

REPORT OF THE FIFTY-SEVENTH SESSION OF THE IPCC

Geneva, Switzerland, 27 – 30 September 2022

1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

The Secretary of the IPCC, Mr Abdalah Mokssit, moderating the opening session, invited the delegates to take their seats, noting that this was the first in-person plenary since the COVID-19 pandemic. The Secretary announced speakers in the opening ceremony and invited the Chair to take the floor.

The Chair of the IPCC, Mr Hoesung Lee, called the Fifty-seventh Session of the IPCC (IPCC-57) to order at 10:00 (CEST) on Monday 27 September 2022 and welcomed delegates to the Fifty-seventh Session of IPCC, noting it was the first in-person session since the Fifty-second Session of the IPCC in Paris in February 2020.

In his opening remarks, the Chair reminded the delegates about the IPCC's accomplishments despite of the challenges caused by COVID-19 pandemic including six electronic and written sessions and complex approval sessions of three assessment reports and flagged that the key findings from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) have influenced important decisions from governments during these critical years for the global climate. He added that the Synthesis Report (SYR) will be presented to the Panel early next year for approval and adoption, concluding the sixth assessment cycle.

The Chair acknowledged the efforts of the Working Group Bureaus, their Co-Chairs and authors as well as Technical Support Units for their contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report under extraordinary circumstances caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Chair announced the remarks by the Secretary-General of the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) Petteri Taalas, the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Inger Andersen, the Deputy Secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Ovais Sarmad and the Head of the International Affairs Division the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment, Ambassador Franz Yaver Perrez.

The Secretary-General of the World Meteorological Organisation Petteri Taalas took the floor, welcoming the three assessment reports and the forthcoming SYR which will feed into the Twenty-eighth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 28) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in the United Arab Emirates. He stressed the evidence of climate change, the growing frequency of extreme weather events and referenced recent examples from Pakistan, Africa, China, Cuba, the United States of America and Europe. Although climate change has been overshadowed by the pandemic and the crisis in Ukraine, the view in the United Nations (UN), is that the climate change is the biggest challenge for mankind. Mr Taalas highlighted the importance of early warning and observing systems in addressing the climate change challenge and a referred to a major Early Warning initiative mandated by the United Nations Secretary-General to be launched and approved and endorsed by the Twenty-seventh session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 27) to the UNFCCC. He also stressed investments into "Cruse" programme and in hydrological monitoring and related services and the WMO initiative for the monitoring greenhouse gases by using ground-based stations, satellite measurements and simulation and modelling tools. He also flagged political interest in exploring solar radiation modification technologies and the related risks.

Mr Taalas praised the work of the IPCC Secretariat supported by WMO and UNEP, inviting further financial support for the IPCC.

Through a pre-recorded video message UNEP Executive Director Inger Anderson highlighted the role of the IPCC in addressing the climate crisis as well as the triple planetary crisis (climate change – biodiversity and nature loss - pollution and waste). She stressed that IPCC science has been critical to bringing everyone to the understanding of the climate crisis and helping to solve the climate crisis. She further noted that the seventh cycle will be crucial as countries need IPCC to guide them as they go deeper into the implementation and extended an invitation to Nairobi for the Fifty-ninth Session of the IPCC (IPCC-59).

Through a pre-recorded video message, the UNFCCC Deputy Secretary Ovais Sarmad said that the work of the UNFCCC Parties relies on the scientific evidence provided by the IPCC stressing that the IPCC assessments reports supported by facts, data and scientific evidence are the bedrock of UNFCCC endeavours.

Through a pre-recorded video message, the Head of the International Affairs Division the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment, Ambassador Franz Yaver Perrez who spoke on behalf of Switzerland as the host country of the session, stressed the importance of timely delivery of the SYR with the view to inform the first Global Stocktake in 2023. He also stressed the importance of the IPCC-57 in view of reaching decisions that can enable a smooth and fast transition to the seventh assessment cycle.

The Secretary took the floor, concluding the opening ceremony.

The Chair drew the attention of the Panel to the provisional agenda for the Session and invited the Secretary of the IPCC to introduce this item and the relevant document (IPCC-LVII/Doc. 1, Rev. 2).

The Secretary presented the item and the document, noting that the Secretariat received many requests for inclusion of new items either under the item on Any other Business or in the core of the provisional agenda and it was suggested for delegates to make their respective proposals as needed at the Session.

Australia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania and the United States of America took the floor.

Delegates expressed their appreciation to the Chair, and the Secretariat for the preparations and organization of the Session and the Government of Switzerland for hosting it.

Many were appreciative to return to in-person meetings after two years of virtual meetings due to the COVID-19 pandemic. While some acknowledged the effectiveness of online plenary sessions, they also recognized the importance of face-to-face exchanges, in particular when discussing strategic decisions about the future of the IPCC.

Some delegates highlighted the role of the IPCC reports in underpinning the global work to combat climate change and achieve the goals of the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement. They commended the IPCC Bureau for the outstanding leadership, the authors for their work during this sixth assessment cycle, and the Secretariat and the Technical Support Units (TSUs) for their support, acknowledging that this cycle has been one of the most challenging cycles in IPCC history, due to both to the increased number of reports and the challenges created by the COVID-19 pandemic. Other delegates highlighted the importance of the lessons learnt from the Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) cycle in preparation for the transition to the Seventh Assessment Report (AR7). Some congratulated the IPCC for making progress in involving a relatively larger number of authors from developing countries in the current cycle and it was suggested to advance

this work in the future. It was also proposed to pay greater focus on equity and climate justice in the future assessments.

Congratulations were also extended to the Chair of the IPCC for being named to the 2021 Bloomberg 50 by Bloomberg Business week, as proof that the messages of the IPCC have clearly been delivered to the people around the world. It was highlighted that the IPCC is more significant than ever.

In relation to the Provisional Agenda, there were diverging views on whether to add additional topics, which ones and under which items.

Some delegates requested an additional agenda item on the timing of the new Bureau elections and on the duration of the next cycle noting that relevant decisions taken previously by the Panel were now obsolete due to the rescheduling of the Synthesis Report and the importance to have a smooth transition to the next cycle. Some delegates said that a discussion on the possible length of the seventh assessment cycle is important for the countries who might nominate Bureau members, as well as for the potential candidates. Other delegates explained that as the Ad-hoc Group (AHG) on the Size, Structure and Composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau for the seventh assessment cycle prepared a report which contains additional considerations raised by its members that are outside the mandate of the Group (Annex B of [IPCC-LVII/Doc. 6](#)), but all these additional topics could be looked at under the proposed item. Some suggested that it would be useful to also consider in these discussions the document on *Working Group Co-Chairs' Perspectives on Lessons Learned from AR6* ([IPCC-LVII/INF. 12](#)), which was included under the item on Any other Business.

