

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

IPCC-XXXIII/INF. 4
(7.V.2011)
Agenda Item: 5
ENGLISH ONLY

REVIEW OF THE IPCC PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

**Comments received from Governments and IPCC Office Holders by 6/05/2011
on the proposals by the Tasks Groups on Procedures (IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.12), Governance
and Management (IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.10), Communications Strategy (IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.13),
and Conflict of Interest Policy (IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.11)**

(Submitted by the IPCC Secretariat)

Austria

ToR for the bureau

- A regular reporting obligation to the plenary on all activities of the bureau is missing;
- The IPCC bureau should specify its internal rules of procedure which need to be approved by the Panel;
- Need for clear specification of tasks and responsibilities of the bureau is needed. They should be distinct from those for the Executive Committee and the IPCC Secretariat as well as from the Panel.

IPCC processes and procedures

- The IPCC Bureau should be in charge of the selection process of participants to scoping meetings.
- 6bis 1.2: the limitation of 5 years to retain comments seems rather arbitrary. Given the relevance of IPCC reports those comments should be retained as long as the report is made available by the IPCC.
- 6bis 3: It is strongly supported to have anonymous expert review given the positive experience in the past and the lack of strong and convincing arguments against it.
- 8: It should be the task of the Panel and not of the TG on Procedures to endorse the procedure to address potential errors and develop errata. Such Procedure is available for the Panel at the IPCC Plenary meeting in May 2011 (Doc. 12, Add.1);
- 9: The guidance note on uncertainties should also be endorsed by the Panel due to the importance of such guidance material.
- 12: Austria has significant reservation to amend the scope of the IPCC as suggested by the Netherlands. Natural variability in the time periods relevant for human-induced influence has also been addressed by the IPCC in the past. There is therefore no need for any change.

Communications Strategy

- General comment: Austria sees a strong role for the senior communication manager. He/she should also act as the main spokesperson for the IPCC.
- Preamble, last paragraph: The ultimate responsibility of all decisions of the IPCC is with the Panel and only under certain circumstances with the Executive Committee. There is a need to specify very clearly the tasks and responsibilities of the Panel, the Executive Committee the Bureau, the Secretariat and the communications manager. Unfortunately, the proposal of the TG on Communications Strategy lacks a chapter that specifies the respective responsibilities and tasks.
- Principles: The principles as suggested are a useful starting point. However, they provide little guidance how to react to information in the media about the IPCC that tries to undermine the credibility of the IPCC. E.g.: should the IPCC monitor how its work is reflected in the media? If so, which media should be monitored? What are the criteria to react? Who decides finally to react or not to react and how to react? What are the options for reactions to be considered?
- Translations: The strategy does not address the issue of the challenge to prepare well translated versions of the reports agreed in English only. It is suggested that translations are organized in advance, including co-operation and engagement of governmental focal points. This should not be limited to the five additional UN-languages but might cover additional languages. In this context it seems useful to develop a dictionary of key terms used in IPCC publications (e.g. covering those

terms defined in the terms and definitions sections as well as in guidance documents) for a broad range of languages.

- The Guidelines are not very clear with respect to the role of CLAs and LAs.
- In general, the process of engaging with the media should be further clarified differentiating if the media contact persons engaged in IPCC work or IPCC spokespersons contact media.
- It is noted that the TG suggests that the senior communications manager should make proposals to the Executive Committee for a formal set of procedures. Austria believes that such proposals need to be adopted by Plenary and that all other proposals should be seen as a starting point but not necessarily as the final guidance given that the very heart of the guidance has not been developed so far. For Austria it seems of utmost priority to develop at least a preliminary complete guidance which could be refined at a later stage. Such preliminary, but complete guidance should be agreed by Plenary 33 in Abu Dhabi.
- Austria agrees that the Executive Committee (EC) should have an important role in making decisions on rapid responses. In order to allow for that it seems important to agree in advance on the use of teleconferences and rapid email exchange in order to guarantee a smooth functioning of the EC. Rules of procedure should be developed and road tested in order to be well prepared for attacks on the IPCC in the media.
- Planned communications materials: it seems that the senior communication manager has no role to play? It is suggested that for rapid responses, errors, planned communication materials a more consistent approach, following general guidelines for communication, should be followed.
- Implementing the new strategy: it seems important to inform the Panel not only on updates on the financial implications but on the relevant communication activities in addition to the cost implications. It will be important to categorize and specify those activities in advance and inform the Panel correspondingly.
- In this context it seems relevant that the Panel decides, based on the information specified above, in advance about the overall financial resources that are available for communication. It will then be the responsibility of the senior communication manager to propose on the optimal allocation of the resources to the various communication activities.
- It might be needed to give the Executive Committee the power to decide on the use of some contingency budget under certain circumstances which should also be decided in advance and be part of the communication strategy in order to meet some extraordinary demand in case of some unforeseen development.
- Evaluation: It is suggested to separate reporting on the communication activities from the evaluation of its effectiveness. These should be separate processes. The evaluation of the impact of the communication strategy should be outsourced and mainly include a compilation of how media informed about the IPCC and its activities. The development of a metrics is supported to facilitate such assessment. It should have a regional dimension and differentiate various media.

Conflict of interest

- Congratulations to the Task Group: the rules and procedures already are in a very good shape. However, it is suggested to include a review of the management of Interest Policy after each assessment cycle.

Governance and Management

Executive Committee

- Austria does not support voting rights for the IPCC Vice Chairs as already indicated earlier in order to have a lean EC.
- The four Heads of the TSUs should also have no voting rights as it is assumed that the co-chairs of the WGs in their decisions take into account all relevant aspects from a WG perspective.

- The two external members of the EC should also have no voting rights. This due to the fact of the difficulty how to decide/select those two external members as the only logical two would be a representative from WMO and one from UNEP. However, IPCC is a distinct body. There is the significant risk that an external member mainly serves the interests of those who were in charge of the selection process. Furthermore the selection of two external persons could be a significant burden for the election process by the Panel.
- Austria supports following the general WMO rule with respect to decision making.

Terms of office

- Ok

Executive Director

- On 4.4.1b: There is the danger of a significant overlap with respect to the functions of the IPCC Head of Secretariat and the senior communications manager. Further clarification on the various tasks related to communication is required.
- Austria fully supports the recommendation not to install an additional Executive Director.

