 2nd para., 2nd line, insert "strive to" so it reads "authors should strive to make as comprehensible as possible".

On p.4, 3rd para., 2nd line, it is good that the TG recognises the importance of communicating about the processes that generated the reports.

On p.5 under Global engagement, the elected Bureau members can play an important role as well as the focal points. Suggest inserting "Bureau members and" before each occurrence of "focal points" in these three paragraphs.

On p.5 under Web presence, assume that the FAQs referred to in the last sentence of the first paragraph are the ones that are developed and approved with the Chapters. Add "from IPCC Assessment and Special Reports" after "FAQs".

On p.5 under Web presence, 2nd para. could be more specific about what is meant by "appropriate technologies". Also the senior communications manager should propose or recommend appropriate technologies to the Executive Committee, but should not have the authority to decide to use them without consultation. Therefore, change text accordingly to read: "The senior communications manager should propose [recommend] to the Executive Committee the use of appropriate technologies to implement the agreed communications strategy.". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

Para 2 - change Technical Reports to Technical Papers and add Methodology Reports

Para 3 - widen scope to advisers to decision-makers

Bullets 2 and 3 - these activities have been done since 1999

Bullet 3 - include UN and observer organizations

Last bullet - this is the new challenge which requires clear guidance

Global Engagement

FPs have been informed about upcoming reports and in fact they approve them. A training for FPs may be useful. Please be clear about terminology - supportive materials seems to be the wrong term.

Sending all press releases to FPs can only be done electronically; FPs should update their contact regularly to make sure they receive the information

Web presence

These activities have been done since 1999, using cutting edge technology; recently problems with procurement have delayed the quick availability of searchable versions of reports, and resulted in not fully satisfactory quality. Support from the new EC may be useful to ensure that advanced technology can be applied in the IPCC context (see also comments on governance)

IPCC Secretariat/Communications manager should have a general oversight role over all IPCC websites to ensure consistency in approaches, design and messaging.

Be clear on FAQs - are they the FAQs from the reports or additional ones beyond?  
[Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[Target audiences]**

### **Canada**

The text in paragraph two under Target Audiences should be made fully consistent with bullet 2 under Scope of IPCC Communications, in that the IPCC should not be, itself, producing derivative products aimed at specific audiences. To clarify, Canada suggests adding the following at the beginning of the last sentence: "WHILE THE IPCC ITSELF DOES NOT PRODUCE DERIVATIVE PRODUCTS AIMED AT SPECIFIC AUDIENCES, IT MAY ENGAGE with organizations that take elements of..." However, such products must not be considered joint productions or in any way products of the IPCC.

### **France**

The main target are governments and policy-makers.

### **Germany**

Sustainable cooperations with other organisations should be established to reach out to broader audiences. A mechanism for the development of such cooperations should be proposed by the senior communication manager to the Panel at its 34th session.

### **Malaysia**

It is extremely important to communicate information with more audience-specific formats. Information with audience-specific formats are:

- Technical Papers on regions and/or topics.
- IPCC outreach material specifically designed for regions
- Regional seminars
- Summaries of IPCC Reports prepared by regional organizations
- A special report on regional issues.

We also support a wider access of the IPCC reports, particularly at the national and regional level, with those activities such as:

- Data sets and interactive models
- Posters
- Outreach activities.

### **Norway**

Norway finds it important to include the UNFCCC in the list of major target audiences.

### **Zambia**

2. There is need for the draft document to be clear on the target audience for IPCC communications. For instance under chapter 2 on page 4, they have used the term primary audience in reference to policy makers only while on page 5, under chapter 3, there's mention of major target audiences in reference to governments and policy makers. I wish to propose instead of "major audiences", there is need to maintain the use of the term "primary audiences" to refer to governments and policy makers.

