

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

IPCC-XLI/INF. 2, Rev. 1
(17.II.2015)
Agenda Item: 5.3
ENGLISH ONLY

FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC

Collated comments from Governments in response to questionnaire of 27 November 2014 on selection of Authors and Review process for IPCC reports

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

FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC

Collated comments from Governments 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
- Denmark
- Germany
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Monaco
- Republic of Korea
- South Africa
- Spain
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- United Republic of Tanzania
- United Kingdom
- United States of America

Part A: Responses by Governments by alphabetical order

Part B: Responses by Governments by topics

PART A

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **Argentina**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other **Expert meetings**

How many experts did you nominate?
experts. 21 of them were nominated for the AR5

The Focal Point nominated more than 40

How many of them were selected?

- CLA 3 (AR5)
- LA 6 (AR5)
- RE 2 (AR5)
- TGICA 0
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) 6 Aprox.

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country?

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **No** % of total nominations.

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country?

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **No** % of total nominations.

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs

- Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
 Research expertise
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
 Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

It would be valuable to receive information about other national experts selected by IPCC – others from FC nominations.

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support No
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
 If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
 % of total working hours
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

We consider that financial incentives are essential especially for Authors and especially for CLA.

- How can this support be strengthened?
This could be reached through a new financial scheme of IPCC.

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- | | |
|--|--------|
| ○ Creating awareness in the country | High |
| ○ Stimulating research | Medium |
| ○ Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields | Low |
| ○ Capacity building | High |
| ○ Advice for national policymaking | High |
| ○ Raising national profile in the international arena | Medium |

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not selected as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

No

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done?

Choose an item.

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? No Opinion

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN 1
- SREX 1
- AR5 2

- AR4 # of experts who participated for AR4.

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify)

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments?

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

Due its extension, it is still a challenge to review in detail the complete reports.

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **Belgium**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other other responses

How many experts did you nominate? 47

How many of them were selected?

- CLA 0
- LA 7
- RE 5
- TGICA 0
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) 2

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country? Yes

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) 2%

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country? Yes

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) 2%

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs

- Other researchers in BELSPO funded project; concertation committee for international cooperation in the area of environment & climate (CIS/ENV-CLIMATE), address lists of relevant experts and experts that have shown an interest
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other federal scientific institutes: KMI-IRM; BIRA-IASB, KBIN-IRSNB, CIS/ENV-CLIMATE
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
 - criteria IPCC - all submissions fitted these criteria and so all submissions received were sent to the IPCC
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
 - Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

Enter your questions and remarks about set up of nomination process

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support Yes
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
 - If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
 - 25 % this is the time we fund a junior to help but it is not a correct estimate of the real work that is performed by the author or review editor

- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other **travel**

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

In BE most research is performed in university labs where the scientist not only perform research but also are teaching. Most of the scientists have an extremely full agenda. For authors and review editors to allow them to travel and to perform IPCC work; BELSPO pays travel (hotel + train/flights) and equivalent of 3MM/year for a junior assistant who can take over some non-IPCC work or who can help with some of the IPCC work (verifying literature, ...) . This way the scientist can concentrate better on his/her IPCC work. We believe this is a minimum (for the BE situation). Nominations are recruited very often from climate relevant research projects funded by BELSPO. It is important that scientistst can rely on a research programme as well.

- How can this support be strengthened?
 increase domestic budget : if more budget was available, the NFP could increase communication and motivate more scientists to be a candidate as CLA, LA, RE,.....

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** Medium
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Medium
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** High

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not select4ed as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

No

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done?

Choose an item.

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? Yes

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN 7
- SREX 11
- AR5 20
- AR4 12

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments

- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Please specify.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

No

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? No

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

[Click here to enter text.](#)

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

. The role of the review editors is very important. REs should have sufficient time and support to perform this job conscientiously. This is needed to ensure that the review comments are dealt with in an effective way. In the past, we also helped by supporting the development of a database tool to help a Belgian RE and other REs that expressed interest. We think that a reflection on the possible use of dedicated software tools to help authors and review editors could be helpful.

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **BRAZIL**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other TFI Expert Meetings

How many experts did you nominate? Data not available

How many of them were selected?

- CLA 4 (AR5)
- LA 12 (AR5)
- RE 8 (AR5)
- TGICA 0
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) Data not available

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country? No

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) % of total nominations.

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country? Yes

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) % of total nominations.

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.

- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
CV; knowledge; affinity with the subject; relevance of the institution.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

The nomination process could be an online registration, through a "restrict access area" on the IPCC website, which would also allow FP to keep track of their country's participation.

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support No
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
% of total working hours
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

A relevant support is in regard to providing means to be in contact with the other participants and sharing information for the task.

- How can this support be strengthened?
This kind of support can mean financing travel for meetings and assuring access to relevant information.

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- | | |
|--|--------|
| ○ Creating awareness in the country | High |
| ○ Stimulating research | Medium |
| ○ Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields | N/A |
| ○ Capacity building | High |
| ○ Advice for national policymaking | Medium |
| ○ Raising national profile in the international arena | High |

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not selected as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

Yes

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done?

Yes

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)?

Yes

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN Data not available
- SREX Data not available

- AR5 Data not available
- AR4 Data not available

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Please specify.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

Yes

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? No

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

An online tool could improve the submission of comments to the products, in place of the download and upload of the spreadsheet format currently in use. Also, the temporary websites used to distribute the draft versions of reports could have a single format and be kept permanently online to allow consultation on previous versions of the reports.

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

Please specify.

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: Bulgaria

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands – 2 persons; update the supplementary guidance to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories – 1 person

How many experts did you nominate? 3

How many of them were selected?

- CLA # of selected CLAs
- LA # of selected LAs
- RE 1
- TGICA # selected for TGICA
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) 2

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country? no.

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) % of total nominations.

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country? no.

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) % of total nominations.

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices

- NGOs
- Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

Enter your questions and remarks about set up of nomination process

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support no
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
% of total working hours
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

Click here to enter text.

- How can this support be strengthened?

Click here to enter text.

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- **Creating awareness in the country** Choose an item.
- **Stimulating research** Choose an item.
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Choose an item.
- **Capacity building** Choose an item.
- **Advice for national policymaking** Choose an item.
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Choose an item.

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not select4ed as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

Choose an item.

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations be government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done?

Choose an item.

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)?

Choose an item.

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN # of experts who participated for SRREN.
- SREX # of experts who participated for SREX.
- AR5 # of experts who participated for AR5.
- AR4 # of experts who participated for AR4.

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Please specify.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

Choose an item.

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? Choose an item.

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

Choose an item.

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

[Click here to enter text.](#)

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

Please specify.

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **Canada**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other Nominations were submitted for the processes listed above, as well as for TFI, TGICA and IPCC Expert Meetings. However, the data below applies only to AR5, SRREN, SREX, TGICA, and the TFI supplements (LULUCF and Wetlands). It does not include data from the AR4 or expert meetings.

How many experts did you nominate? 92

How many of them were selected?

- CLA 5
- LA 34
- RE 8
- TGICA 1
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) # selected for other

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country? Yes

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) 2.2%

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country? Yes

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) 1.1%

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities

- Other research institutions
- Government offices
- NGOs
- Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Notification posted on Government website with contact point for where to go for further information.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
Composition of Committee: We form a small review committee for each call for nominations consisting of government employees who have expertise relevant to the subject area under consideration and/or who have experience in the IPCC assessment process. The review committee provides advice on the nominations to our national Focal Point, and then the Focal Point submits the nominations to the IPCC.

Criteria: In general, we apply the following overarching criteria for selecting nominations for IPCC activities. The application of the criteria are at the discretion of the review committee, and supplementary criteria are sometimes developed for specific calls for nominations where needed:

- (1) Basic screening: Determine if nomination is complete and credible in line with the provided nomination instructions;
- (2) Alignment of Expertise with the IPCC Call for Nominations: Assess of relevance of area of expertise and relevance of current professional activities based on the specific request that is made in the IPCC's call for nominations;
- (3) Engagement and Impact in Area of Expertise: Assess scientific engagement and impact based on (a) quality and number of scientific publications; (b) national and international collaborations and engagement in scientific fora; (c) awards received; and

(d) professional affiliations.

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

(1) It would be helpful if the IPCC could provide more detailed criteria for nominations where possible. The TFI model is a good practice to follow: The TFI typically provides governments with a general indication of the type of expertise and/or experience that is sought. This practice could be expanded to other areas (e.g., to TGICA and to the WGs where possible).

(2) Notifications of selected participants for IPCC roles are not consistently provided to Focal Points, particularly for expert meetings. Provision of early notice of individuals who are selected is essential for governments to put in place the necessary actions to provide travel support. Early notification is particularly important in cases where the IPCC Bureau or Steering Committee has provided new nominations that were not submitted by the government.

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support Yes
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
Support for time needed to fulfill author role is provided to government employees. Amount of time varies depending on role.
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

Preparation of IPCC reports is a substantial undertaking for authors. Support from authors' organizations/employers to devote time to IPCC activities is important for completing this task. Travel support is also very important for authors to fulfill their work and attend required meetings.

- How can this support be strengthened?

Support can be strengthened by providing a detailed work plan for IPCC activities well in advance, and by scheduling meeting dates and locations well in advance in order to provide sufficient notice of travel requirements.

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- | | |
|--|--------|
| <input type="radio"/> Creating awareness in the country | High |
| <input type="radio"/> Stimulating research | High |
| <input type="radio"/> Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields | N/A |
| <input type="radio"/> Capacity building | N/A |
| <input type="radio"/> Advice for national policymaking | Medium |
| <input type="radio"/> Raising national profile in the international arena | Medium |

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not selected as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

Yes

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done? No

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? No

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN Final numbers have not been tracked because expert reviewers provided input directly to the IPCC
- SREX Final numbers have not been tracked because expert reviewers provided input directly to the IPCC

- AR5 Final numbers have not been tracked because expert reviewers provided input directly to the IPCC
- AR4 # of experts who participated for AR4.