CANADA

Conflict of Interest Policy

Canada thanks the TG for the revised draft of the Conflict of Interest Policy. Overall, this draft is much improved and addresses many of Canada's prior concerns. One outstanding issue for Canada is the lack of detail regarding the implementation of the Policy, and in particular how the proposed Conflict of Interest Committee that will be established under this Policy would evaluate and enforce resolution of conflicts.

Specific points that could be considered include:

- a) How the Committee will evaluate potential conflicts of interest;
- b) Options available to the Committee for mitigating different situations of conflict of interest;
- c) How decisions of the Committee will be communicated to the persons in question; and
- d) Public communication of conflicts of interest.

Recognizing that implementation of the policy may evolve as experience is gained in disclosing and mitigating conflicts specific to the IPCC context, some of these issues could also be elaborated in an annex to the Policy (e.g., a Terms of Reference for the Committee) rather than directly in the Policy itself.

We also note the need to clarify how this Conflict of Interest Policy will be implemented for authors of the AR5, recognizing that some of the WGs have already independently developed and implemented their own conflict of interest practices and disclosure forms.

In addition to the issue of implementation, we suggest that the TG also consider the following proposed changes to the Policy:

(1) Specifying in section 19c that that disclosure forms should be updated promptly whenever new information/conditions arise that could results in a real or apparent conflict. Text of 19c could be modified as follows: "The form will be renewed and resubmitted to the Secretariat on an annual basis and promptly when new information arises that needs to be disclosed."

(2) Adding a sub-article to section 19 that specifies the length of time information about interests should be stored. For example, "The IPCC Secretariat should maintain information on interests for at least five years, or until a new assessment cycle is completed, whichever is longer."

Governance and Management

Thank you for the significant work undertaken on these issues. Overall, Canada is pleased with the proposals being made to the Panel on governance and management issues, recognizing that some issues still need to be resolved. In looking ahead to the discussions at IPCC-33, we note the importance of ensuring that the Executive Committee will be complementary to existing IPCC governance and management bodies and that it may be difficult to finalize the terms of reference for the Executive Committee without agreement on those for the Bureau and

Secretariat. Recognizing the need to make progress on these issues at IPCC-33, it may be important to find a way to maintain flexibility to reflect future decisions on the Bureau and other related issues that could impact any decisions taken at IPCC-33 with respect to the Executive Committee and Head of Secretariat.

Procedures

Canada thanks the TG on Procedures for the revised draft its proposal. Overall, Canada is confident that the measures proposed in the TG's proposal will support improved transparency and rigour in the procedures for preparing IPCC reports. We emphasize that the priority of discussions at IPCC-33 should be on decisions associated with the IAC report, and in particular on decisions that are critical to the preparation of the AR5. Specifically, Canada emphasizes the importance of advancing decisions on the use of literature in IPCC reports and on the report review process. .

In order to facilitate efficient discussions at IPCC-33, Canada's main comments on the decisions proposed by the TG are noted below::

Section 3.1.4 (Selection of Lead Authors): In order to acknowledge and respond to the issue identified in the IAC's report with respect to transparency of scientific criteria used in author selection, Canada suggests that the second-last sentence of the proposed paragraph be rephrased as follows: "The WG Bureau/TFI will report to the Panel on the selection process, including on the application of the above-mentioned criteria and other criteria that were used to assess scientific, technical and socioeconomic expertise ~~a description of how the selection criteria for participation and any other considerations have been applied,~~ and including a list of participants."

Furthermore, one additional point that has not been previously discussed by the TG is whether amendments can be made to LA teams after they have been selected. We are aware that in practice LAs are added to authors teams (usually by elevating a CA), but this practice is not reflected in the Procedures. It could be formalized in the Procedures that the Bureau can make amendments to LA teams in the course of preparing a report where gaps in expertise have been identified. Specifically, a new line could be added to the end of paragraph 4.2.2 in the Procedures that reflects this.

Section 3.bis.2 (Expert Meetings and Workshops): Canada suggests that the Procedures include more clear definitions of expert meetings and workshops, as the distinction between these types of meetings is not well-understood. Canada's understanding is that expert meetings are smaller and do not require a government/participating organization nomination process, whereas workshops are larger and require a government/participating organization nomination process. Canada suggests that the definition of these types of meetings be more clearly reflected in the decision text in section 3.bis.2. The TG could also propose that definitions of these types of meetings be added to the definitions section of the Procedures (section 2).

We also note also two further issues with section 3.bis.2:

- The term “government focal point” and “national focal point” are both used. Canada suggests that the reference to “government focal point” in the first sentence be replaced with “national focal point” for consistency.
- The paragraph states that “stakeholders” will be asked to submit nominations in addition to governments and participating organizations. This is inconsistent with the nomination procedures for other meetings/authors where nominations are solicited from only governments and participating organizations. Suggest deleting the references to “stakeholders” in this paragraph.

Section 4.4 (Sources of Data and Literature): Overall, Canada is pleased with the proposed new Annex 2. However, we continue to have some concerns that the new text in the preamble of the Annex is not sufficiently nuanced with respect to the use of newspapers and magazines and may inadvertently be interpreted as excluding some valid research based on sources such as archival newspaper evidence. Canada suggests that the focus of the Annex be on providing sufficient guidance to ensure that authors adequately assess literature choices, rather than limiting specific types of literature. The guidance note on use of literature in the AR5 prepared by the IPCC Bureau may provide further guidance in this regard.

Section 6.bis.2 (Assuring Quality of Review): Canada is supportive of the proposed decision, but we suggest the following revisions for clarity:

- On the first sentence of the decision text, we suggest the following edits: “The Working group/TFI ~~co-chairs~~ Bureaux should arrange the review of reports ~~expert and government reviews~~ in such a way that complete coverage of all texts, graphics, tables, and boxes by reviewers is ensured in each ~~expert and government review~~ phase.”
- On the second sentence, it should be made clearer that LAs from other chapters should contribute to cross-checking other chapters, but it is not their direct responsibility to identify that this cross-checking is needed. We see the *identification* of the need for cross-checking as primarily the responsibility of the CLAs. This is also consistent with the description of the role of CLAs in Annex 1 to the Procedures. This could be clarified in the decision text

Section 6.4 (Report Review): Canada agrees with the TG’s proposed decision. However, as Canada is also supportive of the IAC’s recommendation in this area, we would also encourage work by the TG during IPCC-33 to further integrate this recommendation into the Panel’s decision.

Czech Republic

Comment 1 - IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.10 - Proposal by the Task Group on Governance and Management, par. 2.4.5.b:

Two external members of the Executive Committee should be voted by the Panel.