The paragraph talking about broader audiences and what constitute this group can remain. However, I wish to propose that the media as a target group have a special place in communications as they are used as a conduit to reach out to all the other target groups. In this case, the media should be considered as a separate entity altogether, whose role should explicitly stand out.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

On p.5, first para., IPCC does not itself have "findings", so suggest replacing "findings" by "the information contained in its reports". Thus editing last sentence to read: "IPCC can communicate the information contained in its reports, as well as its processes and procedures."

On p.5, 2nd para., "the IPCC should ensure " is rather strong language for an activity that is not a primary part of the mandate. An appropriate level of facilitation is needed, so suggest replacing "the IPCC should ensure that information is available" by "the IPCC should look for ways to ensure that information is available". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

Add UN, IPCC observer organizations and the scientific community as key audience.

Partnership activities were very successful in the past to address needs of wider audiences and should be explicitly encouraged. Some additional guidance may be appreciated to facilitate quick and targeted activities. Many UN international organizations already showed interest to produce information materials derived from IPCC reports in collaboration with the IPCC for the general public and special user groups. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[Languages of communications, and translation]**

### **Belgium**

(1) Up to now, only the SPM and Technical summaries are translated. Translating the full reports would probably have major budget implications. Rather than translating full reports, we suggest that some effort could be spent on helping those countries that translate reports in non-UN languages to adapt the key graphics (diagrams etc.) from the summaries to their languages (such help could perhaps be provided in a generic manner to all countries). Accessibility of IPCC communications products should be guaranteed.

(2) As an example everybody can check: the French version of the glossary of the AR4 SYR is not usable, because the order of the paragraphs follows the alphabetical order of the English original. Therefore we suggest to add to the text: The quality control of all translations needs to be substantially improved

### **Canada**



Canada agrees that IPCC communications products should be made available in all six UN languages. However, the first paragraph of this section that indicates that full IPCC assessment reports must be made available in all six UN languages is inconsistent with the Principles Governing IPCC Work and the current practice of the IPCC. IPCC Principle #13 indicates that reports should be made available in all UN languages to the extent possible. The current practice of the IPCC is to translate only the Summaries for Policymakers and Technical Summaries, not full reports.

## **Germany**

We note that additional translations into all UN languages would have budgetary implications. This should be mentioned in the decision.

## **Malaysia**

High-quality multilingual accessibility of IPCC communications products should always be guaranteed.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

It is important that the IPCC brochures are also translated into the six UN languages. Suggest editing p.6, first para., 2nd sentence to read "IPCC communication practices should follow this model, and IPCC communications products, including brochures, should be translated and made available.". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

If full reports are to be translated the cost will multiply. Currently SPM and TS are translated, FAQs from reports are to be added in the future. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[Guidelines]**

### **Austria**

The last sentence of para 1 of clause 5 should read: .., and refraining from advocating or communicating personal views on climate policy.

Explanation: Past experiences show that media and the public are not willing/or able to differentiate what a person says in different functions. This has a high risk that the reputation of the IPCC will be damaged also in the future.

### **Belgium**

(1) About selecting authorized spokespersons etc. We suggest to replace : The Chair, Vice-Chairs, or their designate by The Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs, or their designate. Rationale: this is to avoid confusion with the WORKING GROUP Vice-chairs and to add to Co-Chairs are the lead spokespersons for the activities and content of their Working Group or TFI: Working Group Vice-Chairs may assist the Co-chairs this task.

(2) Rapid response. The text stated : The senior communications manager requires sign-off/approval from at least two of these individuals. We suggest to replace this by : Apart from very simple cases for which the answer is copied from existing text, the answer needs to be approved by at least one elected member of the Executive Committee.

(3) Errors. The last word in the para : examined seems too weak. In some cases, this could cause problems as the journalists may conclude that the IPCC has no immediate answer at all. A preliminary response on the content may be desirable as soon as feasible.

