

IPCC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – NINETY-FIRST MEETING
Teleconference, 3 March 2021

CONCLUSIONS AND DECISIONS

Participants

Chair:

Hoesung Lee

Members:

Ko Barrett (IPCC Vice-Chair), Thelma Krug (IPCC Vice-Chair), Youba Sokona (IPCC Vice-Chair), Valérie Masson-Delmotte (WGI Co-Chair), Panmao Zhai (WGI Co-Chair), Debra Roberts (WGII Co-Chair), Hans-Otto Pörtner (WGII Co-Chair), Jim Skea (WGIII Co-Chair), Priyadarshi Shukla (WGIII Co-Chair), Eduardo Calvo (TFI Co-Chair), Kiyoto Tanabe (TFI Co-Chair), Joy Pereira (WGII Vice-Chair).

Advisory members:

Anna Pirani (WGI TSU Head), Melinda Tignor (WG II TSU Head), Roger Fradera (WGIII TSU Head of Operations), Sandro Federici (TFI TSU Head), Noemie Leprince-Ringuet (SYR TSU Head), Abdalah Mokssit (IPCC Secretary).

IPCC Secretariat:

Ermira Fida (IPCC Deputy Secretary), Jonathan Lynn (Head of Communications), Jennifer Lew Schneider (Legal Officer), Nina Peeva, Laura Biagioni, Mxolisi Shongwe, Jesbin Baidya, Melissa Walsh, Werani Zabula, Joelle Fernandez.

Invited:

Elvira Poloczanska (TSU WGII).

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The provisional agenda (EXCOM-XCI/Doc.1, Rev.1) as attached in Annex 1 was adopted.

2. URGENT ISSUES RELATED TO IPCC PRODUCTS AND PROGRAMME OF WORK THAT REQUIRE PROMPT ATTENTION BY THE IPCC BETWEEN PANEL SESSIONS

2.1 Coronavirus related issues: Impact on AR6 schedules and products

- **Update on the changes to the schedule of the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)**

TFI Co-Chair updated the ExCom on the following changes to the TFI schedule for the year 2021, noting that they are tentative and are provided for information:

The Emission Factor Database (EFDB) 19th Editorial Board (EB) meeting and the 18th Data meeting were planned to be held in India and will now be held virtually. The Short-lived Climate Forcers (SLCF) meetings have been changed to provisional dates in September and October in 2021 and January in 2022. The Task Force Bureau meeting planned to be held in July is postponed to a date after the 2nd SLCF meeting.

The Chair clarified the current document does not seek the agreement by the ExCom, this report is just to provide information.

The ExCom took note of the update provided by the TFI Co-Chair.

3. COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

3.1 Ongoing and planned activities

The Secretariat reported on the Communication activities including press releases issued covering the opening statement by the Chair for the Working Group II (WGII) virtual Fourth Lead Author meeting (eLAM4) in Guatemala and the new round of Scholarship Awards.

3.2 Update on the IPCC Communications Strategy

The Secretariat reported on the IPCC Communications Strategy Review distributed to the ExCom prior to the meeting. The Secretariat noted that there are a series of recommendations developed and reviewed by the Communications Action Team (CAT) to bring the communications in line with current practice and the changing trends of communications and would like the endorsement from ExCom to make these changes.

The series of recommendations are divided in to three groups. The first, consist of the proposed changes to the Communications Strategy on which ExCom guidance is sought before presenting them to the Panel at the next session. A second small group of recommendations with budget implications would go the Panel when the budget is being discussed. The third group of recommendations don't require approval by the Bureau or the Panel. The recommendations emphasize a need to develop efforts in developing countries and to formalize that more is being done in social media and how we measure what we do in communications.

The Secretariat invited the ExCom to advise on key audiences among policymakers or the scientific community and to make sure that they are following us and to track that over several years.

Working Group III (WGIII) Co-Chair suggested a mention in the Communications Strategy of the special reports, the need for screening procedures on derivative products with IPCC branding, and referred to the nine constituencies served by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) as a useful way of thinking about broader audiences.

The Secretariat took note of the feedback and recommendations from the ExCom with the view to reflect them in the revised version of the revised Communications Strategy.

The ExCom took note of the report with recommendations.

4. RESPONSE TO POSSIBLE ERRORS IN COMPLETED ASSESSMENTS AND OTHER IPCC PRODUCTS

4.1 Update on the implementation of the Error Protocol and follow-up

The Secretariat informed the ExCom that since the last reporting at ExCom-90, three cases have been closed. Two new claims have been received and two cases are pending.