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Please specify.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

Yes

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? No

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

Recommend that the web interface for government review of reports be designed in such a way that Focal Points can use it to share the draft report with relevant government offices, while providing a separate mechanism specifically for the Focal Point to upload the compiled government comments. Due to the short review timelines and large file size of IPCC reports, it is not always possible for Focal Points to make alternate arrangements for confidential sharing of the draft reports within their governments.

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

(1) Recommend that the expert review process remain fully open, consistent with the practices that were established under the AR5. Governments can provide notifications of opportunities to participate in the expert review process, but there is no need for governments to be involved in nominating expert reviewers. There should continue to be open notices of expert review opportunities posted on the IPCC and WG websites.

(2) Recommend that the WGs could identify sections that are under-reviewed at the time of the Second Order Draft review, so that Governments and Experts can help to support in filling in gaps where possible. Review Editors could help to facilitate this.

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **CHAD**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other we received only one request for experts nomination from ipcc which is the expert nomination request in to the technical assessment of the IPCC inventory guidelines by the IPCC Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)

How many experts did you nominate? **NOT YET**

How many of them were selected?

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| • CLA | # of selected CLAs |
| • LA | # of selected LAs |
| • RE | # of selected REs |
| • TGICA | # selected for TGICA |
| • Other (workshops, expert meetings) | # selected for other |

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country? **No**

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) % of total nominations.

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country? **No**

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) % of total nominations.

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions

- Government offices
- NGOs
- Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other I sent a letter to our minister and this is being send to universities, NGOs, research institutions, government offices and I also made a personal call to expert who are already involved in national green gas inventory.i will nominate as soon as they repond on my invitation
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

If there is any request for expert nomination has been sent to my country please let me know because I haven't received any expert nomination excludinding that I cited above

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support No
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
 % of total working hours

- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?
 RE,LA

- How can this support be strengthened?
 Involving expert from developing country to have representative report

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- | | |
|--|--------|
| ○ Creating awareness in the country | N/A |
| ○ Stimulating research | Medium |
| ○ Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields | High |
| ○ Capacity building | High |
| ○ Advice for national policymaking | High |
| ○ Raising national profile in the international arena | Low |

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not select4ed as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?
 No

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations be government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done? No

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? Yes

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN none
- SREX none
- AR5 none
- AR4 none

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) there are not interested because i think they don't understand very well IPCC only my team is involved but they are complaining because the IPCC documents are not translated in to the UN languages(French)

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

No

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? No

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

I think the timing for the dead line need to be extended especially for the country in which IPCC is not well understood;concerning the web sit all the document on this web should be translated in to UN languages; the technical setup could be ameliorated by adding new understandable interface setting on new and information which are specific for each country on my opinion that could help the new arrival in to the panel to understand what's going on and they have to do

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

IPCC should Send financial support and IPCC expert to the developing country where the IPCC is not or less known or send guide line and financial support to help FPs of the developing country to organize workshops for the purpose of involving university, showing the importance of the data shearing and make IPCC well or better known by people at national level.

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **China**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other 2013 Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol; 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands; IPCC Expert Meeting on Systematic Assessment of TFI Products, and so on.

How many experts did you nominate? 523 (include AR4, the same below)

How many of them were selected?

- CLA 16
- LA 80
- RE 11
- TGICA 1
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) 6

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country? No

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) % of total nominations.

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country? No

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) % of total nominations.

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions

- Government offices
- NGOs
- Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
In 2009, the Chinese Government established a CMA-led Inter-Sector Coordination Group on IPCC, with the major responsibilities for IPCC-related activities in China, including author selection.

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

The Chinese Government hopes IPCC would further improve the transparency of the nomination process and the way and criteria of expert selection, meanwhile take into account the gaps existed in climate change research in the developing countries, and consider the possible increase of the authors from those countries.

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support No
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
% of total working hours

- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

1. Financial support (\$ 4,800-8,000 / year) for IPCC CLA/LA/RE; 2. Technical support for and management of IPCC CLA/LA/RE;

- How can this support be strengthened?
 Suggestions: 1. IPCC Trust Fund gives certain support to the authors from developing countries to help them complete the compiling and organization of the review of IPCC reports; 2. Authors should be encouraged to cite more non-English literatures; 3. IPCC TSU should strengthen its support to CLA and co-chairs from developing countries.

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- | | |
|--|--------|
| ○ Creating awareness in the country | Medium |
| ○ Stimulating research | Medium |
| ○ Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields | Medium |
| ○ Capacity building | Medium |
| ○ Advice for national policymaking | Medium |
| ○ Raising national profile in the international arena | Medium |

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not select4ed as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?
 Yes

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call

- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done? Yes

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? Yes

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN 40
- SREX 35
- AR5 192
- AR4 89

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments

- Reviewers were selected (please specify) 1. Experts recommended but not selected in the nomination process; 2. Officials from the Inter-Sector Coordination Group on IPCC and its recommended experts.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

Yes

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? Yes

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

1. The interval is too short between the rounds of the written comments by the governments for IPCC AR5 WG II report and WG III report; 2. The review period should be no less than eight weeks in every possible way. Considering that the non-English speaking countries need to make some preparations including translation in their review process, the tight schedule due to the insufficient review period (e.g. only 6 weeks were given to the second round of the review of the Synthesis Report) would result in adverse impacts on the review.

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

The Chinese Government appreciates the IPCC Secretariat and TSUs of each Working Group for their efforts made to improve IPCC review process and for its significant progress. To further improve the review process, it is suggested to make the following improvements: extension of the interval between the reviews of reports submitted by different WGs. For example, the interval was too short between the government reviews for WG II and WG III, and needs adjusted; 2. The review period should be no less than eight weeks in every possible way. Considering that the non-English speaking countries need to make some preparations including translation in their review process, the tight schedule due to the insufficient review

period (e.g. only 6 weeks were given to the second round of the review of the Synthesis Report) would result in adverse impacts on the review; 3. It is hoped that more experts in relevant fields should be invited to participate in the first round review.

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **Denmark**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other TFI reports; for SREX information is incomplete

How many experts did you nominate? **28 for AR5, otherwise incomplete information**

How many of them were selected?

- CLA **2 for AR5, 2 for AR4**
- LA **2 for AR5, 2 for SRREN, 2 for AR4**
- RE **1 for AR5, 1 for SRREN, 1 for Wetlands**
- TGICA **Incomplete information**
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) **Incomplete information**

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country?

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **Choose an item. Incomplete information**

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country?

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **Yes Incomplete information**

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs

- Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
 All serious submissions (with a relevant research CV) were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
 Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

Enter your questions and remarks about set up of nomination process

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support Yes
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
 If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
 % of total working hours
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

Technical/secretariat support for CLA. Travel support for CLA/LA/RE.

- How can this support be strengthened?
Awareness of size of the task, awareness of benefits for the institution and country.
Best practice examples from other countries.

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** High
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** High
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** High

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not selected as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

Choose an item.

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done?

Choose an item.

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? No

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN 10
- SREX 4
- AR5 ?

- AR4 ?

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Please specify.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

No

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? No

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

An individual screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

In the call for government comments there was no mentioning of a need for listing reviewers and their affiliation, but when uploading comments this was demanded. Please ask for names from the beginning!

Technical setup and web interface worked well, though sometimes it was a bit confusing whether communication should be with IPCC secretariat or with different TSU's. Deadlines for review were reasonable.

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Formulate call for review comments in clear and understandable language, a presentation of the subject with an expert reviewer (more than the FP) in mind.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **Germany**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other **all previous AR, SR, MR, expert workshops and meetings**

How many experts did you nominate? **for AR5: 101. All nominations have been communicated to the IPCC-Secretariat or respective Working Group / TFI.**

How many of them were selected?

- CLA **11 (all numbers are for AR5 only)**
- LA **27**
- RE **3**
- TGICA **0 out of 3**
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) **about 2 to 4 per event**

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country?

- Yes
- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **2**

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country?

- Yes
- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **2**

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs

- Other
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Email to those interested in IPCC (including agencies, consultants, business & media)
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)

The German government does not select authors for nominations, but candidates are checked for suitable scientific skills. In the past six years only one candidature from academia has not been forwarded because the scientific experience of the candidate did not cover the topic of the nomination.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)

Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

Enter your questions and remarks about set up of nomination process

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support Yes
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours

If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)

Authors and experts work on IPCC both during usual working hours, and are hence supported by their respective institutions, or spend extra-hours on the IPCC. As a government Focal Point we are not in the position to know the percentage, which would also differ between authors.

- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other It is possible that some of the institutes have provided additional technical or administrative support to the experts. This questions cannot be asked by IPCC Focal Points, but by the experts themselves.

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?
Funding of travel expenses, support by the institutions through the permission to spend working hours on IPCC.

- How can this support be strengthened?
The working conditions for authors should remain attractive for the world's best scientists in order to maintain the scientific excellence of products. Enhanced technical support from the TSU or individual support from assisting chapter scientists will be helpful. The role and function of the latter in the assessment process should be clarified.