There were different proposals as to the title of the item and its placement in the agenda.

Some delegates were not in favor of expanding the discussions related to the AHG, pointing to the limited time during this Session and reminding the Panel that the AHG had a clear mandate from the Fifty-third (bis) Session of the IPCC (IPCC-53 bis) with others noting that adding this item would enable the Panel to agree on the Terms of References of a Task Group mandated to work inter-sessional on the agreed topics. Some delegates said that such important topics would have required extensive consultations with their governments in advance and should have been discussed first in the Bureau.

Discussions took place on the work on the Synthesis Report (SYR) noting that the dedicated time and scope for discussions on the SYR was limited and had to be broadened to cover the modalities for the rest of the work and the plan for the approval session. Some said that decisions need to be taken as it regards the SYR, which would not be possible under the current item 7 on Progress Reports, where the SYR was included, as the practice for this type of items was for the Panel to take note.

Another proposed item was one on the IPCC Copyright Policy being added under the item on Any other Business. The rationale behind this proposal was to better promote the key messages of the IPCC reports as various institutions usually distribute adapted versions of the figures of the reports or prepare translations of the reports in various national languages. Speakers were saying that the current policy was restrictive and may pose some challenges in making the work of the IPCC accessible. The proposal was to initiate the process and discuss the current IPCC Copyright Policy, and if needed, review it to ensure that it would help in communicating the IPCC assessments as broadly as possible.

There was a request to hear about collaboration with the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and if there has been progress under a suitable agenda item such as a short reporting under item 8, if found appropriate.

Appreciation was expressed to the Co-Chairs for sharing their reflections in the AR6 cycle with a document on the lessons learnt that was included under Any other Business. Due to the importance of this report, some were suggesting that item 10 is not the place for the Co-Chairs' report, and should be elevated to new agenda item, so that it allows for the Panel to take decisions based on the AR6 lessons to inform the AR7 process.

The IPCC Chair thanked the Panel member for their inputs and proposed a way forward. With regard to the Copyright Policy, he suggested for this to be under the item on Any other Business. As for SYR consideration, he proposed the Panel hear first the progress report from the SYR Technical Support Unit (TSU), and then the Panel may wish to go further in the discussions building on the progress report. With regard to Agenda Item 5, he clarified that this item is about the size, structure and composition of the Bureau and the Task Force Bureau in the seventh assessment cycle, and that the Panel is requested to take a decision on this. Once the Panel has this decision, they can then have a discussion about the smooth transition to the next Bureau. His proposal was that, after an initial round of discussions in Plenary on item 5, he would propose the establishment of a contact group to allow speedy deliberations and conclusions of this Agenda item 5. He suggested placing the item on the smooth transition to the next cycle under Any other Business.

Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Indonesia, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania and the United States of America as well as Ms Valérie Masson-Delmotte, IPCC Working Group I Co-Chair, Ms Ko Barrett, Vice-Chair of the IPCC, Ms Diána Ürge-Vorsatz, IPCC Working Group III Vice-Chair and Mr Taha Zatari, Vice-Chair of Working Group II took the floor.

Delegations expressed appreciation to the Chair for the proposal. Some requested clarification as to whether having the topic of smooth transition to the next cycle under Any other Business would allow enough time for discussions. There was a request to explore whether the Secretariat could consider moving this item forward in the discussions due to the importance of the topic. It was also said that the item would not be only related to the transition to the new Bureau, but broader than that. It is about transitioning to the next cycle and would be important to start thinking about the strategic planning even for the next plenaries for 2023.

The Chair explained that it would depend on how efficiently and with what speed the Panel can deal with the regular agenda items before reaching Any other Business. He said that he would consult with the Secretariat about the timing on certain elements under Any other Business.

A question arose as to whether the Panel can take decision under items included in Any other Business. Speakers said it was crucial to have an agenda item under which decisions could be taken for example on the term of the next Bureau as the rule 8 of [Appendix C to the Principles Governing IPCC Work](#) says that “the term of the IPCC Bureau shall be defined at least one Session prior to the one at which the IPCC Bureau is elected”. As the Bureau should be elected as soon as possible after the SYR approval and as the next session will be dedicated to the approval of the SYR, there will be no time to hold these kinds of discussions. That’s why this decision needs to be taken at this Session and we need an agenda item.

Some delegations requested that the item is considered as item 5 bis in the context of the discussion on the AHG. Others expressed the views that there is no need to separate the discussions on the AHG from those on the smooth transition or to wait for a decision on item 5 to be able to start discussions on the other item, as certain discussions need prioritizing.

Other delegations supported the proposal made by the Chair and suggested that there was a need to work on the agenda items that were already pre-assigned and the sequence should be followed and maintained.

Some delegates pointed out that moving forward new agenda items from Any Other Business would set a precedent that not everyone agreed with.

Others raised concerns about having contact groups especially in parallel to the Plenary as small delegations will not be able to fully participate in the discussions.

Delegates also highlighted that the IPCC Bureau has an important role to play in preparing the Plenary meetings and requested to have a Bureau meeting prior to the next Panel session.

Some were suggesting that they may block the adoption of the agenda if relevant agenda items were not included. Others stated that the current Bureau, TSUs and authors have been working on the AR6 for the last 7 years and having a decision in this Session for the timeline of the next elections is important for the working arrangements.

Some delegates proposed consultations in the break. Others suggested to provisionally adopt the agenda as it is and proceed with the rest of the work while consultations continue that would allow to adopt the agenda at a later stage.

The Chair reminded the delegates that the Panel works by consensus and currently there was no consensus regarding the right place to discuss the elements related to the transition to the next Bureau. He invited the Panel to adopt the agenda and noted that the Secretariat will consider the best way to address the concerns raised by some governments having enough time to discuss elements regarding the transition and lessons learned in the context of helping from the AR6 to the AR7 transition.

The Secretary clarified that the Panel is a supreme body and can take decisions as it regards items under Any other Business. The IPCC Legal Officer, Ms Jennifer Lew Schneider, reiterated this.

The Secretary also clarified that other agenda items should not be linked to item 5. He called for flexibility and proposed to add an item on "Transition to the next cycle with related issues" under Any other Business as proposed by the Chair, with an asterisk clarifying that this item will be scheduled in a timely manner during the Plenary.

Delegations expressed appreciation and requested the Secretariat to produce a conference paper on the revised agenda to be discussed after the break.

The Chair concluded that the Secretariat will prepare a written document on the agenda to be reviewed and adopted by the Panel.

Following the break, the Chair resumed item 10.3 and invited the Secretary to take the floor.

The Secretary reported that the relevant proposal with the new elements on the agenda has been posted as a conference paper.

The Chair invited the Panel to adopt the amended Provisional Agenda as proposed by the Secretariat.