Comment 2 - IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.10 - Proposal by the Task Group on Governance and Management, par. 3.4.1.a:

The term of office for the IPCC Chair and Working Group Co-Chairs and Task Force Co-Chairs should be limited to one term - without the provision of a possible extension for a further term.

Comment 3 - IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.12 - Proposal by the Task Group on Procedures, par. 4.3.:

Unpublished and non-peer reviewed literature should be flagged in IPCC reports. The flag is not a sign of scientific quality, of course, but the formal information that the publication in question has not undergone the peer-review process.

Germany

We would like to thank the Task Groups and their Co-Chairs and Rapporteurs for their excellent work.

A primordial criterion for all reforms should be to enhance the transparency of the assessment process and the reliability of the IPCC-reports as the scientific basis for climate policy.

At IPCC33, it is important that all decisions that might affect the establishment of AR5 are taken, so that the scientific process can take advantage from the IPCC-reform process.

Before taking any decisions, budgetary implications should be assessed. Cross cutting issues need to be carefully addressed, decision making should follow the same rules in all IPCC bodies and committees. During the IPCC33 session and the ongoing reform process an exchange of information about ongoing discussions in the Task Groups should be ensured, thus realizing consistency of decisions.

The Task Groups did not completely respond to their mandates. At IPCC-33 a decision should be taken prolonging the mandates of the TGs as needed. The mandates should specify the issues to be addressed, going also beyond the IAC-recommendations if needed.

Proposal by the Task Group on Processes and Procedures

We appreciate the comprehensiveness of the proposed reforms and amendments to the procedure. In particular the objective to go beyond the IAC-recommendations will help the assessment process to become more transparent and robust in the future.

For IPCC33 we suggest however focusing on reforms that address IAC-recommendations, and 1) to take decisions on those for which consensus has been observed, 2) to decide on a process for those that need further work and then 3) addressing additional improvements, if time allows. Priority should be given to those decisions that affect AR5 and those you help restoring credibility of IPCC.

Some of the proposed modifications to the IPCC-procedures need language and editorial polishing, consistency of language. The suggestions for anonymity of the review process should be further discussed in the Panel at IPCC33. The note in Appendix 3 is a helpful support for the discussion. We consider the issues on procedures on the use of non-scientific journal based literature as well as the handling of the full range of views of crucial importance to enhance the credibility of the IPCC process. The cited literature of all reports should be available also at the IPCC-secretariat and not only at the individual WG's web site as those are less sustainable. The role of the Vice Chairs in the assessment process should be clarified, e.g., take responsibility for coordination of cross cutting issues. The Protocol for Addressing Errors in Previous Assessment Reports needs further consideration and should be discussed in the Panel at IPCC33. The WG-Co-Chairs should be requested to provide an updated version for decision at IPCC34.

Proposal by the Task Group on Governance and Management

The IAC recommended improving the IPCC's management structure so that it becomes operational between Panel sessions. This recommendation should be followed and a new framework should be established at IPCC33. This framework should be simple and flexible, the decisions should be reviewed after the end of the current assessment cycle.

A decision should be taken to establish the Executive Committee at IPCC33.

We agree with the recommendation not to create the position of an Executive Director. However, decisions should be taken at IPCC33 to adapt the functioning of the Secretariat to the increasing demands through improved cooperation and reporting lines between the Secretariat and the Executive Committee. We support the proposed overall term limit for the Head of Secretariat.

A decision on the TORs for the Executive Committee should be taken at IPCC33, but a decision on those for the IPCC bureau is not a priority at IPCC33, because this is slightly beyond its mandate. However, a decision should be taken prolonging the mandate of the Task Group to establish Terms Of Reference for the secretariat, the bureaux and all of its individual members including the government representatives, and for the TSUs.

Proposal by the Task Group on Conflict of Interest

Potential conflicts of interest have been one of the major topics of the public criticism in IPCC last year. Although we think that conflict of interest are rather unlikely to influence the work of the IPCC, it is very important for IPCC to restore public confidence in its senior leadership and lead authors, its work and its reports in this regard. The IAC has recommended establishing a conflict of interest policy and the Panel at its 32nd session has agreed to this recommendation. A Conflict of Interest Policy to be applied to the current assessment cycle should be established at IPCC33 and become operational as soon as possible.

We welcome the proposal made by the task group.

However, the proposed conflict of interest policy should be less redundant and more focussed. Disclosure of financial interests is very detailed, in parts to a degree that impairs implementation, whereas other, i.e. political interests are defined much less precisely. We therefore suggest significantly simplifying and shortening the text and to establish a concise "management of interest policy". Through this policy, relevant interests should be disclosed in a transparent manner, but it should not serve as a means for exclusion for the current assessment cycle. However, the Task Group should get the mandate at IPCC33 to continue its work and establish a more detailed conflict of interest Policy for the next assessment cycle.

Proposal by the Task Group on Communication

We generally support the proposals on communication. In particular, we appreciate the definitions of the scope of IPCC-communications, of the target audiences, and of the limits of IPCC-communication. The proposed evaluation of IPCC communications is supported.

More detailed information should be added on the tasks of the so-called communication team within the Secretariat (possibly as part of the ToRs for the

Secretariat) and the cooperation and distribution of work between the Executive committee and Secretariat.

The need for an outreach strategy for report publications should be anchored in the communication strategy.

All decisions on communication material must be approved by the Panel as they will have financial implications. The Secretariat should engage with the National Focal Points to provide communication material that is suitable across cultural differences.

All IPCC websites (including those of the WGs, the TFI and the Data Center) should have the same design and lay out. The function of the IPCC Data Centre in IPCC-communication should be clarified.

JAPAN

TG	subsection	IAC recommendation	TG Proposal	Comments from Japanese Government
TG Governance	2.4.5 The Composition of the Executive Committee	-	a. Voting members [IPCC Vice Chairs] IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.10 P.2	Vice-chairs are next in rank to IPCC Chair and they are able to represent IPCC Chair or act for IPCC Chair. It is more natural that they are voting members.
			b. Non-Voting members [Two external members as decided by the Panel][Bureau][Executive Committee] IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.10 P.3	It is likely that we will have to discuss at the Panel and the Panel may prefer to "decided by the Panel" because the EV will act on behalf of the Panel.
	3.4.1 The Panel agrees to restrict the term of office for the IPCC Chair, Working Group Co-Chairs		a. The term of office for the IPCC Chair and Working Group Co-Chairs and Task Force Co-Chairs will be limited to one term ² (or another time period as defined by the Panel) with the provision, of a possible extension for a further term for individual cases if the Panel so decides. IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.10 P.4	"Individual"→"exceptional" "Exceptional" is very clear and somehow looks neutral.
	4.4.1 The Panel agrees that:		d. The Head of the Secretariat should continue to be employed on two year renewable contracts, in accordance with WMO employment practice, but that decisions on renewal should be taken in consultation with the Executive Committee, [and with an overall term limit of [8][10] years.]	"The Head of the Secretariat"→"two senior posts of the secretariat"
			e. The Head of the Secretariat will continue to report formally to WMO as employer, but WMO is requested to consult with the Executive Committee on annual performance appraisal in accordance with a transparent reporting processes to be agreed with WMO. IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.10 P.6	Both paragraphes will cover executive secretary and deputy executive secretary.
	typo		IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.10 P.4 L1	"Task Group" should be "Task Force".