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- | | |
|--|--------|
| ○ Creating awareness in the country | High |
| ○ Stimulating research | High |
| ○ Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields | Medium |
| ○ Capacity building | Low |
| ○ Advice for national policymaking | High |
| ○ Raising national profile in the international arena | High |

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not select4ed as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

Yes

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done? No

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? No

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN This question should be answered by the respective WG or the IPCC-Secretariat because the government Focal Point is not involved in the expert review.
- SREX ditto
- AR5 ditto
- AR4 ditto

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Roster of experts

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

No

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? No

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

We are not aware of a unique web interface to the review process, the web sites for submission of the WGs evolved with time in a positive manner. For example the online tests during submission, if the page and line numbers had been filled in correctly, was tedious but very helpful to find and correct errors. The most important improvement would be to no longer use Excel for the review. Excel is not a suitable tool for working with long texts and it is very laborious to manage an agreement on several hundreds of comments from different experts with this tool. The protected Excel sheets provided by the WGs with drop down menus have not been useful in this regard. It would be very helpful indeed, if a modern tool could be provided that also allows for track changes.

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other An innovative tool to manage the comments, replacing Excel, see above.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

The Secretariat should maintain a list of experts from authors and reviewers of previous reports to be invited to participate in the review process. Experts should be able to contact the IPCC on their own behalf, the Panel could develop criteria for their eligibility to act as IPCC-expert reviewers. There should be no selection of individuals by government Focal Points.

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **Jamaica**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other other responses

How many experts did you nominate? **1**

How many of them were selected?

- CLA **none**
- LA **none**
- RE **none**
- TGICA **none**
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) **none**

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country? **No**

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) % of total nominations.

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country? **No**

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) % of total nominations.

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.

- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

Online contact is preferred because it allows more time for the selection process. Actual mail does not usually arrive on time.

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support Choose an item.
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
% of total working hours
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other no

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

Financial support to enable full participation in the process.

- How can this support be strengthened?

Full financial support from IPCC

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- **Creating awareness in the country** Medium
- **Stimulating research** High
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Choose an item.
- **Capacity building** Medium
- **Advice for national policymaking** Medium
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Low

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not selected as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

No

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done? No

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? Yes

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN none
- SREX 3
- AR5 none
- AR4 1

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) based on area of expertise
reviewers were selected from academia and other relevant govt agencies.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

No

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? No

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

All comments were submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

Timeline is sometimes too short

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

Research institutions should be invited to play a greater role in the process.

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **Japan**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other other responses

How many experts did you nominate?

Arrox.190 (as for the case of AR5)

How many of them were selected?

- CLA 4
- LA 22
- RE 5
- TGICA 1
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) N.A.

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country?

Yes

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) % of total nominations.

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country?

Yes

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) Less than 10%

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.

- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

Enter your questions and remarks about set up of nomination process

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support Yes
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
% of total working hours
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

Click here to enter text.

- How can this support be strengthened?
Click here to enter text.

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- | | |
|--|--------|
| ○ Creating awareness in the country | Medium |
| ○ Stimulating research | High |
| ○ Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields | Medium |
| ○ Capacity building | Medium |
| ○ Advice for national policymaking | Medium |
| ○ Raising national profile in the international arena | High |

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not select4ed as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

Yes

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations be government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done?

Yes

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? No Opinion

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- | | |
|---------|-----|
| ○ SRREN | N.A |
| ○ SREX | N.A |
| ○ AR5 | N.A |
| ○ AR4 | N.A |

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Please specify.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

No

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? No

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

[Click here to enter text.](#)

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

Please specify.

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country:

MONACO

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other None

How many experts did you nominate?

0

How many of them were selected?

- CLA # of selected CLAs
- LA # of selected LAs
- RE # of selected REs
- TGICA # selected for TGICA
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) # selected for other

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country?

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) Choose an item.
% of total nominations.

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country?

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) Choose an item.
% of total nominations.

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.

- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

Enter your questions and remarks about set up of nomination process

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support None
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
 % of total working hours
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other None

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

- How can this support be strengthened?

Click here to enter text.

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- **Creating awareness in the country** Choose an item.
- **Stimulating research** Choose an item.
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Choose an item.
- **Capacity building** Choose an item.
- **Advice for national policymaking** Choose an item.
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Choose an item.

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not selected as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

None

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done?

Choose an item.

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? Choose an item.

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN # of experts who participated for SRREN.

- SREX # of experts who participated for SREX.
- AR5 # of experts who participated for AR5.
- AR4 # of experts who participated for AR4.

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Please specify.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

Choose an item.

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? Choose an item.

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

Choose an item.

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

None

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

None

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: Republic of Korea

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other TFI EFDB, TGICA

How many experts did you nominate? 108

How many of them were selected?

- CLA 0
- LA 11
- RE 2
- TGICA 1
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) 3

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country? Yes

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) 3(3%)

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country? No

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) % of total nominations.

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs

- Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Science societies
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

Enter your questions and remarks about set up of nomination process

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support Yes
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
% of total working hours
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

Financial support for authors in developing countries.

- How can this support be strengthened?
Using voluntary contribution fund by developed countries and Green Climate Fund.
There should be a discussion between IPCC members to develop specific methods.

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** High
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** High
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** Low
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Medium

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not selected as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

No

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done? No

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? Yes

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN 3
- SREX 0
- AR5 18

- AR4 10

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Please specify.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

No

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? No

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

All comments were submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

[Click here to enter text.](#)

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

Please specify.

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **South Africa**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other **EFDB**

How many experts did you nominate?
and for AR5 South Africa nominated 16 experts.

For AR4 South Africa nominated 14 experts

How many of them were selected?

- CLA
- LA
- RE
- TGICA
- Other (workshops, expert meetings)
Outreach

For AR5 we had 4 CLAs

For AR5 we had 6 LAs

1 RE for AR5

2 for AR5

South Africa held SREX and IPCC African

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country?

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) Choose an item.
% of total nominations.

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country?

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **No**
% of total nominations.

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices

- NGOs
- Other Expression of Int
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

Can there IPCC increase nominations and funding of experts from the developing country?

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support No
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
% of total working hours
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support

- other South Africa as a developing country does not have funds to support the nominated experts.

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

All of the above but mostly CLA and LA

- How can this support be strengthened?
Increase budget from the IPCC Trust Fund

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** Medium
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Medium
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** High

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not select4ed as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

No

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations be government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done? Yes

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? Yes

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN # of experts who participated for SRREN.
- SREX 8
- AR5 16
- AR4 14

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Only experts who have been nominated where asked to provide comments via email.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

Yes

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? No

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

An individual screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

The deadlines for review comments should be extended to give enough time to the reviewers.

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

It will be useful if IPCC can fund one selected CLA to assist in coordinating the reviews.

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **SPAIN**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other other responses

How many experts did you nominate? n/a

How many of them were selected?

- CLA AR5: 1; AR4: 1
- LA AR5:9; AR4: 2; SREX: 1; SREN:2
- RE AR5: 4; SREX:1; SREN:1
- TGICA # selected for TGICA
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) # selected for other

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country?

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) Choose an item.
% of total nominations.

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country?

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) Choose an item.
% of total nominations.

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)

- Universities
- Other research institutions
- Government offices
- NGOs
- Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC

(ensuring that the minimum requirements are met)

- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)

Specify criteria for selection.

- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)

Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

Enter your questions and remarks about set up of nomination process

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

In principle, when nominating authors the FP clearly warns that support has to be provided and guaranteed by the own expert's institution and/or project. In the last round of AR5 Lead Authors Meeting, the Spanish Climate Change Office (FP) provided some travel support to those authors with that need.

- Travel support Choose an item.
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)

- CLA LA RE No
- Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours

If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)

% of total working hours

- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

The experts have to have sufficient time to develop the IPCC work, and this could mean lighten the burden of ordinary work in their own institutions

- How can this support be strengthened?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- **X Creating awareness in the country** Choose an item.
- **X Stimulating research** Choose an item.
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Choose an item.
- **Capacity building** Choose an item.
- **Advice for national policymaking** Choose an item.
- **X Raising national profile in the international arena** Choose an item.

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not selected as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

Yes, the Spanish Climate Change Office promote the participation of experts in the review process by means of dissemination the information in national networks and Committees

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations be government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done?

Choose an item.

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)?

Choose an item.

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN 17
- SREX 13
- AR5 85 (19 in WG1, 43 in WG2 and 23 in WG3)
- AR4 n/a

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Please specify.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

[Yes in some cases](#)

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? Choose an item.

[No](#)

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

[The Spanish Climate Change Office compiles and assesses the comments](#)

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

Click here to enter text.

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other [Exchange practices in different countries](#)

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

[Brief analysis of comments in the different IPCC review phases could help to follow the process. This is especially important for the Government Review and the plenary session when the assessment reports are approved, in order to facilitate the debates.](#)

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **Sweden**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other **Various Guidelines and Expert Groups**

How many experts did you nominate? **in total 94**

How many of them were selected?

- CLA **3**
- LA **15**
- RE **0**
- TGICA **0**
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) **16**

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country? **Yes**

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **1**

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country? **Yes**

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **3**

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other **Please specify.**

- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Basic vetting of expertise and competence profile
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

No specific comments but we acknowledge the general improvement in the AR5 cycle

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support Yes
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
% of total working hours
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

Click here to enter text.

- How can this support be strengthened?
Click here to enter text.

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- | | |
|--|--------|
| ○ Creating awareness in the country | Medium |
| ○ Stimulating research | Low |
| ○ Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields | Medium |
| ○ Capacity building | Medium |
| ○ Advice for national policymaking | High |
| ○ Raising national profile in the international arena | Low |

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not select4ed as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

No

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations be government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done?

Choose an item.

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? No Opinion

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN 11
- SREX 7
- AR5 40
- AR4 20

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Both alternatives has been used but on different oppcations. Prospective individuals (groups) within government agencies, research institutes and other relevant organisations were contacted. I.e. almost like Box 5 in the previous question, but not an "open call".

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

No

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? No

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

An individual screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

In our view the process works well for us as is. It would be helpful if the Expert Review procedure included that by default the respective national FP get information about national Expert Reviewers (primarily name, but also the comments) from their country. Of course there should be the option for individual Expert Reviewers to not have their name/comments forwarded to the their national FP.