Canada, Germany, Ghana, Luxembourg, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania and the United States of America took the floor.

Some delegations stated that they would be happy to accept this but that it would be important for them not to wait for the item 5 to be concluded before starting with the discussions on the new item 10.3 on the transitions to the next cycle.

Some delegates proposed that the newly added item on the transition will only cover timing of the election and the length of the cycle, and this has to be clearly stated. They reiterated that the discussions on these added items should only take place after the conclusion of item 5.

Other delegations disagreed to restrict the item just to timing and elections for the next cycle, with the view to include also lessons learned and other topics. Suggestions were made to take this item first to the Bureau for their consideration before discussing it with the Panel since this discussion was going beyond the original agenda.

The Chair invited a huddle led by Ms Malak Al-Nory, Saudi Arabia, and Mr Farhan Akhtar, USA to look at the areas of divergence on the formulation of the Agenda Item 10.3. He also proposed to adopt this Provisional Agenda as it was with the understanding that the agreed wording will be provided to all the Panel members later and then the Panel will accept that agreed language as an agenda for this session. This would allow everyone to move to the next item.

The Secretary clarified that this proposal was made with the view of saving time and making progress on other items.

The Chair encouraged the huddle to produce an outcome in full consideration of the discussions from the Plenary. He invited the Panel to move on to the next item of the provisional agenda while waiting for the outcome of the huddle.

Following the conclusion of the huddle, the Chair resumed item 10.3 and invited the two co-facilitators of the huddle Ms Malak Al-Nory and Mr Farhan Akhtar to report on the outcome of the discussions.

Ms Al-Nory reported that a huddle was formed with a specific mandate to formulate a title of Agenda Item 10.3. The huddle agreed on the title *Transition to the Next Assessment Cycle with Related Matters (lessons learned, timing of elections and length of the next cycle)*. It was also agreed that this item would conclude after the conclusion of Agenda Item 5.

The Chair expressed gratitude to the two co-facilitators and the proposal produced by the huddle. The Chair invited the Panel to adopt the Provisional Agenda.

The IPCC adopted the provisional agenda as contained in document IPCC-LVII/Doc.1, Rev. 2, with the inclusion of additional items to be discussed under Any Other Business: IPCC Copyright Policy; and Transition to the Next Assessment Cycle with Related Matters (lessons learned, timing of elections and length of the next cycle). A revised version of the Provisional Agenda ([IPCC-LVII/Doc.1, Rev. 3](#)) has been issued to reflect the addition of agenda items as agreed by the Panel.

2. APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE IPCC

The Chair of the IPCC invited the Secretary of the IPCC to introduce Document [IPCC-LVII/Doc.4](#), the Draft report of the Fifty-sixth Session of the IPCC (IPCC-56).

The Secretary presented the agenda item and document [IPCC-LVII/Doc.4](#) and said that the first draft of the report was distributed for comments on 26 July 2022, and subsequently revised to address the received comments by the set deadline with the final version now being submitted to the Plenary for approval.

The Chair opened the floor for comments.

Switzerland and Belgium took the floor. Switzerland, while ready to approve the report, sought clarification about an imbalance in the reporting as it regards the countries' statements, in the closing of the session. Belgium commented on the text on page 3, which refers to Observer Organizations being requested as per the rules to be silent in Contact Group meetings during the WGIII-1. Belgium proposes "as per the rules" to be deleted from the paragraph adding that this was contrary to previous practice and that procedures of this nature should not be changed without a decision from the Panel.

The Chair said that the report will be corrected as proposed by Belgium. The comments from Switzerland will be included in the report of this meeting.

The Panel approved the draft report of the Fifty-sixth Session of the IPCC.

3. IPCC TRUST FUND PROGRAMME AND BUDGET

3.1 Budget for the years 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025

The Chair opened the Agenda Item 3.1, document [IPCC-LVII/Doc. 2](#) and [IPCC-LVII/Doc. 2, Add. 1](#) on the IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget – Budget for the years 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025 and invited Judith Ewa, Programme Officer to present the documents.

She summarized the contents of document IPCC-LVII/Doc. 2 stating that the opening balance in the IPCC Trust Fund, as at 1 January 2022, was CHF 18,078,000; that total income received as at 23 September 2022 stood at CHF 3,466,712 with income in the pipeline estimated at CHF 5,075,790; that total expenditure stood at CHF 2,851,000 with a total savings of CHF 2,216,760 which is attributed to meetings/activities either being held virtually or postponed to 2023; that the projected interim closing balance at 31 December 2022 is estimated at CHF 23,769,502. She provided an overview of the summary of income and expenditure, a list of governments and organizations that had made a contribution to the Trust Fund in 2022, the status of Income and Expenditure of the IPCC Trust Fund in 2022, a summary of contributions since inception (1989-2022), contributions under the International Public Sector Accounting Standard (IPSAS), the interim statement of comparison of budget and actual amounts and a list of in-kind contributions/activities (January-June 2022). Also, presented the budget for the Secretariat including a newly proposed position at P-4 level and provided an overview of the IPCC Trust Fund budget (2022-2025) including the connectivity costs associated to virtual meetings, the revised 2022 budget, the proposed 2023 budget, the forecast 2024 budget, the indicative 2025 budget, the provisional agenda for the Financial Task Team (FiTT).

Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Republic of Korea, Sweden, Switzerland, United States of America, Venezuela, Mr Greg Flato, Vice Chair of Working Group I and Ms Diana Urge-Vorsatz, Vice Chair of Working Group III, took the floor.

Many delegates appreciated the level of voluntary contributions leading to the good financial health of the IPCC Trust Fund and the work of the Secretariat in managing the finances of the Trust Fund.

Comments made were as to an omission in 2022 budget of Ireland's in-kind contribution as the host country for the Third Core-Writing Team meeting for the Synthesis Report (SYR); seeking clarification on the recording of the 2022 contribution from the Republic of Korea; seeking clarification on the amount in the budget line "Publications/Translation" for 2023 and whether the increase in the "Secretariat" budget line, due to the re-costing of the current posts as well the addition of the newly-proposed position, will be reflected in the budget tables through to 2025. A delegate sought clarification on the financial implication associated with the possible increase to the number of Bureau members. Other comments made included a notification of upcoming contributions from Finland and United States of America. As to lessons learned while transitioning to the next cycle, there was a request for the assessment of the financial implications of holding virtual and hybrid meetings with the view to presenting this information in the budget tables presented to a future session of the IPCC.

A request was made for more information including the reasoning behind the newly proposed P-4 post in the IPCC Secretariat. Additional information was sought on the Communications budget especially with regard to the planning and nature of communication activities and an explanation was sought on the cost of a plenary session as compared to that of a Bureau session. Some regret was expressed that a Bureau meeting could not take place before the Fifty-seventh Session of the IPCC (IPCC-57) as it was felt that a proposed Bureau meeting in February 2023 would be too late.