The ExCom took note of the Error Protocol report.

5. COORDINATION BETWEEN WORKING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES ON ACTIVITIES AND ISSUES PERTAINING TO THE PRODUCTION OF ASSESSMENTS AND OTHER RELEVANT IPCC PRODUCTS

5.1 Update on forthcoming meetings

- **60th Session and 60th (bis) Session of the IPCC Bureau**

The Secretary updated the ExCom on the plans for the 60th Session of the IPCC Bureau (BUR-60) noting that almost all the documents are posted in the Bureau portal and invitation letters have been sent.

ExCom requested if the deadline for receiving comments on the documents posted in the Bureau portal could be extended to 8 March 2021. ExCom suggested to have help desks for internet access by phone as some participants may not have electricity and there needs to be a backup phone access.

The Secretary commented that the Secretariat set the deadline to allow for sufficient time to compile the comments received. He will take into consideration the request to extend the deadline. He noted they have considered the issue of a help desk and to reinforce the staff to help with the logistics.

The Chair informed that at the last Bureau and Panel Session the date for comments was very close to the meeting and this created an enormous amount of burden on the Secretariat.

The ExCom took note of the update.

- **53rd (bis) Session of the IPCC**

The Secretary updated the ExCom on the preparations for the 53rd (bis) Session of the IPCC (IPCC-53 bis). The Secretary informed the ExCom that all the documents for the session have been posted and invitations have been sent.

ExCom highlighted the amount of work the Secretariat has and sought clarification as to why the Information Technology post (P.1) hasn't been filled yet.

The ExCom would like clarification on the transition to the seventh assessment cycle and what will be decided at IPCC-53 (bis) in relation to the Strategic Planning Schedule (SPS).

The Secretary informed the ExCom that the Secretariat is exploring options within the IPCC rules and procedures to support the expanded workload. He noted that the provisional agenda of IPCC-53 (bis) does not include the transition to the seventh cycle and the Panel is expected to consider the current SPS including the preparation for the 54th Session of the IPCC (IPCC-54).

The ExCom took note of the report.

- **54th Session of the IPCC**

The Secretary updated the ExCom on the preparations of the 54th Session of the IPCC (IPCC-54). In the first week of April, they should know more about vaccinations and all possibilities for the session. There have been discussions with Singapore, and the plenary should be in a hybrid format and make sure all participants can have access; there were

also mentions of a help desk and a backup phone line. The Secretariat is exploring other venues.

Working Group I Co-Chair highlighted that there are places with stringent conditions to ensure there is zero risk for being offline during the approval session. She is exploring options to make sure that for the Working Group I there could be a physical venue with robust internet.

The ExCom took note of the update.

- **Possible implications resulting from COVID-19 on IPCC Plenary Sessions**

The Secretariat updated the ExCom on the version 5.0 of the document outlining the COVID-19 implications on approval sessions which reflects the comments from the ExCom and the Operations Action Team (OAT). The document will be presented to the Bureau at BUR-60 and IPCC-53bis and with the view to inform the discussions on the Strategic Planning agenda item. She summarized the main changes to the document as following:

- The recent decision by the Panel on the changes to the Working Group I schedule
- Additional text on enabling conditions for holding the approval session of Working Group I.
- Additional text clarifying the differences between the considered options including what was and wasn't supported by the ExCom and why.

The Chair thanked the Secretariat for the version 5.0.

The ExCom took note of the update by the Secretariat.

5.2 UNESCO co-sponsorship proposal: Expert meeting on methodologies and approaches for working with indigenous and local knowledge systems in international environmental assessments

Following the United Nations Educational, Science and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) proposal for a co-sponsored expert meeting on methodologies and approaches for working with indigenous and local knowledge systems in international environmental assessments, the Chair clarified the steps for allowing co-sponsorship and informed that there will be a vetting process and that the Section 7.2 provisions will be followed.

IPCC Vice-Chair stated that it is the IPCC Chair and the relevant Co-Chairs to approve the workshop and not the ExCom, and that the IPCC Chair could consult with the Bureau as part of his process to build the trust with the Bureau.

ExCom suggested to use the word workshop as expert meetings were for specific topics and this involved cross-cutting topics. There would also need to be clarity on planned outcomes and also asked there be due separation between the two intergovernmental panels, Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and IPCC.