(4) Planned communications materials. Regarding the spokespeople we suggest to add to the text: The general or comon spokes people for the IPCC (IPCC Chair and Vice-chairs, in particular) should be kept well informed about the planned communications materials, so that all spokes people are on the same wavelength. An additional comment: WG Vice-Chairs might also be relevant as spokespeople, especially for communicating with media from their country.

## **Canada**

(1) Greater clarity is needed on the role of other members of the Bureau in IPCC communications. These individuals were elected by the Panel and will be asked to speak authoritatively on IPCC issues in their respective regions. (2) On page 6, under Selecting Authorized Spokesperson, first bullet, Canada suggests the following change: "The Chair, Vice-Chairs, or their designates, ARE THE LEAD SPOKESPERSONS FOR..." This language is consistent with the following bullets, and is sufficiently flexible to reflect that there will be cross-over between the Chair/Vice-Chairs and the Co-Chairs on communications related to the IPCC as an organization and communications on the IPCC's products. (3) Canada suggests that this section clarify that the Secretary is not an authorized spokesperson for IPCC communications. (4) On page 7, under Planned Communications Materials, the need for high level media lines to ensure consistent messaging during the release of a report could be more explicitly identified.

## **Germany**

"How authorized spokespersons ...": refer to the "Principles" of the Communication Strategy.

(What would happen, if this is violated?) --- "Selecting authorized spokespersons...": Who is the "designate" of the Chair/Vice Chair? --- 3rd bullet: Change language: The sen. comm. man. must always be involved to ensure consistent messages. ---The rapid response strategy should be consistent the decisions on Procedures and Management/Governance. The role of the senior comm. man. should be clarified, see above. ---The error handling strategy should be consistent the decisions on Procedures. The description of the process is not detailed enough. ---Comm. Material: Approval of the head of the secretariat and its deputy is not needed. ---Funding for media training must be part of the budget plans.

## **India**

In regard to selecting authorized spokespersons, spokesperson selected from the authors and contributors to the reports by the Co-chairs should ensure adequate regional representation along with other factors such as knowledge of subject etc.

## **Italy**

Be careful in the paragraph "Selecting authorized spokespersons for the organization as a whole, and for individual reports" only "Chair, Vice-Chairs, or their designate" are in the text, while in the paragraph "Rapid response" it is mentioned " the Chair, Vice-Chairs, the Secretary, the Deputy Secretary,"

It is not clear from this text which are the guidelines for the Secretary and Deputy Secretary to speak on behalf of IPCC:

## Japan

### 5. Guidelines:

In cases media of each country contact with a CLA or LA to make questions concerning IPCC matters, the CLA or LA should clarify that he or she is not representing IPCC but answering as a research scientist involved in writing of the IPCC assessment report.

Please clarify the rationale of using two different wordings - "spokespersons" and "spokespeople (on page 7)".

## Malaysia

Senior communications manager of the IPCC should always be involved, for effective coordination according to guidelines. Effective communications can only be assured if there is centralized coordination of the message.

## Netherlands

(1): Authorized spokespersons:

(i): this paragraph should specifically address the position of the IPCC chair, being the most visible person and held responsible by the public and media for all matters concerning IPCC, justified or not. Therefore, the chair of IPCC should be extremely careful in voicing personal views in the media on climate science or climate policies - also when he is publicly speaking in another capacity than IPCC chair as his views will always be linked by the media to the IPCC.

(ii): Spokespersons should avoid presenting themselves as the 'Nobel prize laureate' in person but clarify that the Nobel peace price was for the IPCC organization as a whole

(2): Rapid response: A clear 'management script' should be available that should be used in case of a crisis. This script should be part of the Communication strategy. It should include the role, tasks and responsibilities of all involved individuals in IPCC, and clearly indicate how decisions are taken. Responses to media should be in principle available within 24 hours. The Task Group is invited to co-ordinate this issue with the Governance and Management team.

(3): Errors:

(a): this issue should be dealt with in co-ordination with the TG on Procedures.