In response to the above questions and comments, Ms Judith Ewa, Programme Officer, indicated that the omission of Ireland's contribution under the "In-kind Contributions" table was an oversight, that the budget line "Publications/Translations" in 2023 should cover both the SYR and the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI) publication on Short-lived Climate Forcers. In addition, the standard travel cost for a participant supported by the Trust Fund is CHF 4,000 therefore any increase in the number of Bureau members will be adjusted accordingly, acknowledged that the contribution from Finland had been received and that the contribution from the United States of America was among the contributions referred as being "in the pipeline" during the presentation and thanked the Republic of Korea for its 2022 contribution and assured it that its 2022 contribution had been reflected in Annex 3. She further explained that though the cost of a plenary session and that of a Bureau session may appear disproportionate, one had to take into consideration the cost of interpretation that is factored into them.

The Secretary clarified that the newly proposed P-4 position intends to fill some capacity needs due to the increased workload in the Secretariat, that it will ease the burden to the staff who have been performing them in addition to their functions. He outlined the workload in the Secretariat (increased number of activities/meetings, technical aspects, documentation preparation, support to Task Teams and *Ad Hoc* Groups, etc) which he described as being the highest in any assessment cycle. He explained that there was a plan to hold a Bureau meeting before IPCC-57 but this was not feasible given the number of documents and other preparation involved to ensure an effective support from the Secretariat while preparing for IPCC-57 and start the preparations for the SYR approval session. He further indicated that it is foreseen to hold a Bureau meeting in February 2023, before the approval session for the SYR, pending the support from Bureau members.

Following the comments made by the delegates, the Chair established the Financial Task Team (FiTT) with the mandate to continue discussions on the financial matters and report back to the Panel on 30 September 2022. He reminded the Panel that the FiTT is open-ended with a core membership which comprises Germany, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and United States of America and Co-chaired by Ms Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Mr Maesela Kekana (South Africa) as the replacement of Mr Amjad Abdulla (Maldives).

The FiTT met five times during the week to deliberate on key issues relating to the IPCC programme and budget, including the revised 2022 budget, the proposed 2023 budget, the forecast 2024 budget and the indicative 2025 budget as well as the proposal for the new P-4 position within the IPCC Secretariat.

Recommendations from the FiTT in the form of a draft decision for consideration by the Panel were submitted to the Panel by Ms Helen Plume, on behalf of her Co-chair, Mr Maesela Kekana.

The Panel approved the [Decision IPCC-LVII-4](#) on the IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget as contained Annex 1 which included but not limited to the revised budget for 2022, the proposed budget for 2023, the forecast budget for 2023, the indicative budget for 2025 as well as the P-4 post within the Secretariat.

3.2 Audit of the 2021 financial statements

The Chair opened the Agenda Item 3.2, document [IPCC-LVII/INF. 1](#) on the Audit of the 2021 financial statements.

The agenda item was introduced by Ms Judith Ewa, Programme Officer. She reported on the findings from the External Auditor of the 2021 IPCC financial statements, noting that per such findings, the financial statements of the IPCC, as at 31 December 2021, present fairly the financial position, performance, its changes in asset/equity, its cash flows and comparison of budget and actual amounts for the year ended, in accordance with International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) and the WMO Financial Regulations and Rules.

The Panel took note of the document.

4. ADMISSION OF OBSERVER ORGANIZATIONS

The Chair invited the Secretariat to introduce this agenda item. The IPCC Legal Officer introduced document [IPCC-LVII/Doc.3](#), Admission of Observer Organizations, and noted that since the Fifty-third (bis) Session of the IPCC (Electronic session, 22-26 March 2021), 16 applications had been submitted in accordance with the IPCC Policy and Process for Admitting Observer Organizations. After screening by the Secretariat, the IPCC Bureau reviewed the applications at its Sixty-first Session (Electronic session, 16-17 May 2022) and forwarded these for Panel consideration, noting reservations with the application of The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as a non-scientific and military organization. The deferred application of the Holy See for admission as a non-member observer state with enhanced procedural rights was also presented to the Panel for its further consideration. It was recalled that the rights requested by the Holy See are similar to those granted by the IPCC to the European Union in 2012, which are stated in rule 1.8 of the IPCC observer policy, and in line with the rights granted to the Holy See by the United Nations General Assembly Resolution of the 16th of July 2004.

Additionally, the Panel was informed that the United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (DOALOS), the United Nations secretariat of the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socioeconomic Aspects (Regular Process), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN), as well as the Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions (BRS Conventions) had requested IPCC observer status in accordance with IPCC Observer Policy Rule I.4, and were added to the list of participating UN Bodies and Organizations.

Angola, Australia, Canada, China, Cuba, Denmark, Germany, Iran, Nicaragua, Norway, Senegal, South Africa, Switzerland, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, and Venezuela took the floor.

Delegations thanked the Secretariat for their detailed presentation with rules and procedures laid out clearly. Differing views were expressed on the admission of NATO as an Observer Organization. Several members raised concerns on this application. One delegate noted that NATO is the biggest military alliance worldwide and has little to do with the IPCC and climate change, and that in considering granting observer status, due consideration should be given to the relevance of the applicant, thus from the speaker's view NATO would not qualify as an observer. Other concerns raised included that NATO lacked competency in the field of climate change, the nature of NATO as remote from the purposes of the IPCC, and that admission would be a departure from practice.

Several other delegates supported NATO's application, noting that there should be no inconsistency in applying the rules and procedures for observers which are clearly laid out, that NATO as subject to due diligence met the criteria in the IPCC Policy for Admitting Observer Organizations, and that introducing additional criteria on an ad-hoc basis would open the door to longer discussions on the work and mandate as to qualifications for all observer organizations. It was further pointed out that NATO was indeed qualified in terms of IPCC matters in particular with regard to the establishment of NATO's Climate Change and Security Centre of Expertise, thus providing a platform for further development and sharing of knowledge among experts about the climate change implications, disaster risk management and climate security, and consequently that NATO should be admitted as an observer organization.

Comments on the deferred application from the Holy See were as to clarification on the rights to be granted. Comments made noted that while the Holy See's request for participation in the IPCC was supported, the rights requested as an observer with the IPCC should be in alignment with rights granted within the IPCC, such as those granted to the European Union (EU) and not with those as granted by the United Nations (UN) General Assembly, specifically as to the right to speak in turn with governments or the right to speak after governments. Therefore, further discussion was requested during the regular review of principles and procedures to ensure that any such rights granted would be in line with IPCC process and work. Further requests for clarification focused on the treatment of the Holy See in the UN system and the importance of alignment with IPCC purpose and process.

Separately, a concern raised was whether observer organizations could compete for any type of funding, which in the event could disadvantage developing countries.