The Chair noted there are many elements to consider that aren't specified in Section 7.2 and we must be vigilant about safeguarding the values of the IPCC through this future co-sponsored workshop. As to whether it is called a workshop or an expert meeting, Section 7.2 is indifferent, and UNESCO has put forward a proposal of a co-sponsored international expert meeting.

The Chair concluded that all the suggestions made in the session will be considered by the Secretariat in the vetting process and the Bureau will be consulted if necessary.

The ExCom took note of the proposal of the co-sponsored workshop.

5.3 UN-HABITAT-GCoM co-sponsorship proposal: 2021 Innovate4Cities (I4C) Conference

Working Group II (WGII) Co-Chair provided a background on the UN-HABITAT/GCoM co-sponsorship proposal 2021 Innovate4Cities (I4C) Conference organized to note the importance of science and assemble its own resources to bring more knowledge to the table. The work from this co-sponsored event links back to the work of Working Group II.

The Chair clarified that there is a vetting process, and it ensures criteria have been met and Section 7.2 of Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC work followed. The proposal is the first step toward whether to allow co-sponsorship to this particular proposal.

WGII Co-Chair acknowledged the steps in the process and mentioned a plan for a scientific steering committee and hopes there will be representatives from all three working groups.

IPCC Legal Officer outlined the Section 7.2 of Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC work and noted it is a sub-section under the general heading of workshops and expert meetings, the Chair or the Co-Chairs then determine whether it will be useful. She stated that where there are financial implications then the Panel would decide. If there are no financial implications the co-chairs of the relevant working groups and the Chair would make that determination. She noted that there might be considerations to the extent that there are institutional concerns and if so, then the Panel would take note of the presentation and discuss possible ramifications.

The Chair informed the ExCom that an official response to the proposal should be given by the Secretariat. The Secretariat will conduct the vetting of various elements as indicated in Section 7.2, and those requirements need to be satisfied.

The ExCom took note of the report.

6. ANY OTHER MATTERS

6.1 Risk concerns for the IPCC regarding a co-sponsored workshop report

WGII Co-Chair updated the ExCom on how the co-sponsored meeting with IPBES was handled following concerns raised in the 89th Meeting of ExCom (ExCom-89). He clarified on three main points: how the workshop was run, how participants were chosen and how the meeting report is being prepared.

The meeting report is currently being reviewed internally and will be reviewed by the Scientific Steering Committee (SSC) Co-Chairs and will address the prescriptive language before it is sent for external review.

As to how experts were selected for the workshop, he noted that this was done by the SSC in a transparent process.

Because the workshop was held in a virtual format, participants prepared their inputs prior to the workshop. The final product was not yet decided on and there were arrangements to have a meeting report in the start-up section. The final outcome will have an Executive Summary and Annex and will include the scientific literature that has been reviewed. There

will be no inclusion of any confidence terms or key messages that will make it look like an IPCC assessment report. There will be a disclaimer to give full transparency and he suggested to share it informally and confidentially with the ExCom during the external review period.

ExCom commented that the concerns raised are legitimate and should not be overlooked and emphasized the issue is procedural, not political, and views not singular in this regard, that a workshop report documenting the meeting outcomes is expected as indicated in IPCC-LII/INF.7, and a scientific publication without IPCC involvement is expected as indicated in IPCC-LII/INF.7, and that the workshop report should be free of prescriptive language.

WGII Co-Chair stated the SSC will make sure the meeting report is line with IPCC rules and procedures and will not produce anything that is indicative of an IPCC assessment. The SSC will share the report with ExCom for transparency, if there is any advice it will be considered. It is necessary to keep the level of scientific rigour that the report is heading for. He will take on board the concerns addressed by ExCom.

The IPCC Legal Officer updated the ExCom on the legal review of the co-sponsored meeting, as attached in Annex 2. She stated there were concerns expressed in the ExCom and via email and there has been no change, therefore the concerns remain the same. There are two actions to address this, the first on the scientific output and the second is the institutional risk. Despite assurances there can be no risk to the institution of the IPCC, to its values, its name and to its identity and the rules that are set out on co-sponsorship are an important set of lines to follow. If there is a particular risk, that needs to be verified before proceeding any further. If the changes are not satisfactory the Bureau could consider prohibiting the use of the IPCC name, the logo or the co-sponsorship. The step of verification needs to be included in this process.

