

**FORTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE IPCC  
Nairobi, Kenya, 24-27 February 2015**

IPCC-XLI/Doc. 3  
(27.I.2015)  
Agenda Item: 5.3  
ENGLISH ONLY

**FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC**

**Synthesis of Government submissions in response to questionnaire of 27 November 2014  
on selection of Authors and Review process for IPCC reports**

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

## **FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC**

Synthesis of Government submissions in response to questionnaire of 27 November 2014  
on selection of authors and review process for IPCC reports

At the second meeting of the Task Group on the Future Work of the IPCC (Geneva, Switzerland, 16-17 September 2014) the Secretariat was requested to solicit the views of Member countries on how to improve and further facilitate the selection of authors and the management of the review process for IPCC reports. By a questionnaire annexed to a letter dated 27 November 2014 the Secretary of the IPCC requested the views of the Member countries.

The Governments of the following 19 Member countries submitted their responses by 16 January 2015:

- Argentina
- Belgium
- Brazil
- Bulgaria
- Canada
- Chad
- China
- Germany
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Monaco
- Republic of Korea
- South Africa
- Spain
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- United Republic of Tanzania
- United Kingdom
- United States of America

This report by the Secretariat aims to synthesize the contributions of Member countries for consideration by the Co-Chairs of the Task Group on the Future Work of the IPCC in their preparation of a Recommendation Paper to be submitted to the Panel for its consideration and decision at its 41<sup>st</sup> Session (Nairobi, Kenya, 24-27 February 2015).

### **1. Nomination of experts**

Almost all countries which submitted a response to the questionnaire indicated to have responded to requests for nominations of authors/experts. Almost all indicated to have responded positively to the requests for nominations for SRREN, SREX, AR5, and AR4.

Most countries provided an indication of how many experts they had nominated, with numbers ranging from 1 (Jamaica) to 523 (China); with the exception of Jamaica they all saw one or more of their candidates selected. Most of the nominated candidates were nationals of and residing in the country of nomination (approx. 95%).

A great variety of means and communication channels were used – almost always in combination - to bring the call for nominations to the attention of the experts, including personal contacts, open calls on the website, national committees or networks, circular letters and even adds.

All submissions received by the countries were forwarded to the IPCC. In some countries a basic pre-check on expertise, competence, and scientific credibility took place, either by the Focal Point or a special Committee.

Only a few countries made suggestions as to how the nomination process set up by the IPCC can be further improved, for instance by providing more detailed selection criteria or making the nomination process an online registration process.

Developing countries reported not to be in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors. Most developed countries reported they can provide travel support; some indicated to be also able to give administrative support and support through a research assistant.

The type of support identified as most needed, is support to enable experts to travel, entertain contacts and spend sufficient time on their research. A few countries, such as Switzerland, suggested that the national governments should make the necessary resources available for that purpose. All countries reported to benefit in multiple ways from their experts participating in the IPCC exercise.

## **2. Review process**

### Expert review

Although the nomination process for the AR5 did not include nominations for expert reviewers, almost 50% of the countries which responded to the questionnaire provided additional names to the IPCC WGs for the expert review. The names were often solicited through an open call and generally no screening for relevant expertise was done. Some countries do not have accurate information on how many experts participated in the expert review, others do with the number of experts participating in the expert review ranging from none (Chad) to well over 1500 (USA). Opinions on whether the nominations of expert reviewers should be included in the nomination process vary.

### Government review

Almost all countries which replied to the questionnaire provided comments on virtually all recent IPCC reports. In most cases the comments were invited from relevant government offices and institutions. Sometimes the reviewers were selected but often everyone could submit comments. In a few countries the expert reviewers also contributed to the government review. In most instances a Committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments before submission to the IPCC, in a few cases this was done by one single individual.

Various suggestions for technical measures to further facilitate the review process and the collection and submission of comments were made, such as the introduction of an online tool (Brazil), a more user friendly design of the web-interface (Canada a.o), extended deadlines (Chad; Jamaica; South Africa), stop using excel sheets for the reviews (Germany), and maintaining systems that allow for the upload of spread sheets (US). Providing guidance papers, organizing workshops and the posting of best practices were equally mentioned by all respondents as the type of support which IPCC could provide to government Focal Points to facilitate and manage the review process.

A number of suggestions were made to make the IPCC review broader and more effective, including the development and use of dedicated software tools to help authors and review editors identify sections that are under review (Canada), providing cash and in kind support to countries which need it (Chad; South Africa; Tanzania), maintaining lists of former authors and reviewers and giving experts the possibility to contact IPCC directly (Germany), increasing the participation of research institutes (Jamaica), and providing brief analysis of comments in the different IPCC review stages (Spain).