The Legal Officer responded and clarified on concerns raised by the Panel that regarding the qualification for admission of NATO, that it met the IPCC policy criteria for Observer Organizations; and that the rights requested by the Holy See are similar to those granted to the European Union and in line with those granted by the UNGA in that, amongst others, it participates as an observer state. With regard to funding, IPCC observer policy provides that financial assistance is not provided to observers.

Subsequently, the Panel approved [Decision IPCC-LVII-3](#), admitting by consensus the following 15 organizations as IPCC observers:

- 1) AJEMALEBU Self-Help (AJESH);
- 2) China Biodiversity Conservation and Green Development Foundation (CBCGDF);
- 3) League of Women Voters of the US (LWV);
- 4) Minerals Council of Australia (MCA);
- 5) Max Planck Society for the Advancement of Science (MPS);
- 6) Save the Children International (SCI);
- 7) Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS);
- 8) University of California, San Diego (UCSD);
- 9) Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL);
- 10) University of Bonn (Uni Bonn);

- 11) ProVeg International ((ProVeg Int);
- 12) University of Eastern Finland (Uni E Finland);
- 13) Green Orbit Standard System (GOSS);
- 14) Lake Victoria Region Local Authorities Cooperation (LVRLAC);
- 15) Human Rights and Forest Brain Africa (HURIFBA).

The Panel further decided that the application from the Holy See and the application from NATO would each be treated as pending applications subject to future Panel review.

5. REPORT OF THE AD HOC GROUP ON THE SIZE, STRUCTURE AND COMPOSITION OF THE IPCC BUREAU AND ANY TASK FORCE BUREAU FOR THE SEVENTH ASSESSMENT CYCLE

The IPCC Chair invited Ms Malak Al-Nory (Saudi Arabia) and Mr Farhan Akhtar (United States of America), Co-Chairs of the Ad hoc Group on the Size, Structure and Composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau for the seventh assessment cycle (Ad hoc Group) to report on this agenda item. The Co-Chairs presented [IPCC-LVII/Doc. 6](#) providing a report containing an overview of the meetings and the nature of the proposals received, the proposed changes to the size structure and composition of the Bureau with pertinent excerpts and explanations, and annexures of relevant materials.

Mr Akhtar reported on the Ad hoc Group meetings - 30 June, 10 August and 31 August 2022 - held in accordance with the Ad hoc Group Terms of Reference approved by the Fifty-third (bis) Session of the IPCC (Electronic Session, 22-26 March 2021), with 64 appointed representatives, representation of all six WMO Regions and open-ended membership with submissions of proposals invited throughout the course of the meetings. She further noted that the report included a list of decision points, as well as a compilation of various considerations raised by the members.

Ms Al-Nory then introduced Annex B, Composition of the IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau of [IPCC-LVII/Doc. 6](#) which organizes the various proposals and decision points for the Panel to address consisting of proposed changes to the current size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau as well as support for the Status Quo (no changes to be made from current size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau).

Following the Co-Chair presentation, the IPCC Chair opened the floor for comments.

Statements were made by Bureau members Mr Youba Sokona, Vice-Chair of the IPCC, Ms Ko Barrett, Vice-Chair of the IPCC, Ms Valerie Masson-Delmotte, Working Group I Co-Chair, Debra Roberts, Co-Chair of Working Group II, Ms Valerie Masson-Delmotte, Working Group I Co-Chair, Mr James Skea, Co-Chair, Working Group III, Mr Eduardo Calvo, Co-Chair of Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Mr Kiyoto Tanabe, Co-Chair of Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Ms Carolina Vera, Vice-Chair of Working Group I, Mr Nouredine Yassaa, Vice-Chair of Working Group I, Mr Jan Fuglestedt Vice-Chair of Working Group I, Mr Edvin Aldrian, Vice-Chair of Working Group I, Mr Mark Howden, Vice-Chair of Working Group II, Mr Sergey Semenov, Vice-Chair of Working Group II, Mr Taha Zatari, Vice-Chair of Working Group II, Mr Ramon Pichs-Madruga, Vice-Chair, Working Group III, Mr Andy Reisinger, Vice-Chair of Working Group II, Mr Greg Flato, Vice-Chair of Working Group I, Ms Diana Ürge-Vorsatz, Vice-Chair of Working Group III and Mr N.G. Mahmoud, Vice-Chair of Working Group II.

A request was made that Bureau members be given a chance to present their views and insights regarding the size, structure and composition of the Bureau, given that the coming decisions implicated the future of the Bureau and that the Bureau members thus far lacked the opportunity to provide direct reflections. As there were no objections from the floor for interventions by the

current Bureau with regard to the item under discussion, the IPCC Chair accordingly opened the floor for comments by Bureau members.

Ms Ko Barrett took the floor on behalf of the Gender Action Team (GAT), highlighting the need for the Bureau to embrace the role of women in leadership roles given that the IPCC was still not on par in terms of gender equity and requesting the issue of gender equity be taken into consideration when taking decisions.

Several Bureau members supported the comments of Ms Barrett. Further concerns expressed were for balanced regional representation with suggestions that where a region is not represented after election, the addition of a member would ensure full regional representation. Some Bureau members suggested having greater definition of the roles of the Vice-Chairs to ensure more effective work. It was also suggested to hold a Bureau meeting at the beginning of the seventh assessment cycle to facilitate knowledge transfer between the old and new Bureau members, as well as an inter-sessional workshop to note the lessons learned from this cycle. Some Bureau members noted the absence of an opportunity to discuss these issues within the Bureau prior to the Fifty-seventh Session of the IPCC, further expressing the need for an agenda item on this at the next Bureau meeting as well as one scientific topic in the agenda.

Some Bureau members highlighted age balance as a criterion for the Bureau, calling for inclusion of early career scientists. Bureau members comments included calls for observer status for organizations focused on children towards including forward-looking and generational perspectives.

During the ensuing discussions, interventions were made by representatives of Australia, Albania, Angola, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Brazil, Canada, Comoros, China, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Kenya, Korea, Ghana, Germany, Hungary, Madagascar, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru, South Africa, Sweden, Sudan, Türkiye, Panama, Venezuela, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela and Zimbabwe.

Delegates expressed appreciation for the comprehensive report of the Ad hoc Group. There was support for the Status Quo with slight modifications to improve role, functions and Terms of Reference for Vice-Chairs and to clarify the obligations of the Vice-Chairs and each Bureau member and documentation that strengthens gender and regional balance. Some delegates expressed support to add the Task Group on Data Support for Climate Change Assessments (TG-Data) Co-Chairs to the Bureau. One recommendation was that the TG-Data Co-Chairs could be ex-officio members without them being formal Bureau members. Many delegates expressed the need to see a balance between developing and developed countries. Some delegates supported the suggestion for an inter-sessional meeting and a workshop between old and new Bureaus early in 2023.