IPCC Secretary stated that the rules apply noting the proposal discussed and referring to the Panel decision which highlights two deliverables, with one being the workshop proceedings, and the Panel document envisaged a scientific paper. The workshop proceeding should not have the IPCC logo or name if it is far from the values of the IPCC. The deliverable should be a workshop proceeding.

The Chair stated that the legal review stands and brought to the attention of the ExCom paragraph 22 of the review, i.e., "ExCom invites through the Secretariat the Bureau to consider prohibiting the uses of the IPCC logo, IPCC name and distinction of IPCC co-sponsorship by the above-mentioned workshop until the concerns regarding IPCC fundamental values are fully addressed." The Chair concluded that the ExCom would wait for the result of corrections to be made by the WGII Co-Chair and if the outcome of the corrections is not satisfactory, then the measures indicated in the legal review (para 22) will take effect.

The ExCom took note of the next steps as indicated in the legal review.

- **The next meeting of the ExCom**

The Secretary updated the ExCom that the next meeting of ExCom is scheduled for the first week of April but there is the BUR-60bis and then Easter. A doodle poll will be sent to find a suitable date.

The Chair concluded the 91st Meeting of ExCom.

**IPCC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – NINETY-FIRST MEETING
Teleconference, 3 March 2021**

EXCOM-XCI/Doc. 1, Rev.1
(2.03.2021)
Agenda Item: 1
ENGLISH ONLY

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

- 1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**
- 2. URGENT ISSUES RELATED TO IPCC PRODUCTS AND PROGRAMME OF WORK THAT REQUIRE PROMPT ATTENTION BY THE IPCC BETWEEN PANEL SESSIONS**
 - 2.1 Coronavirus related issues: Impact on AR6 schedules and products
 - Update on the changes to the schedule of the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI).
- 3. COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH ACTIVITIES**
 - 3.1 Ongoing and planned activities
 - 3.2 Update on the IPCC Communications Strategy
- 4. RESPONSE TO POSSIBLE ERRORS IN COMPLETED ASSESSMENTS AND OTHER IPCC PRODUCTS**
 - 4.1 Update on the implementation of the Error Protocol and follow-up
- 5. COORDINATION BETWEEN WORKING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES ON ACTIVITIES AND ISSUES PERTAINING TO THE PRODUCTION OF ASSESSMENTS AND OTHER RELEVANT IPCC PRODUCTS**
 - 5.1 Update on forthcoming meetings:
 - 60th Session and 60th (bis) Session of the IPCC Bureau
 - 53rd (Bis) Session of the IPCC
 - Possible implications resulting from COVID-19 on IPCC Plenary Sessions
 - 5.2 UNESCO co-sponsorship proposal: Expert meeting on methodologies and approaches for working with indigenous and local knowledge systems in international environmental assessments
 - 5.3 UN-HABITAT-GCoM co-sponsorship proposal: 2021 Innovate4Cities (I4C) Conference

6. ANY OTHER MATTERS

6.1 Risk concerns for the IPCC regarding a co-sponsored workshop report

Legal review of risk concerns for the IPCC regarding an IPBES/IPCC co-sponsored workshop report

I. Executive Summary

1. IPCC Participants to the IPBES/IPCC co-sponsored workshop of 14–17 December 2020 have raised concerns regarding representations within the co-sponsored workshop report, specifying that such representations violate fundamental values as identified to the IPCC and set out in its Principles.
2. IPCC fundamental values are those as set out in the Principles Governing IPCC Work, which define the role of the IPCC, how the IPCC is to undertake assessments, and the nature of representations to be made by the IPCC.
3. A workshop report identified to the IPCC poses risks to the integrity of the IPCC Principles where representations made in the workshop report violate IPCC fundamental values. Such identification follows from association with the IPCC name, IPCC logo, distinction of IPCC co-sponsorship, representation by IPCC WG Co-Chairs, participation of Bureau members in the Scientific Steering Committee, presentation on the IPCC website, and linkage of the IPCC name in any media promotion. Such risks require an institutional response where these risks, including with regard to considerations of timing, are not adequately addressed by use of a disclaimer, nor by representatives to the IPCC.
4. Concerns expressed to the co-sponsored workshop leadership have not resulted in timely responses adequately addressing these concerns. Consequently, in view of the risks posed to IPCC fundamental values through association of the IPCC with the workshop report, including with regard to considerations of timing, institutional action to safeguard the IPCC values and identity is advised to address the concerns raised, with the IPCC acting intersessionally through the Executive Committee (ExCom).