TG Procedure	7. Summary for Policymakers	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 existing Procedures should be amended to clarify the current practices related to submitting written comments prior to the approval session. (IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 12, p.12)	In the "current practice", the final revision of the draft by CLAs referring to the government/expert comments is made just before the Plenary adopting the SPM. As a result, at the Plenary, the draft has been changed so drastically from what was given to the panels before the revision that non-English-negative panels had difficulties and disadvantages to catch up with the changes on the floor. Therefore, we request the IPCC secretariat to distribute the SPM draft to be adopted at the Plenary to the panels at least few weeks before the session. It means that the final revision by CLA meeting should be completed few weeks prior to the Plenary, similar to the current rule for SYR.
	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). Discussion of time required for a response on Himalayan glacier error (IAC Report page 54).	<u>Step 5B</u> (3rd paragraph) "If the Independent Review Committee finds there is an error, they are tasked with providing, within one month, a proposed course of action. The IPCC bureau informs the past Chairman and relevant WG Co-chairs of the assessment with the putative error (and relevant CLAs if appropriate) about the proposed action...." (IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 12, Add.1, p. 11)	It should be; "If the Independent Review Committee finds there is an error, they are tasked with providing, within one month, a proposed course of action. The IPCC bureau informs the past Chairman and relevant WG Co-chairs of the assessment with the putative error and relevant CLAs about the proposed action...." Explanation: If agreement is made without the relevant CLAs, it is not appropriate that the CLAs draft the erratum. Also in the Figure 1, in cases of 4B and 5B, the members of the "Consensus" should be written to show that the CLAs are agreed to make erratum.
	2.4 Proposed Decisions on IAC recommendation 2.1 (category I)		(IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 12, p. 4 BOX)	Targeted IPCC reports should be defined according to the definition of Principles Governing IPCC work Appendix A, namely IPCC reports which include Assessments, Synthesis and Special Reports and their Summaries for Policy Makers and Methodology Reports, and Technical Papers. "Bureau members" in the 4th line of proposed paragraph should be replaced by the relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureau" in order to be consistent with LA selection process as well as other common procedures among the IPCC reports development processes. The term "the range of views" should be replaced by "the range of scientific, technical and socio-economic views".

			in the last sentence of the proposed paragraph, the Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs should report to the Panel instead of the WG Bureau/TFI.
3.1.4 Proposed decision combined for the IAC recommendations 3.1.1 and 3.2.1 (category I)		(IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 12, p. 5 BOX)	<p>The term “the range of views” should be replaced by “the range of scientific, technical and socio-economic views”.</p> <p>The Working Group/Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs should report to the Panel instead of the WG Bureau/TFI.</p> <p>For improving the transparency of selection process of authors of SPM and writing team of SYR, selection process and criteria of SPM authors and SYR writing team should be clarified in Principles Governing IPCC Work, Appendix A. Draft amendment will be developed by IPCC 34 for its approval.</p>
3 bis.2 Proposed decision (category. II)		(IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 12, p. 6 BOX)	<p>Nominations and selection of participants for Expert Meetings and Workshops should be undertaken under general guidance of the Panel for preserving transparent and consistent procedure.</p> <p>The term “the range of views” should be replaced by “the range of scientific, technical and socio-economic views”.</p> <p>The term “national focal points” should be the term “government Focal Points”.</p>
5.4 Proposed decisions (cat I)		(IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 12, p. 8 BOX)	The terms “to aim for a range of views” in paragraph 4.4.1 should be replaced by “to consider the range of scientific, technical and socio-economic views” as well as those of in 4.2.2, 4.2.4.1 and Annex I.
8.4. Proposed decisions		(IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 12, p. 13 BOX)	The EC should oversee the implementation of the protocol and that body should take intersessional decisions on how to handle errors.
10.2 Proposed decisions		(IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 12, p. 15 BOX)	<p>The proposed decisions can be assessed only when individual guidance material is identified.</p> <p>If appropriate, guidance material will need to be used consistently among the three working groups and TFI.</p>
typo		IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 12, p.10 L3	‘6.12’ should be ‘6.1.2’.

	typo	IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 12, p.13 Bottom Line	'errors' should be added after 'potential'.
TG Conflict of Interest	General Comments	General Comments	<p>CLAs, LAs REs and expert reviewers as well as members of TSU may have advantage to select scientific literatures which are written by scientists who have close relationship with them; ordinary peoples, mass media and scientists outside climate communities often claims the possible existence of this hidden mechanism. Therefore, this hidden mechanism may produce drawbacks to maintaining credibility of the IPCC. COI policy cannot avoid this possible hidden mechanism beforehand, because this hidden mechanism will be apparent only when they (authors and reviewers and TSU members) have taken their advantage. Instead, the IPCC process provide selecting authors with wide range of views, and drafting process undertaken authors team, and multilayer review processes so that hidden mechanism will not deteriorate scientific quality of the IPCC products.</p> <p>The IPCC should be so careful that COI management policy will not be used in order to automatically recuse good experts/scientists from specific organizations and communities such as government and industries and NGOs. These specific organizations and communities will be sources of good authors with wide range of views.</p> <p>We think it is helpful for all stakeholders if COI management policy is written in short and simple languages with FAQs. Proposed draft is very comprehensive and sophisticated but rather long and complicated. Many of the useful views could be translated into FAQs.</p>