As diverging views were expressed on this agenda item, the IPCC Chair proposed to conduct a contact group, open to all Members, Co-Chaired by the Ad hoc Group Co-Chairs, with the mandate to continue discussions on this item, including as to the number of Chairs and Vice-Chairs, regional balance of Working Group Co-Chairs, overall regional balance, the number and distribution of Working Group Vice-Chairs and the overall size of the Bureau, with the view to find consensus. The Panel agreed to this proposal and the contact group was scheduled to take place on 28 September 2022 at 6:00 pm.

On the report back from the contact group, the Co-Chairs of the Ad hoc Group provided an oral report to the Panel on the outcomes of the discussion. Mr Akhtar highlighted the main issue as the lack of regional representation within the Working Groups and that this could be solved by adding an additional sentence to the document that covers regional representation. This would be at the fourth bullet point of Annex B of Appendix C of IPCC-LVII/Doc. 6, stating that where a

Region is not represented in any given formation within the Bureau, the Region without representation will decide on the additional position in that formation. Mr Akhtar added that the text would allow for that region to nominate and elect an additional person to fill that gap, noting that no other changes on the document are needed. It was proposed to add a footnote to the text after the last bullet point to indicate any additional position would affect the number of Bureau members.

Several delegates supported the proposed changes as presented by the Co-Chairs. Some delegates favored the current composition of the Bureau, cautioning on such an amendment resulting in two rounds of elections. Others requested inclusion of the text that covered the issues of gender and intra-regional balance while others requested clarity on the election process and asked how the additional position fits with the Executive Committee.

Responding to the comments the Co-Chair said the Panel would follow established procedures and the proposed language would create the position which will be triggered solely in the case of a region not represented in the Bureau.

The Secretary noted that the proposed changes for ensuring regional representation could be implemented easily as part of the IPCC procedures. To address the issue of promoting gender and intra-regional balance, he suggested adding text to make reference to both, intra-regional and gender balance in the text on Annex B of Appendix C of the [IPCC-LVII/Doc. 6](#).

The IPCC Chair further clarified the proposed language would not change the practice the IPCC has been taking for the selection of Bureau members and would not introduce an additional round of election.

Further discussions raised concerns on the micro-management of what happens at the regional level, so it was agreed not to add the additional text on intra-regional balance.

Some delegates noted that the additional text solves the problem of regional representation faced in the sixth assessment cycle. On concerns raised regarding time limits, it was requested that time limits on seats could be addressed under upcoming Review of Principles as an amendment to Rule 10.

The IPCC Chair confirmed the agreement on the proposed text to be added to the Decision document.

The Panel recognized the importance of maintaining the efficiency and functionality of the current size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau, noted the need to accommodate any possible regional imbalances at the time of elections, and approved the amendment to Annex B of Appendix C of the IPCC-LVII/Doc. 6, providing for an additional position in a Working Group where a Region is not represented in a Working Group.

6. REPORT OF THE IPCC CONFLICT OF INTEREST COMMITTEE

The Chair of the IPCC Conflict of Interest (COI) Committee, Mr Youba Sokona, gave a verbal report on the activities of the Committee, informing the Panel on the 19th, 20th and 21^s COI Committee meetings which were held respectively on 19 January 2022, 4 April 2022, and 27 September 2022. At the 19th meeting, the COI Committee reviewed the 2020-2021 updated information in the COI forms submitted by the IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau (TFB) members, which they are required to provide annually in accordance with the IPCC COI Policy and further took into consideration the annual reports of 2020-2021 of the Bureaux of the three Working Groups and the Task Force Bureau (TFB) with regard to conflict-of-interest issues.

The COI Chair was pleased to inform the Panel that 100% compliance was reached, all updates were found in order and that no conflict of interest was found. At the 20th COI Committee meeting, this took place in writing on a matter of urgency concerning a Working Group III Lead Author undertaking a consultancy contract that was with an observer organization and which overlapped with the approval of the WGIII report. The Chair informed that the Committee reached consensus that there was a conflict of interest but further confirmed that this was rectified with no negative outcomes and no discernible impact on any IPCC products, and that the agreed action was solely to advise the author on the need for full compliance with the IPCC Conflict of Interest policy in any future engagement.

At the 21st meeting, held in the margins of the Fifty-seventh Session of the IPCC, the COI Committee reviewed the 2022 updated information in the COI forms submitted by the IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau (TFB) members, which they are required to provide annually in accordance with the IPCC COI Policy, as well as the annual reports of the three Working Group Bureaux and the Task Force Bureau in relation to their consideration of conflict-of-interest issues. The COI Committee had noted with appreciation that no conflicts of interest were identified. The Chair thanked the Co-Chairs and their Bureaux for the completeness and transparency of their reports.

Finally, on behalf of the COI Committee, the Chair raised a request before the Panel with regard to adjusting quorum requirements to allow for more flexible and frequent meetings of the COI Committee, towards a more timely review of changes proposed within Working Groups and TFI Bureau and better risk management for the IPCC.

The Panel took note of the report from the COI Committee and did not reach consensus on the matter of quorum adjustment at this time.

7. PROGRESS REPORTS

7.1. Working Group I contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report

The IPCC Chair invited Working Group I (WGI) Co-Chairs to introduce document [IPCC-LVII/INF.4, Rev.1](#).

Ms Valérie Masson-Delmotte, Co-Chair of Working Group I (WGI) thanked the WGI TSU for their work on the production of the AR6 WGI. She reported that the report which contains about 2400 pages was delivered to the Cambridge University Press and will be printed in two volumes; that a dedicated microsite which presents the final AR6 WGI report and all relevant material such as responses to reviewers' comments, Errata and other supporting material was developed in collaboration with the IPCC Secretariat and launched in May 2022; that volunteer WGI experts, Bureau members and IPCC Focal points had completed proofreading the translations of the Summary for Policy Makers (SPM) and the Glossary, and had started proofreading the translated Technical Summary (TS) and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs); She added that WGI provided recommendations to the Informal Group on Publications; that a video series tagged "Climate Change Explained", complemented by regional videos which incorporate regional information from the AR6 WGI, regional fact sheets and the Interactive Atlas were disseminated through IPCC social media platforms; that media analysis of climate change scenarios-related information supported by the United Nations Foundation, and communication of key messages from the AR6 WGI SPM figures in the form of visual storylines, supported by the Norwegian Environment Agency and Information Design Lab were ongoing; that WGI Bureau members were involved in briefings at various levels across regions; that a session on the use of scenarios in the 2022 Scenarios Forum was convened in June 2021 by Jan Fuglestad, Vice-Chair of WGI and Anna Pirani, Head of WGI TSU; that factsheets associated with physical climate information relevant for sectors would be released around October 2022; that a summary for actuaries from 51 different countries was released in April 2022; the Task Group on Data Support for Climate

Change Assessments (TG-Data) Regional Outreach Events involving the Interactive Atlas which are important for AR6 WGI data dissemination were ongoing; She noted that WGI continued to contribute in TG-Data activities, and the implementation of the FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable) data principles were documented as well as lessons learnt and recommendations for the AR7; that WGI experts contribute to cross-WG activities such as the preparations of the Summary for Urban Policy Makers and the IPCC Expert Meeting on Scenarios; that about 151 authors participated in a survey whose results would contribute to a report on the preparation of the AR6 WGI; that the outcome of a survey conducted with Chapter Scientists that was submitted as an Annex revealed some important issues which require the IPCC's attention; that WGI, supported by Canada, worked with advisers from the SHIF¹ Collaborative to develop inclusive practices and diversities in the assessment process which have been documented with inputs from WGI Bureau members and TSU staff.