II. Background and Issue

5. IPCC participants in the IPBES/IPCC co-sponsored workshop of 14–17 December 2020 have raised concerns about representations within a confidential draft workshop report made available to the participants. The representations noted throughout the draft report are observed to include policy positions, prescriptive language and value judgements. The workshop report is seen as posing risks both to the fundamental values of the IPCC process of scientific rigor and neutrality, and to the integrity of the IPCC as an institution as supported by these fundamental values, with foreseeable impacts on the activities of the IPCC, since the report will be associated with the IPCC through various official means.
6. These concerns note a need for immediate action regarding the risks surrounding the timeline envisaged for release, i.e. if released as ostensibly shared with the Panel without prior Panel review, this is likely to jeopardize the institution of the IPCC through undermining its principles and values, and impacting the essential scheduled work of the IPCC, including the upcoming approval sessions.
7. The issues for consideration are the nature of the representations made in the workshop report; whether these representations pose risk as related to identification of the

workshop report to the IPCC; and means for addressing risk to the IPCC, including for co-sponsored workshops.

III. Review

8. The workshop report is an outcome of a co-sponsored workshop, as presented to the Panel (IPCC-LII/INF.7) at its 52nd Session (Paris, France, February 2020) which took note of the presentation for a co-sponsored workshop. Regarding procedures on the conduct and management of the workshop, the Scientific Steering Committee (SSC) for the IPBES/IPCC co-sponsored workshop was established to undertake these, as in alignment with IPCC-LII/INF.7. In alignment with section 7.2 of the IPCC rules applicable for co-sponsored workshops, the workshop report outcome, as a non-IPCC product, further carries a disclaimer that the report does not imply IPCC endorsement or approval.¹ A subsequent legal review noted that there was no contravention of the IPCC rules applicable for co-sponsored workshops with regard to the SSC determination of workshop conduct and format of the workshop outcomes.
9. The matter of organization of the co-sponsored workshop and the format of the workshop report outcome may be distinguished from the issue of representations made within the workshop report: format decisions go to appearance and layout, while representations are as to positions or facts.² With regard to any material as identified to the IPCC, representations must be in alignment with the IPCC Principles.³
10. The representations in the confidential draft workshop report made available to the participants have been flagged by IPCC workshop participants as violating IPCC fundamental values. IPCC fundamental values are based on the Principles Governing IPCC Work, and further enunciated by the IPCC Panel in its Communications Strategy⁴. IPCC fundamental values are identified both to the mandated role of the IPCC and how the IPCC is to undertake its work.⁵ Specifically, these fundamental values as set out in the IPCC Principles provide for language that is policy neutral, objective, open, transparent, non-prescriptive, of consistent messaging, and as building on language that as accepted, adopted or approved by the members of the Panel. These fundamental values are essential to the work of the IPCC, to ensure that work identified to the IPCC is presented as policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive, i.e. policy-neutral and maintaining scientific balance.

Draft workshop report characteristics, Nature of representations

11. IPCC workshop participants have specified that the representations in the draft workshop report include policy positions, prescriptive language, wording in conjunction with sensitive issues and value judgements. These specifications include that the result is not a workshop proceeding following past practice as there was no workshop but work on a draft report⁶; the existence of this draft prior to the workshop is an important factor, differentiating this workshop from the previous co-sponsored workshops. This raises questions about who selected the authors of the draft and the role of participants who attended the workshop later. Notably, this FOD which became a basis for the 14-17

¹ Principles Governing IPCC Work (“IPCC Principles”), Appendix A, Section 7.2.

² “Representations”, see Black’s Law Dictionary, 11th ed.

³ IPCC Principles, paragraph 2.

⁴ See IPCC Communications Strategy, adopted by the Panel at the Thirty-Fifth Session (Geneva, 6–9 June 2012), amended at the Forty-Fourth Session (Bangkok, 17-20 October 2016).

⁵ IPCC Principles, paragraph 2 « Role ».

⁶ “First Order Draft: Solving the climate and biodiversity challenges together. Confidential draft report of the joint IPBES-IPCC expert workshop, 10 December 2020”. The workshop was held on 14-17 December 2020.