	Comments on COI committee		Comments on COI committee	<p>COI management policy is implemented autonomously by the IPCC because COI management policy protects integrity of the IPCC. Obviously, integrity of the IPCC cannot be protected by the outside organizations such as IAC, WMO and UNEP. The IPCC community does protect its integrity by themselves.</p> <p>Although COI committee is a part of core elements of COI management policy, COI committee members will be selected by outside organizations according to the proposal. It is well known that there are common practices in which university COI committee members are selected by and composed of members of university. We do not support proposed COI committee selection process and composition; COI committee members should be selected by the IPCC (EC or the IPCC Bureau or the Panel) and should have balanced composition with external members and members from the IPCC Bureau (e.g. Vice chairs).</p>
TG Communication	6. Limits of IPCC Communication		<p>6. Limits of IPCC Communication</p> <p>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.</p> <p>(IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 13, p.6)</p>	<p>A guideline should be considered for when authorized spokespersons speak on behalf of the IPCC (after 33th plenary).</p>

Netherlands

To: Task Group on Communication Strategy (IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.13)

On page 5 it reads: *'a critical analysis of the media occurrences involving the IPCC over the last two years would be helpful in developing these procedures (i.e. procedures for a rapid responses to urgent inquiries). We suggest to take a more concrete Panel decision:*

The IPCC should carefully evaluate its media communication, especially during the 'crisis' in 2010, by evaluating what went wrong, and what went well, with a view to further improve its media communication in future. To this end, the IPCC Secretariat may hire an independent consultant and report back on 'lessons learned' to the Panel for its consideration by IPCC-34. The terms of reference for such an assignment could be developed during the IPCC -33 session by the Task Group on Communication. With this action, we believe that IPCC demonstrates that it is in fact a learning organization, which would contribute to its credibility.

To: Task Group on Governance and Management (IPCC-XXXIII/Doc. 10)

The Netherlands suggests adding a decision to the current proposals:

An external independent evaluation, such as held by the InterAcademy Council in 2010, should become part of a periodical 'Plan-Do-Check-Act' cycle (PDCA), well-known in modern management of organizations. The 'Check' part of this cycle (being a review or evaluation of its processes, procedures and practices) could take place directly after finalization of an assessment period. In such a review, we also suggest to include the observations of the IPCC Observer Organizations, or Participating Organizations, as they could provide very valuable feedback on IPCC's products and services.

To: Task Group on Procedures (IPCC-XXXIII/Doc.12)

1. Section 4.4 on non-scientific journal based literature: We may need to revisit the language with regard to non-peer reviewed literature given the misunderstandings that seem to float around in the blogosphere – as if IPCC would be lowering its standards in using literature in using instead of strengthening it. Some rewording may be found in consultation with the WG/TFI co-chairs and TSUs.
2. Section 6bis 4 page 11 on confidentiality of drafts: We suggest a modification of the text on confidentiality making the statement more precise and more explanatory: (changes in **bold**):
'All drafts of IPCC assessment reports (including the final draft) **including related communication and documentation created during the drafting are considered to be pre-decisional materials and** will therefore be considered as confidential material, not for public distribution quotation, or citation until acceptance by the Panel of the final IPCC report. The first order draft, second order draft and the final draft, the expert and government review comments, and the author responses to those comments on both drafts will be made available on the IPCC open website on a clearly visible place, within **four** weeks after the **finalization of the report, subsequent to** acceptance of the report by the Panel.'

Peru

Doc. 10

2.4.2 The purpose of the Executive Committee is to provide a formal intersessional management...

2.4.5 The Composition of the Executive Committee will be as follows:

a. Voting members

IPCC Chair (Chair of the EC)

IPCC Co-Chairs of Working Groups I, II and III and of the Task Force on Inventories.

IPCC Vice Chairs (pending to the assignment of executive functions)

b. Non-Voting members

Head of Secretariat

The four Heads of the Technical Support Units

In Peru's view any external members might be present as guests but shall not constitute part of the Executive Committee.

2.4.6

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 members¹.

d. If the Chair cannot be present at a meeting of the EC he/she may nominate as chair an IPCC Vice Chair or if one is not present another voting member.

4.4.1

d. The Head of the Secretariat should continue to be employed on two year renewable

contracts, in accordance with WMO employment practice, but that decisions on renewal should be taken in consultation with the Executive Committee, and with an overall term limit of 10 years.

Section 7. Review of decisions

Peru does not consider necessary a decision by the Panel on this issue. The Panel may consider to invite the Executive Committee, the Bureau and the Secretariat to provide feedback on the impact of the decisions proposed.

Doc 10. Add.1

6 e. undertake initial scrutiny of Conflict of Interest disclosures with respect to IPCC authors and review editors and advise the Conflict of Interest committee;
(pending to the establishment of such committee and its Terms of Reference)

Doc.11

In Peru's view, paragraph 8 shall read:

8. A "conflict of interest" refers to any current financial or other interest which could:

i) significantly 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.

In Peru's view, paragraph 11 shall read:

11. In ascertaining the possible presence of a conflict of interest, the following kinds of financial interests will be disclosed and reviewed: employment relationships (including private and public sector employment and self-employment); consulting relationships (including working in commercial or professional consulting or service arrangements, serving on scientific and technical advisory boards, serving as an expert witness in litigation, and providing services in exchange for honorariums and expense reimbursement); directorships; stocks, bonds, and other financial instruments and investments including partnerships; real estate investments; patents, copyrights, and other intellectual property interests; commercial business ownership and investment interests; research funding and other forms of research support.

In Peru's view, paragraph 19 shall read:

d. A Conflict of Interest Committee is established. The Conflict of Interest Committee will consist of 5 individuals, preferably with experience in matters related to this policy. Members of the Committee will be jointly selected by the IPCC Plenary Secretary-General of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) taking into account geographical balance and following consultation with reputable international scientific organizations such as the InterAcademy Council. Members of the Committee will work on a voluntary basis. The Committee may sub-contract a reputable firm to assist with the implementation of the policy.

United States

Task Group on Communications

We propose the following additions to Section 6 (Limits of IPCC Communication):

All those associated with the IPCC should be clear to distinguish in which instances they are speaking in an official IPCC capacity and in which instances 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 and should be aware that the public and the media often do not differentiate among the various functions a person might have. For the same reason, those associated with the IPCC should not use their IPCC affiliation in activities unrelated to the IPCC where such affiliation might be construed to reflect on the nature of IPCC activities.

It is expected that persons 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 is not perceived as taking positions or making statements that would have the appearance of reflecting bias in the work of the IPCC.

The IPCC Bureau will keep the implementation of these aspects of the strategy under review in respect of the activities of IPCC bureau members.

Task Group on Conflict of Interest

The U.S. considers that a robust conflict of interest policy is in the IPCC's interest. We believe the current draft is a good reflection of the approaches adapted for science and technical assessments in a number of countries.