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other It would be helpful if the review form would as well be available in an unprotected version that could be distributed to participating reviewers to help collect the comments in a format that is suitable for the consolidated government submission. And the protected ('official') government review form should allow text to be pasted into the document. But only the latter version should be acceptable as providing government review comments.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

Please specify.

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **Switzerland**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other **Previous IPCC reports**

How many experts did you nominate? **>100**

How many of them were selected?

- CLA **>10**
- LA **>20**
- RE **>10**
- TGICA # selected for TGICA
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) **>50**

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country? Choose an item.

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **5%**

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country? Choose an item.

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **10%**

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other **Swiss Academy of Sciences**

- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other [Web site](#)
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

Enter your questions and remarks about set up of nomination process

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support [Yes](#)
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
[% of total working](#) hours
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

The institutions that employ the experts (universities, research institutions, companies, NGOs, etc.) have to support their participation to the IPCC process

- How can this support be strengthened?
The Government could complete the support provided by the employers of the experts

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** High
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** High
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** High

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not selected as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

No

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done? No

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? No

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN 3
- SREX 3

- AR5 5
- AR4 5

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Please specify.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

Yes

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? Yes

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

All comments were submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

Click here to enter text.

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

Please specify.

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **United Republic of Tanzania**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- vAR5
- AR4
- Other other responses

How many experts did you nominate? **20**

How many of them were selected?

- CLA # of selected CLAs
- LA **4**
- RE # of selected REs
- TGICA # selected for TGICA
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) **5**

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country? **No**

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **0**

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country? **No**

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) % of total nominations.

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.

- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

Enter your questions and remarks about set up of nomination process

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support No
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs,LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
% of total working hours
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

Reference material

- How can this support be strengthened?
Experts should be given reference material link through FP

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- **Creating awareness in the country** Medium
- **Stimulating research** Medium
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** High
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** Medium
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Medium

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not selected as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

Yes

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done? Yes

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? No Opinion

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN 4
- SREX 2
- AR5 5
- AR4 # of experts who participated for AR4.

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- vAR5 - WGI
- vAR5 - WGII
- vAR5 WGIII
- vAR5 - SYR
- v2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- v2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Please specify.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

No

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? No

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

All comments were submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

[Click here to enter text.](#)

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

Country FPs should have a forum whereby experts gether and provide inputs. However, it is difficult or developing countries to establish these foras because of resources

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **United Kingdom**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other **Inventory reports, TFI**

How many experts did you nominate? **154**

How many of them were selected?

- CLA **12**
- LA **65**
- RE **14**
- TGICA # selected for TGICA
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) # selected for other

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country? **Yes**

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **<5%**

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country? **Yes**

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **<5%**

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.

- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Advertisement in the magazine New Scientist

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
Very basic checks on scientific credibility

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

Some small problems with sending the information to the IPCC via the website

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support Yes
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
% of total working hours
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project
 - support through a research assistant
 - administrative support
 - other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

Travel and subsistence. CLAs have been provided with additional staff support up to £10k for a year.

- How can this support be strengthened?
Beyond a wider review of the whole international process for financial support, the UK believes it is contributing in the most appropriate manner.

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- | | |
|--|--------|
| ○ Creating awareness in the country | Low |
| ○ Stimulating research | High |
| ○ Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields | Low |
| ○ Capacity building | Medium |
| ○ Advice for national policymaking | High |
| ○ Raising national profile in the international arena | Low |

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not selected as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

No

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done?

Choose an item.

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? No Opinion

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN We don't have the numbers and haven't monitored the review process
- SREX We don't have the numbers and haven't monitored the review process
- AR5 We don't have the numbers and haven't monitored the review process

- AR4 We don't have the numbers and haven't monitored the review process

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Please specify.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

No

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? No

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

The spreadsheet was inflexible to all but the most careful editing. Basic cut and paste made it incompatible with the upload feature.

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

Please specify.



Department
of Energy &
Climate Change

Renate Christ
Secretary of the IPCC
IPCC Secretariat

**Department of Energy & Climate
Change**

3 Whitehall Place,
London SW1A 2AW
E: sarah.honour@decc.gsi.gov.uk
www.decc.gov.uk

Your ref: 5348-14/IPCC/GEN

12-1-2015

Dear Dr Christ

Thank you for inviting the UK to submit our views on how to improve and further facilitate the selection of authors and the management of the review process for IPCC reports. Please see our completed form attached to this covering letter. All our responses refer to the AR5.

The UK strongly believes in supporting authors/experts and we have completed section I in full. Within the final question on the benefits to the UK of experts contributing to the IPCC, we would like to highlight two benefits which are not listed in the options. Our primary reason for supporting experts is to help ensure an effective report is produced. Additionally, networking opportunities are another area which we feel benefits the UK.

Within section II on the review process we are not able to answer all the questions as UK experts are free to participate in the review without informing government.

Finally, regarding the selection of expert reviewers, we feel the process should seek these reviewers from a wide pool of experts and not look only at experts who were willing to be nominated as authors.

Yours sincerely

Sarah Honour
Department of Energy and Climate Change

ANNEX 1

Questionnaire addressed to IPCC Government Focal Points on the IPCC nominations and review process (Click on the field to enter information or use the tab key to move to next item)

Name of country: **United States of America**

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond (Please specify):

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other **TGICA, TFI**

How many experts did you nominate? **SRREN = 164; SREX = 30; AR5-WG1 = 472; AR5-WG2 > 500; AR5-WG3 = 424; AR4-WG1 = 326; AR4-WG2 = 403; AR4-WG3 = 216**

How many of them were selected?

- **CLA** **SRREN = 7; SREX = 2; AR5-WG1 = 8; AR5-WG2 = 10; AR5-WG3 = 6; AR4-WG1 = 10; AR4-WG2 = 7; AR4-WG3 = 5**
- **LA** **SRREN = 9; SREX = 10; AR5-WG1 = 52; AR5-WG2 = 35; AR5-WG3 = 35; AR4-WG1 = 32; AR4-WG2 = 15; AR4-WG3 = 21**
- **RE** **SRREN = 2; SREX = 2; AR5-WG1 = 11; AR5-WG2 = 11; AR5-WG3 = 7; AR4-WG1 = 6; AR4-WG2 = 7; AR4-WG3 = 3**
- **TGICA** **Could not find**
- **Other (workshops, expert meetings)** **Could not find all data**

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country? **Yes**

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) **Less than 1% of total nominees for AR5 and associated Special Reports.**

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country? **No**

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations)

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)

- Universities
- Other research institutions
- Government offices
- NGOs
- Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

How did you organize the selection process?

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
[See Attachment I.](#)

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

[No comments.](#)

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

- Travel support [Yes](#)
- Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)
 - CLA LA RE No
 - Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)
[% of total working](#) hours
- Other support in the form of:
 - funding of IPCC work as project

- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other Please specify

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

Travel support is essential to the role. Even before that, though, it is essential that the author establish an arrangement with their home institution to be released from a certain percentage of their regular duties in order to fully engage in the writing process. For other scientists, particularly from less developed countries, we believe it is also essential to have access to scientific journals.

- How can this support be strengthened?
Find a means to provide journal access to all CLAs, LAs and Res – perhaps by providing them with some sort of affiliation to institutions having such access.

b. Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** High
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** High
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** High

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not select4ed as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

Yes

How were they identified and selected?

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations be government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done? No

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)? No Opinion

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

- SRREN 50
- SREX 91
- AR5 906
- AR4 511

b. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Reviewers were selected through a call via the White House Subcommittee on Global Change Research and through a database of subject matter experts, as well as personal contacts.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

Yes

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments? Yes

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

It is important that the IPCC expand opportunities for experts to provide their comments directly on draft reports. It is also critical for the U.S. – given the number of comments we typically compile - that the IPCC maintain systems that allow for uploads of spreadsheets as in the AR5.

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

No.

Attachment I

Author Selection Process

Government of the United States of America

- 1) IPCC notifies focal point of the call for nominations.
- 2) The U.S. Department of State issues a Federal Register notice to the general public for nomination of experts. This call is also posted on the web site of the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP - the entity that coordinates federal climate science research) and shared with the Subcommittee on Global Change Research and shared across USGCRP interagency working groups and social media (Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn).
- 3) Nominations, complying with IPCC requirements, are collected via email or a U.S. nominations site for a period somewhat shorter than the IPCC call.
- 4) A committee of government subject matter experts based upon the detailed outline of the IPCC product are identified and contacted to participate on a review panel. Leads are identified for each chapter. Those leads are asked to recruit and consult additional experts to review nominees for their chapter(s).
- 5) Slates of nominees are developed by each of the chapter panels for the roles of CLA, LA, RE, and CA. All nominees not selected for another role, are recommended as expert reviewers and provided to the IPCC.
- 6) Slates of nominees are compared among the leads to determine appropriate work load for nominees that were selected for multiple roles across multiple chapters.
- 7) Nominees selected for CLA and RE roles are contacted in order to ensure that they understand the commitment particularly if they did not nominate themselves for the role for which they were selected.
- 8) Slates of nominees are reviewed by the Department of State and other officials at the Executive Office of the President and finalized.
- 9) Nomination forms and CV's are provided to the IPCC for consideration.
- 10) IPCC informs the IPCC FP of how many nominees have been selected for author roles. Individual agencies pay for the travel of their employees to participate in IPCC activities. Agencies pay into a funding pool to support the participation of non-governmental employees in IPCC activities. Support has been provided through a cooperative agreement or contract with a third party.