(b): The IPCC secretariat should have a publicly accessible website for reporting potential errors and pro-actively invite stakeholders to use this facility. The handling of errors needs procedures ensuring co-ordination on between the communication manager, the executive team, the WG /T|FI co-chairs and authors. Resource issues need to be addressed.

## New Zealand

1. Include mention of the importance of effective internal comms so elected reps and membership are advised personally and usually in advance of public comment

so they are not surprised by their own organisation's public comments 2. Media training for any spokespeople should be mandatory  
3. The Working Group Vice-Chairs should be added to the list of those who WG Co-Chairs may engage as spokespersons.

## **Norway**

Selecting authorized spokespersons for the organization as a whole, and for individual reports, 2nd bullet point:

In reality a large number of authors will have to be available for national media during the release of reports. It is therefore important that the IPCC and the Government Focal Points support and facilitate the authors so that they can prepare well for these releases.

## **Spain**

In relation to the guidelines on who should speak on behalf of the IPCC, in our view is very important to have a clear definition of who would be responsible to speak on the different aspects, as well as to ensure good internal coordination in the preparation of the external communications. In addition, it would be highly recommendable to minimize the number of spokespersons, to ensure better identification of them abroad and especially by the media.

Concerning to who should speak, in general terms, we find the Task Force proposals quite clear and adequate, but we believe that the Chairman or his designate should also be authorized to speak on the content of the Summaries for Policymakers and in particular on the content of the Synthesis Report.

## **UK**

In the section on authorized spokespersons (page 6, final bullet point) we suggest adding a sentence to note that the Senior Communications Manager should be authorised to provide off the record briefings to provide background context

## **United States of America**

We propose a new first sentence to this section, reading: "Neutrality and objectivity in statement by IPCC leadership are critical to the support of the IPCC over time."

Also in the first paragraph: "authorized spokespersons must..." should be replaced with "authorized spokespersons should..."

Also in the first paragraph: add the phrase "or being perceived as" between "or refraining from" and "advocating". Thus, that section of the sentence should read: "... most notably maintainig policy neutrality, scientific balance, and refraining from, or being perceived as, advocating or communicating personal views..."

Under "Selecting authorized spokespersons",  
-- in the first bullet, the phrase "or their designate" is unclear: how will designates be chosen? It would perhaps be more clear to say "or an appropriate designate" in this case  
--bullet 3 from the top should be amended to read: "IPCC leadership should ensure the relevant and appropriate coordination of message with the senior leadership of the Panel, and keep the Executive Committee members, and the

Secretariat informed of any significant communications activities, and should coordinate key messages where appropriate."

On "Rapid Response", we would propose the first paragraph to be amended to read as follows: "To communicate in these exceptional circumstances, head of Secretariat and Executive Committee will develop procedures to ensure a timely and effective response to urgent inquiries. In general, executive responsibility for ensuring timely and effective response will depend on the nature of the request, but will fall to the Chair and/or relevant members of the Executive Committee, supported by the Secretariat." The previous iteration seemed overly prescriptive and as was drafted, would not adequately reflect the strengths and expertise of members involved in the process. We would also suggest the Executive Committee be tasked with proposing a process for rapid response for consideration of the Panel.

## **Zambia**

Under chapter 5 on page 6, the title of the chapter is guidelines while second paragraph of the same chapter also talks about objectives of the guidelines in reference to the selection of authorised spokespersons to speak for the organisation. In order to remove any ambiguity in the use of the word guidelines, I wish to propose that paragraph two be recast to read as follows:

"In keeping with the principles set therein, it is necessary to identify a group of spokespersons allowing the IPCC to speak credibly to its products and processes".

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

(1) Selecting spokespersons, p.6, 1st bullet. In line 1 delete "or their designate". In line 3, insert "Panel Sessions and" before "Bureau Meetings".