Dec workshop looks like an IPCC product with authors selected through the IPCC process. Moreover, no such joint expert workshop was approved, as IPCC-LII/INF.7 took note of a co-sponsored workshop and not a joint expert workshop. The IPCC workshop participants have further indicated that the result is a scientific report that does not build on earlier reports, instead using a top-down approach; the report has all appearances of an assessment report without the actual controls and involvement that must be associated with such an assessment report; use of prescriptive language, e.g. promoting nature-based solutions, % targets for dedication of used land area for conservation and mitigation; many sentences are phrased with "must"; frequent wording as distinct from past practice within IPCC, e.g. "climate crisis"; value judgements, e.g. on nature-based solutions, on mitigation risks as expressed in the present sense; there are statements that require coherency checks with messages as put forth from WG III; sensitive issues behind approach, e.g. geopolitical strategies promoted by limited and select countries; there is a risk of perception of "green colonialism" in context of development challenges and land rights.

12. IPCC participants have further noted that concerns raised have not been timely addressed: despite numerous efforts to engage on the deviation from IPCC fundamental values regarding, *inter alia*, policy neutrality, policy prescriptive language and value judgements presented, IPCC participants to the workshop have stated that there have been no changes to the report regarding these fundamental values despite their reaching out to both IPBES and IPCC workshop leadership, including the SSC representatives of the IPCC, also with a view to the pending release of the workshop report. Additionally, IPCC participants to the workshop have indicated absence of full disclosure of updates from IPBES on the co-sponsored workshop.

Areas of risk

13. The representations as indicated by the IPCC participants pose risk to the IPCC fundamental values to the extent that the workshop report is identified to the IPCC. Such identification results from the report association with the IPCC through official means such as usages of the IPCC name and IPCC logo, the distinction of IPCC co-sponsorship, representation by IPCC Co-Chairs, participation of IPCC Bureau members on the Scientific Steering Committee (SSC), presentation of the report on the IPCC official website, and through media promotion referencing the IPCC.
14. IPCC distinction and character through use of IPCC name and IPCC logo
The IPCC name and IPCC logo convey the distinction and character of the IPCC and represent as such its fundamental values. These values are set out in the IPCC Principles, indicating what may be expected of the organization and its work. From a legal point of view, these values play a critical role in decisions taken on how work takes place within the IPCC, as well as the perception of the work from an external standpoint, having a brand and identity value. Accordingly, any usages of the elements of the IPCC name and IPCC logo have legal ramifications extending to distinctive intellectual property asset components which convey the purpose and values associated with the IPCC. Thus, any usages of the IPCC name and IPCC logo for the workshop report will impart association with IPCC fundamental values, including as to the representations in the report.
15. IPCC distinction: co-sponsorship, IPCC Bureau members, IPCC Co-Chairs
IPCC co-sponsorship for the IPBES/IPCC workshop presents further considerations as engaging IPCC fundamental values: in addition to identifying the IPCC through its name as co-sponsor, co-sponsorship entails Panel recognition of the workshop and establishment of the SSC responsible for the management and organization of the workshop; with the IPCC as one of two co-sponsors, external perception of the designated IPBES/IPCC co-sponsored workshop may logically follow that the IPCC is

engaged at least to 50% of the workshop, so that the IPCC fundamental values are identified to the workshop and its report.⁷ Further, IPCC Bureau members are seen to participate on the workshop SSC and may be deemed to approve of any internal and external review process, along with engagement of IPCC Working Group Co-Chairs as designated representatives for the IPCC and therefore accountable on respective IPCC-related matters to the IPCC. Such linkages of Panel, IPCC Bureau and IPCC Co-Chairs with the co-sponsorship, with the SSC and any perceived linkage of involvement with the workshop report engages the IPCC fundamental values to the extent that the IPCC will be deemed to have identified itself to any representations made in the workshop report.

16. Publication on IPCC website and timeline for release of report

It is further noted that the workshop report is to be uploaded to the IPCC website. Thus, the workshop report which is an unofficial, non-endorsed document and indicated by IPCC participants to the workshop as violating IPCC fundamental values will appear as accessible alongside official IPCC publications, likewise bearing the IPCC name and the IPCC logo. As past and customary practices have not indicated that reports which violate IPCC fundamental values are to be so published, publication would require IPCC to review and make recommendations. However, the envisaged timeline for publication of the report pre-empts any Panel review in light of current scheduling constraints. Thus, the workshop report would be published without appropriate Panel review as to risks, as a deliverable not in alignment with IPCC fundamental values.