PART B

I. Nomination of authors/experts

To which requests for nominations received from the IPCC did your country respond
(Please specify):

Argentina

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other Expert meetings

Belgium:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other

Brazil:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other TFI Expert Meetings

Bulgaria:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands – 2 persons; update the supplementary guidance to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories – 1 person

Canada:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4

- Other Nominations were submitted for the processes listed above, as well as for TFI, TGICA and IPCC Expert Meetings. However, the data below applies only to AR5, SRREN, SREX, TGICA, and the TFI supplements (LULUCF and Wetlands). It does not include data from the AR4 or expert meetings.

Chad:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other we received only one request for experts nomination from ipcc which is the expert nomination request in to the technical assessment of the IPCC inventory guidelines by the IPCC Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)

China:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other 2013 Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol; 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands; IPCC Expert Meeting on Systematic Assessment of TFI Products, and so on.

Denmark:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other TFI reports; for SREX information is incomplete

Germany:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other all previous AR, SR, MR, expert workshops and meetings

Jamaica:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other

Japan:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other

Monaco:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other None

Republic of Korea:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other TFI EFDB, TGICA

South Africa:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other EFDB

Spain:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other other responses

Sweden:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other Various Guidelines and Expert Groups

Switzerland:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other Previous IPCC reports

United Republic of Tanzania:

- v SRREN
- v SREX
- v AR5
- AR4
- Other

United Kingdom:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other Inventory reports, TFI

United States of America:

- SRREN
- SREX
- AR5
- AR4
- Other TGICA, TFI

How many experts did you nominate?

Argentina

The Focal Point nominated more than 40 experts. 21 of them were nominated for the AR5

Belgium: 47

Brazil:

Data not available

Bulgaria:

3

Canada: 92

Chad: NOT YET

China: 523 (include AR4, the same below)

Denmark: 28 for AR5, otherwise incomplete information

Germany:

for AR5: 101. All nominations have been communicated to the IPCC-Secretariat or respective Working Group / TFI.

Jamaica:

1

Japan:

Approx. 190 (as for the case of AR5)

Monaco: 0

Republic of Korea:
108

South Africa:

For AR4 South Africa nominated 14 experts and for AR5 South Africa nominated 16 experts.

Spain: n/a

Sweden: in total 94

Switzerland: >100

United Republic of Tanzania: 20

United Kingdom: 154

United States of America:

SRREN = 164; SREX = 30; AR5-WG1 = 472; AR5-WG2 > 500; AR5-WG3 = 424; AR4-WG1 = 326;
AR4-WG2 = 403; AR4-WG3 = 216

How many of them were selected?

Argentina

- CLA 3 (AR5)
- LA 6 (AR5)
- RE 2 (AR5)
- TGICA 0
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) 6 Aprox.

Belgium:

- CLA 0
- LA 7
- RE 5
- TGICA 0
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) 2

Brazil:

- CLA 4 (AR5)
- LA 12 (AR5)
- RE 8 (AR5)
- TGICA 0
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) Data not available

Bulgaria:

- CLA # of selected CLAs
- LA # of selected LAs
- RE 1
- TGICA # selected for TGICA
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) 2

Canada:

- CLA 5
- LA 34
- RE 8
- TGICA 1

Chad:

China:

- CLA 16
- LA 80

- RE 11
- TGICA 1
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) 6

Denmark:

- CLA 2 for AR5, 2 for AR4
- LA 2 for AR5, 2 for SRREN, 2 for AR4
- RE 1 for AR5, 1 for SRREN, 1 for Wetlands
- TGICA Incomplete information
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) Incomplete information

Germany:

- CLA 11 (all numbers are for AR5 only)
- LA 27
- RE 3
- TGICA 0 out of 3
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) about 2 to 4 per event

Jamaica:

- CLA none
- LA none
- RE none
- TGICA none
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) none

Japan:

- CLA 4
- LA 22
- RE 5
- TGICA 1
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) N.A.

Monaco:

- CLA # of selected CLAs
- LA # of selected LAs
- RE # of selected REs
- TGICA # selected for TGICA
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) # selected for other

Republic of Korea:

- CLA 0
- LA 11
- RE 2
- TGICA 1
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) 3

South Africa:

- CLA For AR5 we had 4 CLAs
- LA For AR5 we had 6 LAs
- RE 1 RE for AR5
- TGICA 2 for AR5
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) South Africa held SREX and IPCC African Outreach

Spain:

- CLA AR5: 1; AR4: 1
- LA AR5:9; AR4: 2; SREX: 1; SREN:2
- RE AR5: 4; SREX:1; SREN:1
- TGICA # selected for TGICA
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) # selected for other

Sweden:

- CLA 3
- LA 15
- RE 0
- TGICA 0
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) 16

Switzerland:

- CLA >10
- LA >20
- RE >10
- TGICA # selected for TGICA
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) >50

United Republic of Tanzania:

- CLA # of selected CLAs
- LA 4
- RE # of selected REs
- TGICA # selected for TGICA
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) 5

United Kingdom:

- CLA 12
- LA 65
- RE 14
- TGICA # selected for TGICA
- Other (workshops, expert meetings)

United States of America:

- CLA SRREN = 7; SREX = 2; AR5-WG1 = 8; AR5-WG2 = 10; AR5-WG3 = 6; AR4-WG1 = 10; AR4-WG2 = 7; AR4-WG3 = 5
- LA SRREN = 9; SREX = 10; AR5-WG1 = 52; AR5-WG2 = 35; AR5-WG3 = 35; AR4-WG1 = 32; AR4-WG2 = 15; AR4-WG3 = 21
- RE SRREN = 2; SREX = 2; AR5-WG1 = 11; AR5-WG2 = 11; AR5-WG3 = 7; AR4-WG1 = 6; AR4-WG2 = 7; AR4-WG3 = 3
- TGICA Could not find
- Other (workshops, expert meetings) Could not find all data

Did you nominate experts who are nationals of your country but reside/do their research in a different country?

Argentina:	No	
Belgium: Yes		
If yes - how many (in % of total nominations)	2%	
Brazil: No		
Bulgaria: no.		
Canada: Yes		
o If yes - how many (in % of total nominations)	2.2%	
Chad: No		
China: No		
Denmark: Incomplete information		
Germany: Yes		
o If yes - how many (in % of total nominations)	2	
Jamaica: No		
Japan: Yes		
Monaco:		
Republic of Korea: Yes		
o If yes - how many (in % of total nominations)	3(3%)	
South Africa:		
Spain:		
Sweden: Yes		
o If yes - how many (in % of total nominations)	1	
Switzerland: Choose an item.		
o If yes - how many (in % of total nominations)	5%	
United Republic of Tanzania: No		

United Kingdom: Yes

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations)

<5%

United States of America: Yes

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations)
AR5 and associated Special Reports.

Less than 1% of total nominees for

Did you nominate experts who reside/do research in your country but are not nationals of your country?

Argentina: No

Belgium: Yes

If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) 2%

Brazil: Yes

Bulgaria: no

Canada: Yes

○ If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) 1.1%

Chad: No

China: No

Denmark: Yes

○ If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) Incomplete information

Germany: Yes

○ If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) 2

Jamaica: No

Japan: Yes

○ If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) Less than 10%

Monaco:

Republic of Korea: No

South Africa: No

Spain:

Sweden: Yes

○ If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) 3

Switzerland: Choose an item.

○ If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) 10%

United Republic of Tanzania: No

United Kingdom: Yes

- If yes - how many (in % of total nominations) <5%

United States of America: No

How did you bring the call for nominations to the attention of experts?

Argentina:

- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices

Belgium:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other researchers in BELSPO funded project; concertation committee for international cooperation in the area of environment & climate (CIS/ENV-CLIMATE), address lists of relevant experts and experts that have shown an interest
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other federal scientific institutes: KMI-IRM; BIRA-IASB, KBIN-IRSNB, CIS/ENV-CLIMATE
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other

Brazil:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs

- Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media

Bulgaria:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media

Other

Canada:

- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.

- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Notification posted on Government website with contact point for where to go for further information.

Chad:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other I sent a letter to our minister and this is being send to universities, NGOs, research institutions, government offices and I also made a personal call to expert who are already involved in national green gas inventory.i will nominate as soon as they repond on my invitation
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media

Other

China:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)

- Universities
- Other research institutions
- Government offices
- NGOs
- Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other

Denmark:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other

Germany:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other

- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Email to those interested in IPCC (including agencies, consultants, business & media)
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media

Other

Jamaica:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution

Japan:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media

Other Please specify.

Monaco:

Republic of Korea:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution

- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Science societies
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Please specify.

South Africa:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Expression of Int
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other

Spain:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media

Other Please specify

Sweden:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.

- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other

Switzerland:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other [Swiss Academy of Sciences](#)
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other [Web site](#)
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other

United Republic of Tanzania:

- **v** Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- **v** National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - **v** Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - **v** Government offices
 - **v** NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)

- Universities
- Other research institutions
- Government offices
- NGOs
- Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other

United Kingdom:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other Advertisement in the magazine New Scientist

United States of America:

- Personal contacts and contacts of my institution
- Open call (i.a. launched on a website)
- National committee or network (please specify composition, if possible for each category)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.

- Circular letter (please specify to whom)
 - Universities
 - Other research institutions
 - Government offices
 - NGOs
 - Other Please specify.
- Meeting/Symposium
- Social Media
- Other

How did you organize the selection process?

Argentina:

- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Research expertise

Belgium:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
criteria IPCC - all submissions fitted these criteria and so all submissions received were sent to the IPCC
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)

Brazil:

- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
CV; knowledge; affinity with the subject; relevance of the institution.

Bulgaria:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
Please specify criteria and composition of committee

Canada:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)

Composition of Committee: We form a small review committee for each call for nominations consisting of government employees who have expertise relevant to the subject area under consideration and/or who have experience in the IPCC assessment process. The review committee provides advice on the nominations to our national Focal Point, and then the Focal Point submits the nominations to the IPCC.