(2) Selecting spokespersons, p.6, 3rd bullet. Not all WG-internal issues would need involvement by the communications manager. In last sentence, change "always be involved" to "always be informed".

(3) Rapid response, p.7, main para. A better mechanism for rapid response is needed, but this suggestion shows how difficult it is to delegate authority too narrowly away from the Co-Chairs who are responsible for implementing the work programme (Para. 4.2 of the existing IPCC Procedures). Suggest that the Executive Committee delegates responsibility to a subgroup which works with the senior communications manager. If the enquiry concerns a WG product, at least one of the Co-Chairs from the relevant WG must be involved. It is hard to say that two individuals signing off will be sufficient to capture all relevant people. Suggest rewriting as follows:

"To communicate in these exceptional circumstances, the senior communications manager needs to be able to rely on members of the IPCC leadership. The Executive Committee delegates responsibility to a subgroup from the Chair, Vice-Chairs, the Secretary, relevant Working Group Co-Chairs, TF Co-Chairs which works with the senior communications manager. This group has a responsibility to respond to urgent inquiries in a timely manner. The senior communications manager requires sign-off/approval from all relevant individuals before issuing a response. Before and after the response, the senior communications manager should maintain open channels of communication with the full Executive Committee and provide updates as appropriate."

(4) Errors, p.7. Needs a bit of clarification on what kind of errors and who is the authorised spokesperson, which in this case must be the person tasked with responsibility for leading the process of handling errors. Suggest rewriting as follows:

"The IPCC is in the process of developing a formal procedure for acknowledging putative errors of fact that might change the scientific content of an assessment. In the case of addressing such a putative error of fact, the individuals tasked with responsibility for leading the process of handling errors, i.e., the Co-Chairs or IPCC Chair, should work closely with the senior communications manager on a timely and cogent response." [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

Comment under the heading planned communications materials

Planned communications materials would also need to be approved by the Chair of the IPCC to ensure consistency of messages and particularly in respect of the Synthesis Report. In any case all communications from the IPCC should be within a framework that cuts across Working Groups and should ensure consistency of messaging. [Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman]

#### 5. Guidelines "rapid response"

Concerning the sign-off/approval cannot be done by any two members of the executive committee but by individuals that match the expertise / are from the pertinent working group. [Ottmar Edenhofer, Co-chair, WG III]

Page 6: It may be overly binding to require that the senior communications manager always be involved in all communications activities, as long as coordination of messages is maintained in more general terms.

Page 7, Rapid response section: Further specification of which members of the IPCC

leadership should be contacted for approval in various cases could be helpful. For

example, if a response involves information specific to one Working Group, approval by one

of the Working Group Co-Chairs should be required before a response is issued.

[Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## IPCC Secretariat

### Spokespersons

This section requires more clarity about who designates on which grounds spokespeople, for specific tasks or for all matters related to IPCC, how are these designations communicated the IPCC Secretariat/Communications manager. What is the specific role of the IPCC Secretariat/Communications manager involved is too vague.

### Rapid Response

How would the spokespersons system function in case of unforeseen circumstances, e.g. who communicates the line to take.

The reference to IPCC leadership needs to be clarified, and the role of the EC.

### Errors:

Again who are authorized spokespersons in this case?

### Materials:

Which material? Please specify

It is essential that the IPCC Secretariat/Communications manager is fully informed about all communications material prepared by TSUs and that he/she is able to provide advice and ensure consistency. He/she should work closely with the Co-chairs in this respect.

Again the spokespersons selection and role is not clear. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[Addressing potential conflicts of interest]**

### **Austria**

This clause 6 should read as follows:

Addressing potential conflicts of interest

One central pillar of the IPCC is that its reports are policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive. When speaking on behalf of the IPCC, individuals shall take care to stay within this mandate and not express views beyond the scope of the IPCC reports, or advocate specific policies.

Individuals speaking on behalf of the IPCC must avoid coming into conflict with the above guideline when communicating to media in a different function, as the public/the media usually do not differentiate among the various functions a person might have.