17. Media promotion

A proposed launch press conference on the workshop report raises concerns as regarding the basis of a press release with any reference to the IPCC. As any media promotion or a press release will reference the co-sponsors to the workshop, this would include reference to the IPCC, with the workshop report designated as an outcome of this IPCC co-sponsored workshop. Consequently, the IPCC would be associated with the workshop report, including where the workshop report violates IPCC fundamental values. To the extent that the IPCC Communications Programme would be involved in such media promotion, this would further identify the IPCC to the report representations of the co-sponsored workshop.

Provisions for risk under Section 7.2: use of disclaimer

18. The Principles Governing IPCC Work, Appendix A, Section 7.2 provide for use of a disclaimer as to no implication of IPCC endorsement or approval of proceedings recommendations or conclusions, and absence of any IPCC review as to papers or report. Although the workshop report will carry such a disclaimer, the weight of this disclaimer must be balanced against the scope of risk posed to the IPCC, given the above noted seven areas of risk that lead to a violation of IPCC fundamental values. While the disclaimer is a statement of non-IPCC endorsement or approval, this must be seen in light of the signals of tacit approval through use of IPCC name, IPCC logo and the designation of being an IPCC co-sponsored workshop. Additionally, the participation of IPCC Bureau members and Co-Chairs will convey that these had inputs on the review process and exercised judgment with a view to IPCC fundamental values. Moreover, both publication on the IPCC website alongside IPCC official publications further bearing the IPCC name and IPCC logo will make differentiation between official IPCC approved publications and the workshop report as non-approved incongruous, while any media promotion will place the IPCC in a contradictory position of promoting a workshop report that it neither endorses nor approves. Consequently, in view of the areas of risk in which IPCC fundamental values are engaged, the use of a disclaimer

⁷ See IPCC-LII/INF.7.

cannot disassociate the distinction and character of the IPCC with the co-sponsored workshop, with report representations as violating the fundamental values of the IPCC.

Role of IPCC representatives in limiting risk to IPCC fundamental values

19. The IPCC provided for IPCC representatives within the SSC as set out in IPCC LII/INF.7, specifically Working Group II Co-Chairs. As IPCC representatives in the SSC, they are accountable to the IPCC with regard to the values and interests of the IPCC, including with respect to the alignment of the outcomes of the co-sponsored workshop with IPCC fundamental values. However, IPCC workshop participants have specified that these concerns have not been adequately addressed either directly by the Working Group II Co-Chairs, the SSC, or the co-sponsor IPBES. With respect to the representations made in the workshop report, any intervention by the IPCC representatives has shown no indication of preventing the violation of IPCC fundamental values.

IV. Conclusion and steps forward

Institutional response

20. As set out above, the weight of the final report bearing the use of the IPCC name, IPCC logo and IPCC distinction of co-sponsorship, engagement of IPCC Bureau members and IPCC Co-Chairs, publication through the IPCC official website, and any media promotion all carry a risk of undermining and compromising IPCC fundamental values that go to the institutional role of the IPCC, how the IPCC is to undertake assessments, and the nature of representations to be made by the IPCC. As the scope of risk noted herein so strongly identifies the workshop report to the IPCC as to overwhelm the meaning of any disclaimer, and as the concerns raised have not been adequately addressed by designated IPCC representatives, in view of the timeline for release of the report, the IPCC needs to take timely institutional action to limit the potential and foreseeable damage to IPCC fundamental values.
21. While formal review of the workshop report is not within the purview of ExCom authority, in view of the risks indicated and with a view to the timeline for release of the report as noted above and IPCC Plenary not in session, ExCom has the appropriate role to safeguard the alignment of IPCC fundamental values as to the representations of the workshop report, acting intersessionally for the IPCC Panel. In this regard, ExCom has every right to review areas of risk as noted herein, including the uses of the IPCC logo, IPCC name and distinction of IPCC co-sponsorship, where these impinge on the fundamental values of the IPCC, and to suspend use of the IPCC name and logo until the concerns regarding IPCC fundamental values are fully addressed at the appropriate institutional level by the co-sponsor IPBES.

Steps to be taken

22. ExCom invites through the Secretariat the Bureau to consider prohibiting the uses of the IPCC logo, IPCC name and distinction of IPCC co-sponsorship by the above-mentioned workshop until the concerns regarding IPCC fundamental values are fully addressed.

IPCC Legal Officer
02 March 2021