Criteria: In general, we apply the following overarching criteria for selecting nominations for IPCC activities. The application of the criteria are at the discretion of the review committee, and supplementary criteria are sometimes developed for specific calls for nominations where needed:

(1) Basic screening: Determine if nomination is complete and credible in line with the provided nomination instructions;

(2) Alignment of Expertise with the IPCC Call for Nominations: Assess of relevance of area of expertise and relevance of current professional activities based on the specific request that is made in the IPCC's call for nominations;

(3) Engagement and Impact in Area of Expertise: Assess scientific engagement and impact based on (a) quality and number of scientific publications; (b) national and international collaborations and engagement in scientific fora; (c) awards received; and (d) professional affiliations.

Chad:

China:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
In 2009, the Chinese Government established a CMA-led Inter-Sector Coordination Group on IPCC, with the major responsibilities for IPCC-related activities in China, including author selection.

Denmark:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
All serious submissions (with a relevant research CV) were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)

Germany:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
The German government does not select authors for nominations, but candidates are checked for suitable scientific skills. In the past six years only one candidature from academia has not been forwarded because the scientific experience of the candidate did not cover the topic of the nomination.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)

Jamaica:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)

Japan:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)

Monaco:

Republic of Korea:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)

South Africa:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)

Spain:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
(ensuring that the minimum requirements are met)
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)

Sweden:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Basic vetting of expertise and competence profile
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)

Switzerland:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)

United Republic of Tanzania:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)

United Kingdom:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
[Very basic checks on scientific credibility](#)

United States of America:

- All submissions received were forwarded to the IPCC
- Selection by FP (please specify criteria)
Specify criteria for selection.
- Selection by a committee (please specify criteria and composition of committee)
[See Attachment I.](#)

Do you have any remarks/questions about how the nominations process was set up by the IPCC, web interface, requirements, and deadlines of the nominations process? (Please specify)

Argentina:

It would be valuable to receive information about other national experts selected by IPCC – others from FC nominations.

Belgium:

Brazil:

The nomination process could be an online registration, through a "restrict access area" on the IPCC website, which would also allow FP to keep track of their country's participation.

Bulgaria:

Canada:

(1) It would be helpful if the IPCC could provide more detailed criteria for nominations where possible. The TFI model is a good practice to follow: The TFI typically provides governments with a general indication of the type of expertise and/or experience that is sought. This practice could be expanded to other areas (e.g., to TGICA and to the WGs where possible).

(2) Notifications of selected participants for IPCC roles are not consistently provided to Focal Points, particularly for expert meetings. Provision of early notice of individuals who are selected is essential for governments to put in place the necessary actions to provide travel support. Early notification is particularly important in cases where the IPCC Bureau or Steering Committee has provided new nominations that were not submitted by the government.

Chad:

If there is any request for expert nomination that has been sent to my country please let me know because I haven't received any expert nomination excluding that I cited above

China:

The Chinese Government hopes IPCC would further improve the transparency of the nomination process and the way and criteria of expert selection, meanwhile take into account the gaps existed in climate change research in the developing countries, and consider the possible increase of the authors from those countries.

Denmark:

Germany:

Jamaica:

Online contact is preferred because it allows more time for the selection process. Actual mail does not usually arrive on time.

Japan:

Monaco:

Republic of Korea:

South Africa:

Can there IPCC increase nominations and funding of experts from the developing country?

Spain:

Sweden:

No specific comments but we acknowledge the general improvement in the AR5 cycle

Switzerland:

United Republic of Tanzania:

United Kingdom:

Some small problems with sending the information to the IPCC via the website

United States of America:

No comments.

a. Support for authors

Are your country and/or the institution in your country to which experts/authors are affiliated, in a position to provide financial or other support to IPCC authors?

Travel support

Argentina: No

Belgium: Yes

Brazil: No

Bulgaria: no

Canada: Yes

Chad: No

China: No

Denmark: Yes

Germany: Yes

Jamaica:

Japan: Yes

Monaco:

Republic of Korea: Yes

South Africa: No

Spain:

In principle, when nominating authors the FP clearly warns that support has to be provided and guaranteed by the own expert's institution and/or project. In the last round of AR5 Lead Authors Meeting, the Spanish Climate Change Office (FP) provided some travel support to those authors with that need.

Sweden:

Yes

Switzerland: Yes

United Republic of Tanzania: No

United Kingdom: Yes

United States of America: Yes

Other support (please specify if answers apply to CLAs, LAs or REs, or to all)

Argentina:

CLA LA RE No

Belgium:

CLA LA RE No

Brazil:

CLA LA RE No

Bulgaria:

CLA LA RE No

Canada:

CLA LA RE No

Chad:

CLA LA RE No

China:

CLA LA RE No

Denmark:

CLA LA RE No

Germany:

CLA LA RE No

Jamaica:

CLA LA RE No

Japan:

CLA LA RE No

Monaco:

CLA LA RE No

Republic of Korea:

CLA LA RE No

South Africa:

Spain: CLA LA RE No

CLA LA RE No

Sweden:

CLA LA RE No

Switzerland:

CLA LA RE No

United Republic of Tanzania:

CLA LA RE v vNo

United Kingdom:

CLA LA RE No

United States of America:

CLA LA RE No

Consideration of time spent on IPCC as working hours
If yes – how much time (approximately in % of total working hours)

Argentina:

Belgium:

25 % this is the time we fund a junior to help but it is not a correct estimate of the real work that is performed by the author or review editor

Brazil:

Bulgaria:

Canada:

Support for time needed to fulfill author role is provided to government employees. Amount of time varies depending on role.

Chad:

China:

Denmark:

Germany:

Authors and experts work on IPCC both during usual working hours, and are hence supported by their respective institutions, or spend extra-hours on the IPCC. As a government Focal Point we are not in the position to know the percentage, which would also differ between authors.

Jamaica:

Japan:

Monaco:

Republic of Korea:

South Africa:

Spain:

Sweden:

Switzerland:

United Republic of Tanzania:

United Kingdom:

United States of America:

Other support in the form of:

Argentina

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other

Belgium:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other travel

Brazil:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other

Bulgaria:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other Please specify

Canada:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other

Chad:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other

China:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other Please specify

Denmark:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other

Germany:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other It is possible that some of the institutes have provided additional technical or administrative support to the experts. This questions cannot be asked by IPCC Focal Points, but by the experts themselves.

Jamaica:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other no

Japan:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other

Monaco:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other None

Republic of Korea:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other Please specify

South Africa:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other South Africa as a developing country does not have funds to support the nominated experts.

Spain:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other Please specify

Sweden:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other

Switzerland:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other

United Republic of Tanzania:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other

United Kingdom:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other

United States of America:

- funding of IPCC work as project
- support through a research assistant
- administrative support
- other

Which support do you consider essential for the task of an IPCC CLA/LA/RE?

Argentina:

We consider that financial incentives are essential especially for Authors and especially for CLA.

Belgium:

In BE most research is performed in university labs where the scientist not only perform research but also are teaching. Most of the scientists have an extremely full agenda. For authors and review editors to allow them to travel and to perform IPCC work; BELSPO pays travel (hotel + train/flights) and equivalent of 3MM/year for a junior assistant who can take over some non-IPCC work or who can help with some of the IPCC work (verifying literature, ...). This way the scientist can concentrate better on his/her IPCC work. We believe this is a minimum (for the BE situation). Nominations are recruited very often from climate relevant research projects funded by BELSPO. It is important that scientistst can rely on a research programme as well.

Brazil:

A relevant support is in regard to providing means to be in contact with the other participants and sharing information for the task.

Bulgaria:

Canada:

Preparation of IPCC reports is a substantial undertaking for authors. Support from authors' organizations/employers to devote time to IPCC activities is important for completing this task. Travel support is also very important to for authors to fulfill their work and attend required meetings.

Chad:

RE,LA

China:

1. Financial support (\$ 4,800-8,000 / year) for IPCC CLA/LA/RE; 2. Technical support for and management of IPCC CLA/LA/RE;

Denmark:

Technical/secretariat support for CLA. Travel support for CLA/LA/RE.

Germany:

Funding of travel expenses, support by the institutions through the permission to spend working hours on IPCC.

Jamaica:

Financial support to enable full participation in the process.

Japan:

Monaco:

Republic of Korea:

Financial support for authors in developing countries.

South Africa:

All of the above but mostly CLA and LA

Spain:

The experts have to have sufficient time to develop the IPCC work, and this could mean to lighten the burden of ordinary work in their own institutions

Sweden:

Switzerland:

The institutions that employ the experts (universities, research institutions, companies, NGOs, etc.) have to support their participation to the IPCC process

United Republic of Tanzania:

Reference material

United Kingdom:

Travel and subsistence. CLAs have been provided with additional staff support up to £10k for a year.

United States of America:

Travel support is essential to the role. Even before that, though, it is essential that the author establish an arrangement with their home institution to be released from a certain percentage of their regular duties in order to fully engage in the writing process. For other scientists, particularly from less developed countries, we believe it is also essential to have access to scientific journals.

How can this support be strengthened?

Argentina:

This could be reached through a new financial scheme of IPCC.

Belgium:

increase domestic budget : if more budget was available, the NFP could increase communication and motivate more scientists to be a candidate as CLA, LA, RE,.....

Brazil:

This kind of support can mean financing travel for meetings and assuring access to relevant information.

Bulgaria:

Canada:

Support can be strengthened by providing a detailed work plan for IPCC activities well in advance, and by scheduling meeting dates and locations well in advance in order to provide sufficient notice of travel requirements.