We want to ensure that the policy is implemented in a way that does not place undue burden on authors and reviewers who contribute their time to IPCC processes, and should not discourage experts from participating in IPCC processes.

The experience of conflict of interest policies in both Working Group 1 and Working Group 2 provides assurance that a robust conflict of interest policy will enhance confidence in IPCC processes without discouraging participation by authors and reviewers.

We offer the following specific comments on the draft Conflict of Interest Policy.

On "scope of the policy" add an additional paragraph 7bis:

The Panel recognizes that authors and reviewers participate in IPCC reports on a non-compensated basis, and intends for this policy to be implemented and overseen in a manner that does not impose undue burdens on those participating in the development of IPCC products."

On Paragraph 8, please add the language below for clarity:

A “conflict of interest” refers to any current financial or other interest which could i) significantly impair, or could appear to significantly impair, the individual’s objectivity in carrying out his or her duties and responsibilities for the IPCC, or ii) create an unfair advantage, or appear to create an unfair advantage, for any person or organization. For the purposes of this policy, the appearance of a conflict of interest - an “apparent conflict of interest” - is one in which circumstances could lead a reasonable person to question an individual’s objectivity or question whether an unfair advantage has been created. The term “conflict of interest” means something more than individual bias. There must be interest, ordinarily financial, that could be directly affected by the work of the Panel.

On paragraph 11, we suggest the following:

All significant and relevant non-financial interests should be disclosed. These include any associations with organisations with an interest in the topic of the IPCC report or product to which the individual is contributing. These may include government advisory committees, non-departmental public bodies, charities or non-governmental organisations. As indicated in paragraphs 8 and 15. such associations do not in themselves constitute a conflict of interest, , but it is important that they are disclosed. All interests that might undermine the credibility of the IPCC report or product if they were made public during or after its preparation should be disclosed. Individuals to whom this policy applies are encouraged to disclose interests rather than not and to seek advice from the Secretariat if in doubt.

On paragraph 15, we suggest the following substitute for the last sentence:

Holding a view that one believes to be correct is not a conflict of interest. One must stand to personally gain through an outcome in the product under development by the Panel for a conflict of interest to be present.

Task Group on Procedures

We have the following comments on the paragraph on grey literature:

“In the assessment process, primary consideration ~~priority~~ should be given to ~~referring to~~ peer-reviewed articles in the scientific literature.; For topics for which sufficient peer-reviewed information is unavailable – for example, information about experience and practice with mitigation and adaptation activities, ~~but it is recognized that~~ validated*, non-scientific journal-based sources can be drawn upon ~~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 and international organizations, workshop proceedings). Emphasis is to be placed

on assurance of quality of the non-peer-reviewed literature. ~~In principle, newspapers and magazines are not valid sources of scientific knowledge. Blogs, social networking sites, and broadcast media~~ Commercial sources are not acceptable sources of information for IPCC Reports.” [* criteria for validation should be established]

Inputs by Office Holders as decided by P-32

Thomas Stocker (Co-chair WG I)

Conflict of Interest Policy Task Group

We are pleased that many of the WGI comments on the draft in March were implemented in this proposal, in particular that the requirement of disclosure is not voluntary and it will be applied in a rigorous manner. It is helpful that the policy now incorporates the necessary detail about its proposed implementation, although we have some comments on specific aspects.

We are concerned that the policy in the current draft relies so heavily on the model of the US National Research Council (NRC). Despite the recommendation by the IAC to consider this as an example, we feel that its dominant focus on financial issues is of limited relevance to the majority of those voluntarily involved in preparing IPCC reports. Thus, in the WGI CoI policy, which was established proactively as an interim measure, we felt that it was more appropriate in the context of the chapter teams to consider the issue of professional conflicts of interest.

The US NRC policy will not be familiar to many in the chapter teams so more background information may be necessary to help those completing the IPCC form to understand what is intended as the US model is not culturally relevant everywhere.

Given that responsibility for implementing the IPCC CoI policy for the chapter teams resides with the WG or TF Bureau, it is essential that support for this is provided as with all other aspects of WG and TF business by its TSU, rather than in this instance being centralised at the Secretariat. In implementing the CoI policy, not just the confidentiality but also the security of the information provided on CoI forms and in associated emails must be assured, including in storage and final archiving. For both these reasons, we propose that the forms for the WG and TF authors and Review Editors are not submitted to the Secretariat but rather to the relevant TSU. A summary analysis would be provided by the WG or TF Bureau to the Secretariat and Panel at anytime upon request. Upon completion of the assessment cycle, all forms would be transferred by the relevant TSU to the Secretariat for secure archiving.

Please find below specific comments for consideration in finalising the proposal:

Purpose of the Policy

It should be remembered that the overwhelming majority of people to whom this policy will apply are volunteers. It is therefore important to reassure them that disclosure does not mean automatic disqualification – this is mentioned in paragraph 16 but could be brought out in this first section.

Conflict of interest

12. Under non-financial interests, scientific journals should be mentioned specifically because involvement of authors, especially CLAs and Co-Chairs, as journal editors is one of the more significant aspects that needs to be disclosed, and has been the cause of criticism of IPCC in the past.

Similarly, involvement in government delegations both at IPCC and UNFCCC sessions should be mentioned specifically because involvement of authors, especially CLAs, in this dual role is one of the more significant aspects that needs to be disclosed, and has been the cause of criticism in the past.

13. We disagree with the extension of the policy to the interests of the individual's spouse and minor children. Whilst fully understanding that this may be common practice in financial institutions, this seems inappropriate in the context of the work of the IPCC's volunteer chapter teams.

16. As discussed in our general comments, we feel that it would be helpful to provide more information as an aid to understanding, such as concrete examples of what would be seen as a conflict of interest or, perhaps more importantly, not. In implementing the WGI policy, we found that such examples were 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 CoI¹, we found that authors and Review Editors were very cooperative and forthcoming in addressing real, perceived, or potential CoIs.

Implementation

19. There is no proposal about what happens in the case of non-compliance. Consideration should be given to restoring the text from the February draft that read: Non-compliance could result in individuals not being able to participate in the full range of assessment activities.

19a. The proposal that each individual currently associated to the IPCC will fill in a disclosure form within two months after the adoption of the policy ignores the important question of the transition for those who have already completed the interim policy, such as the WGI CLAs, LAs, REs, Bureau and TSU, and also individuals associated with WGII. Depending on how soon the policy is adopted, this potentially also includes the TF and WGIII.