It is expected that persons working at the highest levels take the utmost care in avoiding confusion or misinterpretation in their public statements. The senior leadership should be mindful that publicly advocating or expressing personal opinions about climate policies may jeopardize the reputation of the IPCC, even if unintended. It is important that the IPCC leadership is not perceived as taking positions or making statements that would have the appearance of reflecting bias in the work of the IPCC.

### **Belgium**

(1) We suggest to add: When speaking on behalf of the IPCC, any reasonable effort has to be made to avoid that this person be presented as the sole recipient of the collective Nobel Peace Prize attributed jointly in 2007 to Al Gore and to the IPCC. Justification: Some members of the IPCC seem to have no problem having such announcements made when they speak on behalf of IPCC. This seems to us inappropriate as it was the collective work of thousands of scientists over the years which has justified the fraction of the Nobel Peace prize attributed to IPCC.

### **Canada**

(1) Canada underscores the importance of the guidance provided in this section. We suggest that the strong language used here also be further reflected in the Principles section of the communications strategy, particularly with respect to emphasizing that individuals deeply associated with the IPCC not take on a policy advocacy role. (2) Canada suggests reiterating in Section 6 the third communications principle from Section 2, above, that IPCC communications should be drawn from IPCC Reports and that the IPCC does not issue statements updating scientific conclusions unless these come from formal IPCC assessment documents. We suggest the following edits to Section 6, page 8, third paragraph: "...IPCC participants are encouraged to respond to interest in emerging reports (OR EMERGING SCIENCE), as an opportunity to communicate how the IPCC works (AND THE NEED FOR CAREFUL ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING SCIENCE). The IPCC encourages the science community, including those involved in producing its reports, to engage with wide audiences ON AN ONGOING BASIS..."

### **France**

Regarding the conflict of interests policy, the TG should envisage that the scope includes the domain of external Communication : the Secretariat-Communication-staff, and the contractors and contracts, as well as temporary and occasional contributors to the external Communication.

## **Germany**

Consistency with the recommendations from TG CoI is required. --- Who is "IPCC participants"?

## **Japan**

6. Addressing potential conflicts of interests:  
A guideline to treat conflict of interests and that on roles of LA should be developed.

## **Malaysia**

Addressing potential conflicts of interest should be under the Task Group Conflict of Interest Policy. In this respect, Cross-Task Group review and discussion is important for the 33rd Panel of the IPCC.

## **United States of America**

This category may speak more to the issue of bias as opposed to conflict of interest, and a change in the heading may be appropriate here.

In the second paragraph, we would suggest the first sentence to read as follows: All those associated with the IPCC should be clear to distinguish in which appearances they are speaking in an official IPCC capacity, and in which appearances they are speaking personally or on behalf of other organizations.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

This is a very useful section but the title is a bit misleading. It is not really about conflicts of interest in the usual sense, so suggest changing subheading to read "Limits of IPCC Communication". [Thomas Stocker, Co-chair, WG I]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

Be clear in terminology; the use of senior positions, senior leadership and IPCC leadership is confusing. Further clarify what is meant by IPCC participants. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[Implementing the new strategy]**

### **Belgium**

(1) It is not clear to us to whom the senior communications manager will reports: the head of the Secretariat, or Executive Committee? It cannot act



under any responsibility, as said in the specific case of rapid response above. This needs to be clarified also here

## **France**

A single communication-specialist position in the Secretariat, in the area of external Communication, is probably not enough. More continuity in this function is needed. The continuity and quality may require a larger team. Access to continuous technical support – e.g. webmaster – is needed to allow rapid-responses.

## **Germany**

We are not sure about the staff situation concerning comm. in the secretariat, but the sen. comm. man. might need support to fulfill the suggested tasks.