Chad:

Involving expert from developing country to have representative report

China:

Suggestions: 1. IPCC Trust Fund gives certain support to the authors from developing countries to help them complete the compiling and organization of the review of IPCC reports; 2. Authors should be encouraged to cite more non-English literatures; 3. IPCC TSU should strengthen its support to CLA and co-chairs from developing countries.

Denmark:

Awareness of size of the task, awareness of benefits for the institution and country. Best practice examples from other countries.

Germany:

The working conditions for authors should remain attractive for the world's best scientists in order to maintain the scientific excellence of products. Enhanced technical support from the TSU or individual support from assisting chapter scientists will be helpful. The role and function of the latter in the assessment process should be clarified.

Jamaica:

Full financial support from IPCC

Japan:

Monaco:

Republic of Korea:

Using voluntary contribution fund by developed countries and Green Climate Fund. There should be a discussion between IPCC members to develop specific methods.

South Africa:

Increase budget from the IPCC Trust Fund

Spain:

Sweden:

Switzerland:

The Government could complete the support provided by the employers of the experts

United Republic of Tanzania:

Experts should be given reference material link through FP

United Kingdom:

Beyond a wider review of the whole international process for financial support, the UK believes it is contributing in the most appropriate manner.

United States of America:

Find a means to provide journal access to all CLAs, LAs and Res – perhaps by providing them with some sort of affiliation to institutions having such access.

Which benefits does your country/institution gain from experts contributing to the IPCC?

Argentina:

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** Medium
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Low
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Medium

Belgium:

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** Medium
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Medium
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** High

Brazil:

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** Medium
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** N/A
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** Medium
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** High

Bulgaria:

- **Creating awareness in the country** Choose an item.
- **Stimulating research** Choose an item.
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Choose an item.
- **Capacity building** Choose an item.
- **Advice for national policymaking** Choose an item.
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Choose an item.

Canada:

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** High
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** N/A
- **Capacity building** N/A

- **Advice for national policymaking** Medium
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Medium

Chad:

- **Creating awareness in the country** N/A
- **Stimulating research** Medium
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** High
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Low

China:

- **Creating awareness in the country** Medium
- **Stimulating research** Medium
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Medium
- **Capacity building** Medium
- **Advice for national policymaking** Medium
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Medium

Denmark:

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** High
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** High
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** High

Germany:

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** High
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Medium
- **Capacity building** Low
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** High

Jamaica:

- **Creating awareness in the country** Medium
- **Stimulating research** High
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Choose an item.

- **Capacity building** Medium
- **Advice for national policymaking** Medium
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Low

Japan:

- **Creating awareness in the country** Medium
- **Stimulating research** High
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Medium
- **Capacity building** Medium
- **Advice for national policymaking** Medium
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** High

Monaco:

Republic of Korea:

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** High
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** High
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** Low
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Medium

South Africa:

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** Medium
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Medium
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** High

Spain:

- **X Creating awareness in the country** Choose an item.
- **X Stimulating research** Choose an item.
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Choose an item.
- **Capacity building** Choose an item.
- **Advice for national policymaking** Choose an item.
- **X Raising national profile in the international arena**

Sweden:

- **Creating awareness in the country** Medium
- **Stimulating research** Low
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Medium
- **Capacity building** Medium
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Low

Switzerland:

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** High
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** High
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** High

United Republic of Tanzania:

- **Creating awareness in the country** Medium
- **Stimulating research** Medium
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** High
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** Medium
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Medium

United Kingdom:

- **Creating awareness in the country** Low
- **Stimulating research** High
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** Low
- **Capacity building** Medium
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** Low

United States of America:

- **Creating awareness in the country** High
- **Stimulating research** High
- **Attracting students to climate change relevant study fields** High
- **Capacity building** High
- **Advice for national policymaking** High
- **Raising national profile in the international arena** High

II. Review process

a. Expert review

The nomination process for authors for the AR5 did not include nominations for Expert Reviewers. Nominated expert who were not select4ed as CLA/LA/RE were invited to comment as expert reviewers.

Did you provide additional names to the IPCC Working Groups for the expert review?

Argentina: No

Belgium: No

Brazil: Yes

Bulgaria:

Canada: Yes

Chad: No

China: Yes

Denmark:

Germany: Yes

Jamaica: No

Japan: Yes

Monaco:

Republic of Korea: No

South Africa: No

Spain:

Yes, the Spanish Climate Change Office promote the participation of experts in the review process by means of dissemination the information in national networks and Committees

Sweden: No

Switzerland: No

United Republic of Tanzania: Yes

United Kingdom: No

United States of America: Yes

How were they identified and selected?

Argentina:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Belgium:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Brazil:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Bulgaria:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Canada:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Chad:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

China:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Denmark:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Germany:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Jamaica:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Japan:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Monaco:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Republic of Korea:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

South Africa:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Spain:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Sweden:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Switzerland:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

United Republic of Tanzania:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

United Kingdom:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

United States of America:

- Open call
- Nominations by universities and other research institutions
- Nominations by government officers
- Nominations by NGOs

Was a screening for relevant expertise done?

Argentina:

Belgium:

Brazil: Yes

Bulgaria:

Canada: No

Chad: No

China: Yes

Denmark:

Germany: No

Jamaica: No

Japan: Yes

Monaco:

Republic of Korea: No

South Africa: Yes

Spain:

Sweden:

Switzerland: No

United Republic of Tanzania: Yes

United Kingdom:

United States of America: No

Would you like to have the initial nominations process broadened to also include nominations of Expert Reviewers (as was the case before the AR5)?

Argentina: No Opinion

Belgium: Yes

Brazil: Yes

Bulgaria:

Canada: No

Chad: Yes

China: Yes

Denmark: No

Germany: No

Jamaica: Yes

Japan: No Opinion

Monaco:

Republic of Korea: Yes

South Africa: Yes

Spain:

Sweden: No Opinion

Switzerland: No

United Republic of Tanzania: No Opinion

United Kingdom: No Opinion

United States of America: No Opinion

How many experts from your country participated in the expert review of:

Argentina:

- SRREN 1
- SREX 1
- AR5 2

Belgium:

- SRREN 7
- SREX 11
- AR5 20
- AR4 12

Brazil:

- SRREN Data not available
- SREX Data not available
- AR5 Data not available
- AR4 Data not available

Bulgaria:

Canada:

- SRREN Final numbers have not been tracked because expert reviewers provided input directly to the IPCC
- SREX Final numbers have not been tracked because expert reviewers provided input directly to the IPCC
- AR5 Final numbers have not been tracked because expert reviewers provided input directly to the IPCC
- AR4

Chad:

- SRREN none
- SREX none
- AR5 none
- AR4 none

China:

- SRREN 40
- SREX 35
- AR5 192
- AR4 89

Denmark:

- SRREN 10
- SREX 4
- AR5 ?
- AR4 ?

Germany:

- SRREN This question should be answered by the respective WG or the IPCC-Secretariat because the government Focal Point is not involved in the expert review.
- SREX ditto
- AR5 ditto
- AR4 ditto

Jamaica:

- SRREN none
- SREX 3
- AR5 none
- AR4 1

Japan:

- SRREN N.A
- SREX N.A
- AR5 N.A
- AR4 N.A

Monaco:

Republic of Korea:

- SRREN 3
- SREX 0
- AR5 18
- AR4 10

South Africa:

- SRREN # of experts who participated for SRREN.
- SREX 8
- AR5 16
- AR4 14

Spain:

- SRREN 17
- SREX 13
- AR5 85 (19 in WG1, 43 in WG2 and 23 in WG3)
- AR4 n/a

Sweden:

- SRREN 11
- SREX 7
- AR5 40
- AR4 20

Switzerland:

- SRREN 3
- SREX 3
- AR5 5
- AR4 5

United Republic of Tanzania:

- SRREN 4
- SREX 2
- AR5 5
- AR4

United Kingdom:

- SRREN We don't have the numbers and haven't monitored the review process
- SREX We don't have the numbers and haven't monitored the review process
- AR5 We don't have the numbers and haven't monitored the review process
- AR4 We don't have the numbers and haven't monitored the review process

United States of America:

- SRREN 50
- SREX 91
- AR5 906
- AR4 511

a. Government Review

For which recent IPCC reports did your country provide review comments?

Argentina:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

Belgium:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

Brazil:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

Bulgaria:

Canada:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

Chad:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

China:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

Denmark:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands

- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

Germany:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

Jamaica:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

Japan:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

Monaco:

Republic of Korea:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

South Africa:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

Spain:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

Sweden:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands

- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

Switzerland:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

United Republic of Tanzania:

- vAR5 - WGI
- vAR5 - WGII
- vAR5 WGIII
- vAR5 - SYR
- v2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- v2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

United Kingdom:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

United States of America:

- AR5 - WGI
- AR5 - WGII
- AR5 WGIII
- AR5 - SYR
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines: Wetlands
- 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol
- SRREN
- SREX

How did you invite comments?

Argentina:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

Belgium:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

Brazil:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

Bulgaria:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

Canada:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

Chad:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

China:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

Denmark:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

Germany:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

Jamaica:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

Japan:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

Monaco:

Republic of Korea:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

South Africa:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

Spain:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

Sweden:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

Switzerland:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

United Republic of Tanzania:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

United Kingdom:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

United States of America:

- I provided comments myself
- I asked my team to provide comments
- I asked the relevant government offices to provide comments
- The drafts were distributed and comments collected through a national committee
- Experts and government institutions were invited to comment in an open call
- We use a web-based interface to collect comments

How were experts participating in the government review selected?

Argentina:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify)

Belgium:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify)

Brazil:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify)

Bulgaria:

Canada:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify)

Chad:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) there are not interested because i think they don't understand very well IPCC only my team is involved but they are complaining because the IPCC documents are not translated in to the UN languages(French)

China:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) 1. Experts recommended but not selected in the nomination process; 2. Officials from the Inter-Sector Coordination Group on IPCC and its recommended experts.