If the intention is that the policy forms an Appendix to the IPCC Principles which apply to future assessments, the general case should be stated first, e.g., within two months of being invited to serve (CLAs, LAs, REs), elected (Bureau) or appointed (Secretariat and TSU staff). Then the exception of the transition in AR5 can be mentioned.

19a. As explained in our general comments above (page 1), for reasons of both efficiency and security, the forms for the WG and TF authors and Review Editors should be submitted to the relevant TSU rather than to the Secretariat. Another reason, coming directly from WGI's experience in implementing the CoI exercise, is that a considerable amount of follow up is needed to get all the forms submitted correctly, over five months in this case. This is most effectively done by the TSU, which has a working relationship with all the individuals concerned.

19b. This needs to specify a time period for submitting the form. Submission should be to the relevant TSU or the Secretariat depending of the role of that individual. The same change to be made in paragraph 19c, and wherever else relevant.

19c. An annual process would be too onerous on this scale. We propose an annual requirement to confirm that there are no changes or to update incremental information. There should also be the possibility to resubmit when circumstances change.

19g. We fully agree with the proposal that the disclosure forms for the chapter teams will be reviewed by the appropriate WG or TF Bureau. Having recently completed the first CoI exercise for WGI, we note the need for consistency of implementation across the Bureaux and the Conflict of Interest Committee and wonder how this will be ensured.

¹ https://www.ipcc-wg1.unibe.ch/guidancepaper/WG1_GuidanceNote_Conflict-of-Interest.pdf

191. We cannot say often enough that not only the confidentiality of the information but also its security is critical.

Disclosure Form Part I

It is important to introduce an element of self disclosure by including a caveat about relevant interests as follows: "that may constitute a real, perceived, or potential conflict of interest ". Otherwise the entry will become a CV and impossible to scrutinise and assess for hundreds of authors.

Advice about the relevance of a particular matter should be sought "from the Secretariat or relevant TSU".

Disclosure Form Part II

2. Other Interests:

We suggest adding "government representation including membership of international delegations" as 2(e).

Communications Strategy Task Group

We were very pleased that virtually all of our comments on the draft in March were implemented in this proposal. In particular, the recognition of the importance of communicating about the processes that generate IPCC reports, and the important role that the elected Bureau members can play in global engagement.

The residual points will likely be dealt with when the senior communications manager is appointed and develops the IPCC strategy, especially for rapid response. Please find below our comments for the Task Group to consider in finalising the proposal:

2. Defining the scope

Web presence, page 3: "the use of appropriate technologies" is mentioned at the end of the last paragraph and it could be more specific about what is meant by this.

5. Guidelines

Selecting spokespersons, last bullet, page 5: Not all Working Group-internal issues would need the direct involvement of the senior communications manager. In the last sentence, change "always be involved" to "always be informed".

Rapid response, page 5: We agree that it is an urgent and immediate priority for proposals to be made for a formal set of procedures for rapid response to enquiries, and therefore all the more urgent for the senior communications manager to be appointed and in post.

With regard to these procedures, our suggestion is that the Executive Committee delegates responsibility for response to urgent enquiries to a subgroup that works with the senior communications manager. The composition of this subgroup would vary depending on the nature of the enquiry. If it concerns a Working Group product, at least one of the Co-Chairs from the relevant Working Group must be involved. This subgroup has the responsibility to

respond to the urgent enquiry in a timely manner. The senior communications manager requires sign-off/approval from all relevant individuals before issuing a response.

Part of the above suggestion has already been included in the proposal in the discussion of Rapid response on page 5, but the important point about sign-off has not. A further aspect that requires consideration in developing the procedures is that not all enquiries come initially to the Secretariat.

Governance and Management Task Group

We are pleased that many of the comments that we made on the draft in March have already been implemented. Please find below our comments for consideration in finalising the proposal and for future work:

We appreciate the progress that the Task Group has made in developing detailed proposals for the establishment of an Executive Committee and on Terms of Office, as well as considering the issues associated with a potential Executive Director. However it is important that the role of the Secretariat and its relationship to other actors is thoroughly discussed, as well as the qualifications and roles of all Bureau members. We note that some aspects of this are mentioned in the Introduction under items 1b and 1c. However, further work is needed in developing Terms of Reference for all senior elected officials (Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs, Co-Chairs) as well as for the Bureau as a whole; and for the Technical Support Units (TSUs) as well as for the Secretariat.

The current IPCC Procedures state in paragraph 4.2 that the "WG and TFB Co-Chairs are responsible for implementing the work programme...". It is, therefore, welcomed that the proposed terms of reference for the Executive Committee are compatible with this, by giving the Executive Committee the role of ensuring effective coordination (2.4.4a).

2. Executive Committee

The proposals for the composition and mode of operation of the Executive Committee (2.4.5, 2.4.6) focus to a large extent on voting rights, which understandably have to be specified in the rules. However we believe that there is a danger of losing sight of the key principle of IPCC that decisions are founded on consensus and that IPCC at all its levels should speak with one voice, whether that is in a Working Group report, the Bureau or the Executive Committee. Therefore, we suggest that this principle should be contained more prominently in the Task Group document, e.g., in a preamble, or under 2.3 Task Group considerations.

Turning to 2.4.5, the composition and mode of operation of the Executive Committee, the WGI Co-Chairs believe that 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 attending but non-voting members of the Executive Committee, bringing their range of views to the discussions. 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 attending but non-voting members of the Executive Committee, for practical reasons. Therefore we propose deleting [IPCC Vice-

Chairs] from 2.4.5a, and removing the square brackets from [IPCC Vice-Chairs] and [The four Heads of the Technical Support Units] in 2.4.5b.

We do not agree that external members are appropriate in an IPCC 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 [Two external members as decided by the [Panel][Bureau][Executive Committee]] in 2.4.5b.

In 2.4.6, some additional thought needs to be given to voting rules in order to preserve the balance of the WGs in the AR5 cycle. Due to the exceptional decision for WGIII AR5, the voting of the WG Co-Chairs will have to be weighted in some way. The simplest proposal, which is also most consistent with the origin of that exceptional decision, would be for each Co-Chair to have one vote, with the exception of the two developing country Co-Chairs of WGIII AR5 who would have one vote between them.

Decision-making by consensus is indeed mentioned in 2.4.6.b and we would urge that this paragraph is rewritten to focus on the norm (consensus) before getting to the exception (a vote). To be even clearer, it should be split to read as follows:

2.4.6.b Decision-making in the Executive Committee will normally be made by consensus.