## **Malaysia**

IPCC needs to have some flexibility to engage additional temporary staff, including consultants, when necessary. This, however, must be supported by a regular updates and review on the financial implications and needs by the IPCC.

## **New Zealand**

1. How will you drive readers to the website? Other than publishing address on press releases? Consider partnerships with other websites or the govt focal points described earlier to provide links?

2. in regard to "other technologies"...would you consider use of social media? Facebook? Twitter? Official IPCC blog?

## **United States of America**

In the second paragraph:

-- the "significant resources implications" associated with communications and their implications should be explored as soon as possible.

In the final paragraph:

-- We would propose replacing "senior communications manager" with "individuals responsible for communications in the IPCC" in the first usage of this term in the paragraph.

-- We would propose the deletion of the line "and be under the authority of the senior communications manager." at the end of the paragraph, as this phrasing suggests that TSUs cannot have their own communication function, which is not intended.

## **Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32**

Page 8, Implementing the new strategy section: It is unclear what extensive network within

the IPCC is referred to, and how this network is different from the activities already occurring through the Working Groups and Task Force. [Chris Field, Co-chair, WG II]

## **IPCC Secretariat**

To implement an efficient communications strategy including outreach and partnership activities sufficient resources are necessary. Having one senior staff and consultants will not work. There needs to be sufficient in house capacity to carry out all relevant activities and only for peak periods and specific tasks consultants should be used. The current situation with one post and short term staff is not sustainable due to restrictions on short term staff and consultants that do not allow for any continuity. It makes the activities also very vulnerable to unforeseen events. E.g. in 2008 the communications officer and the Secretary were on sick leave for an extended period, which lead to major missed opportunities in terms of communication after the award of the Nobel Peace Prize.

There are also some ground rules to make internal and external communication more efficient:

- All involved in communication activities have to have clear mandates. This applies also to TSUs and how they relate to the Communications manager.
- Differences between WGs (different specializations, TSUs in different countries, and so on) should be considered as an asset; and the role of the secretariat who harmonizes that work valued.
- The communications manager/team within the IPCC secretariat should be informed of interactions between journalists/bloggers and spokespeople/TSUs Heads.
- The communications manager/team within the Secretariat should coordinate activities related to IPCC communications in general. A focal point dealing with communications could be designated for each WG.
- The communications manager/ team should maintain contact with journalists (attendance to UN press briefings and more information notes) and organize regular briefings. journalists
- The IPCC Secretariat, including the communications manager/ team should maintain contacts and organize briefings for partner organizations to enhance overall cooperation and outreach
- Following the 33rd Plenary Session, an IPCC Communications Guide could be issued; it will be the line for IPCC Communications for public use. It would define clearly inter alia what type of information one could expect from the IPCC and who can speak on behalf of the organization. [Renate Christ, Secretary, IPCC]

## **[Evaluation of IPCC communications]**

### **Germany**

Agreed

### **Japan**

7. Evaluation of IPCC Communication:

On page9 in line 1, there is a mention about "the objectives". Please indicate on which page of this document this "objectives" is described.

### **Malaysia**

It is important for the senior communications manager of the IPCC to provide to plenary meetings on the appropriate evaluation about IPCC communications, including the type and extent of outreach and media coverage.

## **United States of America**

In the second paragraph, we would propose replacing "senior communications manager" with "head of Secretariat" as this responsibility is typically that of the head of Secretariat in other instances.

## **Zambia**

4. Chapter 8 on page 8 and 9 talks about using the objectives set out in the draft document as a guide to evaluate the IPCC's communications. However, you will recall in my earlier comment that the draft document does not have a chapter on objectives. In this context, I wish to propose that rather than the objectives, the evaluation should be based on the communications strategy to be developed from this draft document. This is on the understanding that this draft document will guide the Senior Communications Manager of IPCC to develop a comprehensive and concise communications strategy. Thus evaluations of the IPCC communications should be based on the strategy rather than on the current draft document under review.