Denmark:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify)

Germany:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Roster of experts

Jamaica:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) based on area of expertise
reviewers were selected from academia and other relevant govt agencies.

Japan:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Please specify.

Monaco:

Republic of Korea:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify)

South Africa:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Only experts who have been
nominated where asked to provide comments via email.

Spain:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify)

Sweden:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Both alternatives has been
used but on different occasions. Prospective individuals (groups) within government
agencies, research institutes and other relevant organisations were contacted. I.e.
almost like Box 5 in the previous question, but not an "open call".

Switzerland:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify)

United Republic of Tanzania:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify)

United Kingdom:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify)

United States of America:

- Everyone could submit comments
- Reviewers were selected (please specify) Reviewers were selected through a call via the White House Subcommittee on Global Change Research and through a database of subject matter experts, as well as personal contacts.

Did experts who submitted comments, as expert reviewers, also contribute to the government review?

Argentina: No

Belgium: No

Brazil: Yes

Bulgaria:

Canada: Yes

Chad: No

China: Yes

Denmark: No

Germany: No

Jamaica: No

Japan: No

Monaco:

Republic of Korea: No

South Africa: Yes

Spain:

Yes in some cases

Sweden: No

Switzerland: Yes

United Republic of Tanzania: No

United Kingdom: No

United States of America: Yes

IPCC procedures invite non-government expert reviewers to send their comments to their Government Focal Point. Did you receive such comments?

Argentina: Yes

Belgium: No

Brazil: No

Bulgaria:

Canada: No

Chad: No

China: Yes

Denmark: No

Germany: No

Jamaica: No

Japan: No

Monaco:

Republic of Korea: No

South Africa: No

Spain: No

Sweden: No

Switzerland: Yes

United Republic of Tanzania: No

United Kingdom: No

United States of America: Yes

How were the government comments consolidated before submission to IPCC?

Argentina:

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Belgium:

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Brazil:

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Bulgaria:

Canada:

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Chad:

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

China:

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Denmark:

An individual screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Germany:

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Jamaica:

All comments were submitted to the IPCC

Japan:

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Monaco:

Republic of Korea:

All comments were submitted to the IPCC

South Africa:

An individual screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Spain:

The Spanish Climate Change Office compiles and assesses the comments

Sweden:

An individual screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Switzerland:

All comments were submitted to the IPCC

United Republic of Tanzania:

All comments were submitted to the IPCC

United Kingdom:

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

United States of America:

A committee screened, evaluated and edited the comments which were then submitted to the IPCC

Do you have any remarks/questions about the web interface, the technical set up, and timing of deadlines for the review process? (Please specify)

Argentina:

No

Belgium:

Brazil:

An online tool could improve the submission of comments to the products, in place of the download and upload of the spreadsheet format currently in use. Also, the temporary websites used to distribute the draft versions of reports could have a single format and be kept permanently online to allow consultation on previous versions of the reports.

Bulgaria:

Canada:

Recommend that the web interface for government review of reports be designed in such a way that Focal Points can use it to share the draft report with relevant government offices, while providing a separate mechanism specifically for the Focal Point to upload the compiled government comments. Due to the short review timelines and large file size of IPCC reports, it is not always possible for Focal Points to make alternate arrangements for confidential sharing of the draft reports within their governments.

Chad:

I think the timing for the deadline needs to be extended especially for the country in which IPCC is not well understood; concerning the website all the documents on this website should be translated into UN languages; the technical setup could be ameliorated by adding new understandable interface settings on new information which are specific for each country on my opinion that could help the new arrival in the panel to understand what's going on and they have to do

China:

1. The interval is too short between the rounds of the written comments by the governments for IPCC AR5 WG II report and WG III report; 2. The review period should be no less than eight weeks in every possible way. Considering that the non-English speaking countries need to make some preparations including translation in their review process, the tight schedule due to the insufficient review period (e.g. only 6 weeks were given to the second round of the review of the Synthesis Report) would result in adverse impacts on the review.

Denmark:

In the call for government comments there was no mentioning of a need for listing reviewers and their affiliation, but when uploading comments this was demanded. Please ask for names from the beginning!

Technical setup and web interface worked well, though sometimes it was a bit confusing whether communication should be with IPCC secretariat or with different TSU's. Deadlines for review were reasonable.

Germany:

We are not aware of a unique web interface to the review process, the web sites for submission of the WGs evolved with time in a positive manner. For example the online tests during submission, if the page and line numbers had been filled in correctly, was tedious but very helpful to find and correct errors. The most important improvement would be to no longer use Excel for the review. Excel is not a suitable tool for working with long texts and it is very laborious to manage an agreement on several hundreds of comments from different experts with this tool. The protected Excel sheets provided by the WGs with drop down menus have not been useful in this regard. It would be very helpful indeed, if a modern tool could be provided that also allows for track changes.

Jamaica:

Timeline is sometimes too short

Japan:

Monaco:

Republic of Korea:

South Africa:

The deadlines for review comments should be extended to give enough time to the reviewers.

Spain:

Sweden:

In our view the process works well for us as is. It would be helpful if the Expert Review procedure included that by default the respective national FP get information about national Expert Reviewers (primarily name, but also the comments) from their country. Of course there should be the option for individual Expert Reviewers to not have their name/comments forwarded to the their national FP.

Switzerland:

United Republic of Tanzania:

United Kingdom:

The spreadsheet was inflexible to all but the most careful editing. Basic cut and paste made it incompatible with the upload feature.

United States of America:

It is important that the IPCC expand opportunities for experts to provide their comments directly on draft reports. It is also critical for the U.S. – given the number of comments we typically compile - that the IPCC maintain systems that allow for uploads of spreadsheets as in the AR5.

What kind of support can the IPCC provide to government FPs to facilitate and manage the review process?

Argentina:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other

Belgium:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other

Brazil:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other

Bulgaria:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Canada:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other

Chad:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other

China:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices

- Other Please specify.

Denmark:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Formulate call for review comments in clear and understandable language, a presentation of the subject with an expert reviewer (more than the FP) in mind.

Germany:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other An innovative tool to manage the comments, replacing Excel, sea above.

Jamaica:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices

Other

Japan:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other

Monaco:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

Republic of Korea:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other Please specify.

South Africa:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other

Spain:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other [Exchange practices in different countries](#)

Sweden:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other It would be helpful if the review form would as well be available in an unprotected version that could be distributed to participating reviewers to help collect the comments in a format that is suitable for the consolidated government submission. And the protected ('official') government review form should allow text to be pasted into the document. But only the latter version should be acceptable as providing government review comments.

Switzerland:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other

United Republic of Tanzania:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other

United Kingdom:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other

United States of America:

- Guidance papers
- Workshops
- Posting of best practices
- Other

Do you have any other suggestions how to make the IPCC review broader and more effective?

Argentina:

Due its extension, it is still a challenge to review in detail the complete reports.

Belgium:

. The role of the review editors is very important. REs should have sufficient time and support to perform this job conscientiously. This is needed to ensure that the review comments are dealt with in an effective way. In the past, we also helped by supporting the development of a database tool to help a Belgian RE and other REs that expressed interest. We think that a reflection on the possible use of dedicated software tools to help authors and review editors could be helpful.

Brazil:

Bulgaria:

Canada:

(1) Recommend that the expert review process remain fully open, consistent with the practices that were established under the AR5. Governments can provide notifications of opportunities to participate in the expert review process, but there is no need for governments to be involved in nominating expert reviewers. There should continue to be open notices of expert review opportunities posted on the IPCC and WG websites.

(2) Recommend that the WGs could identify sections that are under-reviewed at the time of the Second Order Draft review, so that Governments and Experts can help to support in filling in gaps where possible. Review Editors could help to facilitate this.

Chad:

IPCC should Send financial support and IPCC expert to the developing country where the IPCC is not or less known or send guide line and financial support to help FPs of the developing country to organize workshops for the purpose of involving university, showing the importance of the data shearing and make IPCC well or better known by people at national level.

China:

The Chinese Government appreciates the IPCC Secretariat and TSUs of each Working Group for their efforts made to improve IPCC review process and for its significant progress. To further improve the review process, it is suggested to make the following improvements: extension of the interval between the reviews of reports submitted by different WGs. For example, the interval was too short between the government reviews for WG II and WG III, and needs adjusted; 2. The review period should be no less than eight weeks in every possible way. Considering that the non-English speaking countries need to make some preparations

including translation in their review process, the tight schedule due to the insufficient review period (e.g. only 6 weeks were given to the second round of the review of the Synthesis Report) would result in adverse impacts on the review; 3. It is hoped that more experts in relevant fields should be invited to participate in the first round review.

Denmark:

Germany:

The Secretariat should maintain a list of experts from authors and reviewers of previous reports to be invited to participate in the review process. Experts should be able to contact the IPCC on their own behalf, the Panel could develop criteria for their eligibility to act as IPCC-expert reviewers. There should be no selection of individuals by government Focal Points.

Jamaica:

Research institutions should be invited to play a greater role in the process.

Japan:

Monaco:

Republic of Korea:

South Africa:

It will be useful if IPCC can fund one selected CLA to assist in coordinating the reviews.

Spain:

Brief analysis of comments in the different IPCC review phases could help to follow the process. This is especially important for the Government Review and the plenary session when the assessment reports are approved, in order to facilitate the debates.

Sweden:

Switzerland:

United Republic of Tanzania:

Country FPs should have a forum whereby experts get together and provide inputs. However, it is difficult for developing countries to establish these forums because of resources

United Kingdom:

United States of America:

No