2.4.6.c If, under exceptional circumstances, it is not possible for the Executive Committee to reach a decision by consensus despite taking every effort to do so, decisions may be adopted by a [simple][2/3] majority of the voting members.

3. Terms of Office

To avoid the appearance of prejudging the outcome of future decisions by the Panel, we suggest changing “possible changes in the overall mode of work” in the first line of 3.3a to read “significant changes in the overall mode of work”.

Speaking as a WG Co-Chair, I agree with the proposal in 3.4.1 to limit the term of office for the IPCC Chair and Co-Chairs. Consideration should also be given to term limits for the other members of the Bureau, i.e., IPCC Vice-Chairs and WG Vice-Chairs.

There would be difficulties in organising an election for a new Chair in order to create a Chair Elect (3.4.1b), separated in time from the new Bureau, and this could be a major distraction at a busy time. 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.

4. Executive Director

4.3 In paragraph d at the bottom of page 5, the Task Group 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 Task Group’s conclusion convincingly, it would be helpful to append the job description for the current post of Secretary to the report of the Task Group.

4.4.1b 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 Task Group.

4.4.1d We do not support 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. The provision of two year renewable contracts is limitation enough.

6. Terms of Reference of the Secretariat

The interplay between the roles and responsibilities of the Secretariat and the TSUs needs to be considered and terms of reference for both developed.

Procedures Task Group

We are pleased that many of our comments on the draft in March were implemented in this proposal and in particular that the important point about confidentiality is now treated explicitly in section 6. Whilst this is clearly related to the review process, guidance on confidentiality is needed in a broader context, given that requests occur for access to working papers, emails, etc. Confidentiality 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. It 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 jeopardised if material that is in the nature of a draft or incomplete information to be further developed were to be released prematurely. It is increasingly clear that this concept needs to be specified in the IPCC Procedures, also showing that this is not a contradiction of the current Principles of IPCC, which state that the assessment is carried out on a “comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis”.

As well as discussing confidentiality of the report drafts, WGI proposes adding wording that discusses the confidentiality of other interim documentation, e.g., “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.”

Please find below our other comments for consideration in finalising the proposal:

1. Introduction

The distinction between category I and category II proposals may require more explanation by the TG Co-Chairs. Priority should be given to the key decisions that were well supported by a consensus in the TG, and those that immediately affect the next stages of the AR5 process.

4. Sources of Data and Literature

4.4 Box on Annex 2, page 7: Information from all sources should be critically assessed, so in the first sentence under point 1, we suggest replacing “a non-scientific journal-based” in the second line by “any”, so that it reads “from any source.”

The final sentence of section 1 in this Annex is an important point that needs to be made clearer. In the Annex to the current Procedures, it was contained in a separate clause. We suggest expanding the sentence and going back to something closer to the current text, e.g., “Sources in addition to peer-reviewed literature will also be listed in the reference sections of

IPCC Reports. For these, it must be indicated how the material can be accessed if not publicly available.”

6. Report review

6bis1. Availability of review comments: We still have serious concerns and reservations about the overall practicality of the proposal to make the responses to review comments available to reviewers before the completion of the assessment and do not support this change.

A clear distinction must be made between any decision about providing an individual reviewer with the responses to his or her own comments during the review process and continuing the current public access to the review archives upon completion of the assessment. Thus the proposed sentence in 6bis1.2 requires further modification and splitting into two sentences to make this distinction. It must be made absolutely clear that an individual reviewer would only receive responses to his or her own comments, for the sole purpose of keeping track of what happened to those comments, and this is not opening up a separate channel for further review.

6bis3. Anonymous expert review: WGI is convinced that making the expert review anonymous would in fact decrease the openness and transparency of the IPCC assessment process and is potentially open to abuse when reviewers do not have to put their name on their comments. Furthermore, we feel that it is unnecessary because review comments are dealt with by a team of authors, not by a single author, and this, coupled with the role of the Review Editors, ensures that any "bias" of one individual to another is filtered out under the current procedures. There is a fundamental difference to anonymous peer review with a journal. In the case of an IPCC assessment, the authors work at IPCC's invitation whereas for a regular journal article the authors want to publish their own work.

6bis4. Confidentiality of draft reports: for the reasons described in our introductory comments, we very much welcome this new section and proposed decision in 6bis4.2. We again stress that the first sentence of the proposed decision text needs some editing in order to include the key term “pre-decisional” and to capture the other kinds of material in addition to the draft reports.

We have some concerns about the timescale referred to in the second sentence of 6bis4.2 because the Final Report, although approved, is not typically publicly available in its entirety until after copy editing, etc. Therefore this decision as worded could create the odd situation of making the final draft publicly available before the Final Report itself. Furthermore, it takes some time to finish copyediting and making the necessary changes traced back to the chapters following the SPM approval. It would be unfortunate to have to release something by xx weeks which was premature and could result in additional errata. Issues may also need to be clarified with the publisher commissioned for the report. Therefore we propose changing the last phrase in this sentence to read “as soon as possible after the acceptance of the report by the Panel, allowing reasonable time for its finalisation.”.

8. Procedure for handling potential errors

The proposed error protocol has now been finalised by the Co-Chairs, and the IPCC Chair, as requested by IPCC-32, and is included in Doc. 12, Add.1. The first bullet in the proposed decisions in 8.4 needs to be clearer about the status of the protocol and who is responsible for each step. We suggest the following minor edits with new text marked in bold:

“The procedures should be updated with mention of the protocol to address potential errors and develop errata as appropriate. Once finalised **by the IPCC Chair, the IPCC Vice-Chairs and the Co-Chairs** and endorsed by the Task Group on Procedures, the **agreed** protocol should be adopted as an Annex to the Procedures. “

We would, however, suggest that the Panel may wish to consider this protocol to be a “living document” that can be adjusted if necessary when experience has been gathered, rather than adopting it as an Annex to the Procedures immediately, before the WGs and TF have had any experience with its application.

10. IPCC guidance material

It is not clear what guidance materials are being referred to in this section. More specification is needed including mentioning WG-specific guidance. Such WG-specific guidance material is essential for the WG Co-Chairs in order to perform their duties. In particular, in the proposed decision 10.2, it is not clear what group of guidance materials is meant. We propose rewording the first sentence 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.”

12. Other issues

The WGI Co-Chairs do not agree with the suggested amendment to article 2 of the IPCC principles. It is necessary to limit the understanding to the scientific basis of **risk of human-induced climate change** in order to keep the IPCC endeavour in proportion.