Belgium, India, Mauritius, Norway, Pakistan, Republic of Tanzania and Switzerland took the floor.

Delegates appreciated the report provided by the WGI Co-Chair and commended the work of the WGI Co-Chairs and team including communication and outreach activities and materials as well as handover documents;

Other comments and points were as to whether the best practices from WGI outreach and communication activities could be adopted by other Working Groups and a request for an update on the status of the publication of IPCC Special Reports and their dissemination was made. A clarification was sought on the process of identifying targeted groups and sectors provided in regional factsheets and other outreach materials and a query was made about data quality control as to the FAIR principles. A delegate noted that topics covered in the outreach activities are perceived to leave out certain issues which are of great interest to some countries such as the carbon budget. Another one expressed concern over key messages being conveyed in an unbalanced way, especially concerning issues of equity. Other points were as to welcoming the collaboration of WGI with the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and requesting an assessment of the extremes and their associated impacts which are attributed to climate change such as those experienced in Pakistan.

Ms Masson-Delmotte in her responses expressed her sympathy for the people affected by the recent events in Pakistan. As to the data quality control, she said that the curation process is critical to ensure high quality of the data and information. She suggested conducting an analysis of the outcomes of communication and outreach activities across the three Working Groups noting that a survey of IPCC Focal Points soliciting their views on the WGI report preparation process will be helpful; She further noted that the preparation of legacy and handover documents would be contingent on the availability of TSU staff; that the choice and complexity of material presented in outreach activities are to a large extent determined by advice from communication specialists; that during presentations at events such as the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties (COP), issues such as the importance of reducing emissions and the remaining carbon budget are discussed.

The Secretary informed the Panel that hard copies of AR6 reports would be send to IPCC Focal Points.

The Panel took note of the WGI progress report.

¹ <https://shiftcollaborative.ca/>

7.2. Working Group II contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report

The Chair invited Working Group II (WGII) Co-Chairs to introduce document [IPCC-LVII/INF.3](#).

Ms Debra Roberts, Co-Chair of Working Group II reported that an SPM Writeshop was held in December 2021 to review and respond to review comments; informal consultations with governments were conducted to explain key concepts; that AR6 WGII was published online including supplementary material and other ancillary resources; that a copy of the report was delivered to Cambridge University Press in August 2022 and will be printed in three volumes; WGII extensively engaged in communication and outreach activities and prepared material such as factsheets, overarching Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and selected figures; that training for authors individually and in the context of chapters were conducted in preparation of communication work and media interviews; that joint WGII-WGIII communication webinars for authors' home institutions were held; that WGII TSU worked with four Media Science Centres to organize regional embargoed media briefings; that regionally focused communication material for Africa were produced and piloted in Senegal which has created a precedence for the production of similar material for other regions; that WGII actively participated in a range of UNFCCC activities during the Fifty-sixth Session of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 56) and would contribute to mandated and other events at the Sharm El-Sheikh Climate Change Conference COP 27 WGII was involved in co-sponsored meetings such as the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the IPCC-UN HABITAT-Global Covenant of Mayors Co-Sponsored Innovate4Cities Conference. Ms Roberts thanked the WGII TSU for their continued hard work and contribution to the Synthesis Report.

Australia, India, Mauritius and Saudi Arabia took the floor.

Delegates appreciated the WGII report. Comments and suggestions. They commended the cross-Working Group collaboration. Other comments and comments were as to the communication and outreach activities undertaken while laudable could reach a wider range of stakeholders and be balanced in the communicated findings; a request for a graphic depicting contributions from WGII chapter scientists from different regions; a concern raised regarding the use of IPCC name in reports of co-sponsored meetings which were not approved by the Panel and the use of certain language.

In response to the comments, Ms Roberts said that IPCC Procedures were adhered to and, in particular, during the preparation of the ICOMOS-UNESCO-IPCC Co-Sponsored Meeting, the IPCC Legal Officer was consulted and the report includes a disclaimer and no IPCC logo; As to communication and outreach activities, the messages conveyed during the communication activities emphasize the importance of context and regional differentiations. She further highlighted the WGII report's emphasis on context dependency and regional differentiation and referred to a survey targeting chapter scientists which is was still underway.

The Panel took note of the WGII progress report.

7.3. Working Group III contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report

The Chair invited Working Group III (WGIII) Co-Chairs to introduce document [IPCC-LVII/INF.10](#).

Mr Jim Skea, Co-Chair of Working Group III reported that the final government review ended on 30 January 2022 and about 5000 comments were received; that webinars were organized to address novel topics and challenging issues in the AR6 WGIII SPM; that the design of the approval session (i.e. during the Fifty-seventh Session of the IPCC) of the AR6 WGIII, which was held from 21 March – 3 April 2022, was coordinated by a Task Team under the leadership of IPCC Vice-Chairs; that the provision of excellent facilities at the approval hub by the United

Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Government for the approval session was greatly appreciated so is the support by Bureau members, TSU staff from all three Working Groups and the Secretariat. He gratefully acknowledged the exceptional role played by WGIII Vice-Chairs Messrs Nagmeldin Mahmoud and Ramón Pichs-Madruga during the approval session as well as the unprecedented collaboration between Working Groups in the AR6 including the preparation of cross-Working Group boxes, a shared Glossary and other forms of scientific support. He added that a survey for Chapter Scientists was conducted and the preliminary results indicated very positive messages and some dissatisfaction; that the AR6 WGIII preparation for publication by the Cambridge University Press included implementing ticklebacks and corrigenda, technical proofreading and copyediting; that the material for AR6 WGIII would be sent to the publisher around early November 2022 while the material for the Special Report on Climate Change and Land was ready to be sent to the publisher; He noted that TG-Data Guidelines² on the application of FAIR Principles were followed and the data underlying SPM and Technical Summary figures were submitted to the IPCC Data Distribution Centre (DDC³). As to communication and outreach activities associated with the AR6 WGIII he mentioned input to a range of UNFCCC activities and events at SBSTA 56, participation in outreach events for policy makers, business and civil society, producing a set of sectoral factsheets which would be ready for COP 27. WGIII continued to contribute in the preparation of the AR6 Synthesis Report (SYR) through the Scientific Steering Committee (SSC), the Helicopter Group and supporting the drafting process. As to other activities he mentioned the establishment of a 16-member SSC for the IPCC Workshop on the Use of Scenarios in AR6 and subsequent assessments. The workshop would tentatively be held in Bangkok around April 2023 and encouraged Governments to nominate individuals who are either scenario producers or users. As to the WGIII TSU he said that it is winding down with part of the TSU staff having contractual support up to March 2023 and gratefully acknowledged their great work during the AR6. He called for a clear end point for the AR6 cycle to facilitate contractual issues negotiations with Governments. He concluded the report noting that WGIII Co-Chairs were painstakingly considering appropriate handover packages with the view to give them to their successors in AR7.

The Chair gratefully acknowledged the support offered by the three Working Groups in the preparation of the AR6 SYR.

India, Japan, Mauritius and Friends World Committee for Consultation (FWCC) took the floor.

Comments and suggestions included the appreciation of a regional distribution of the contributors to AR6 WGIII; concerns that the key statements communicated are perceived to be unbalanced and sought clarity on the role of development in relation to climate change mitigation and adaptation; a request for an infographic on author's regional representation.

In his responses WGIII Co-Chair Mr Jim Skea noted the challenges in trying to distil messages when communicating to different audiences. As to the equity issues, he mentioned that equity elements are embedded in Chapter 2 of AR6 WGIII and that equity considerations will be a feature of the Scenario Workshop to be held around April 2023.

The Panel took note of the WGIII progress report.

² <https://zenodo.org/record/6504469#.Y1YOp3ZBw2w>

³ <https://www.ipcc-data.org/>

7.4. Synthesis Report of the Sixth Assessment report

The Chair of the IPCC invited Mr Jose Romero, Head of AR6 Synthesis Report (SYR) TSU to introduce document [IPCC-LVII/INF.6](#).

Mr Romero informed the Panel that according to the revised schedule for the preparation of the AR6 SYR, the report approval is scheduled to take place from 13 to 17 March 2023. He mentioned a few other relevant deadlines such as 3rd October 2022 for the completion of the longer draft report and 7th November 2022 as the first meeting of the SPM drafting team; He mentioned the development of the draft SPM figures including efforts made to ensure traceability of the SYR figures to the underlying Working Group reports and the traceability of the SYR SPM figures to the longer SYR report. He further mentioned the ongoing revision of the four sections of the SYR, taking into consideration the review comments received and the support provided by the SYR TSU to the SYR drafting team.

Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Ms Valérie Masson-Delmotte, Co-Chair of Working Group I, Mr Hans-Otto Pörtner, Co-Chair of Working Group II, Mr Sergey Sermenov, Vice-Chair of Working Group II, Ms Anna Pirani, Head of Working Group I TSU and FWCC took the floor.

Delegates expressed their appreciation for those involved in the preparation of the SYR report, particularly the Core Writing Team (CWT) who accepted to work under the revised timelines, and those who contributed to resolving the perceived crisis which occurred around June/July 2022. Concerns and disappointment were shared regarding the delay in the completion of the SYR which would make it unavailable for UNFCCC COP27 and the likely ramifications for the IPCC's future timelines and its contribution to the UNFCCC Global Stocktake (GST) process. Requests were made for the Panel to be informed about the reasons for this delay in order to learn lessons with the view to avoiding a similar situation in the future. Other delegates noted that some of the reasons for the delays were due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic and invited the Panel to focus on completing the SYR instead of spending too much time reviewing what had gone wrong in the recent past.

Other comments and points were as to the confirmation of the availability of the support from the Republic of Korea to the SYR TSU in 2023 for a successful approval of the SYR report; concerns over the availability of the support from the Working Group TSUs who are in the process of winding down their operations; the need to involve the High-Level Consultative Group (HLCG), SSC and TSUs and consider lessons learnt from the approval of the Working Group reports in the ongoing planning and progress of the SYR; the need to engage more with governments before the SYR approval session on the SPM contents, particularly on the figures; concerns over the timeline for the SYR government review coinciding with a holiday period in some countries. A suggestion was made to extend the review period by about a week. It was further stated that the SYR should ensure policy relevance and usefulness for policy makers. Noting that the key information on the state of global climate assessed in the Working Group reports might become outdated, it was suggested that the CWT could consider incorporating more up-to-date information from the same datasets used in the Working Group reports. Other suggestions were as to the SYR preparation schedule to allow for internal review of the report by the SSC and the invitations for SSC meetings not to be sent at short notice. Some delegates mentioned the uncertainty regarding the availability of the remaining Working Group I TSU staff members who provide support to some of the SYR Section Facilitators; that Working Group II had funding covering the revised timelines of completing the SYR although there would be limited capacity of personnel within the TSU; that a definite plan of the work over the next months until the end of the AR6 would be very helpful to consider the handover to the AR7 Working Group II TSU.

In response to the comments and suggestions made the Chair of the IPCC said that the SYR process is on track, thanks to all contributors. He recalled that the HLCG which comprises the Chair, three IPCC Vice-Chairs, the Secretary of the IPCC, and SYR TSU Head was established during the Sixty-second Session of the IPCC Bureau with its mandate to consult with authors with the view to find a new schedule for the SYR preparation; that following its consultation with the authors, Working Group Co-Chairs, SSC and Bureau members a revised schedule was developed and communicated to the IPCC Focal Points for their approval; He further recalled that the maximum interval allowed between the release of the WGI report and the SYR in a cycle is 18 months. As to the request on incorporating the updated information from the Working Group reports, the Chair stated that as it is not in line with the IPCC rules, it could solely be done should the Panel decide to do so.

A Bureau member added that due to an abrupt change in key SYR TSU personnel around May/June 2022 the SSC, Bureau and Working Groups got intensively involved to respond to SYR authors who had paused in writing with the view to adequately support their work and inform the governments that there was a viable plan to produce the SYR after such changes; that the Bureau grappled with the challenges and decided to establish the HLCG to help address roadblocks to progress, craft a plan and a revised schedule and to liaise with the authors to understand their support needs and to rebuild the trust required to have them end their pause in writing and continue to engage in the SYR production process; that there was a collective agreement on the revised plan and schedule; that the work resumed and interactions were occurring on a regular basis between the SYR TSU and the Section Facilitators; that the HLCG would be re-engaged and will play a role in the planning and preparation for the approval session; that it was unfortunate that the reports for the Sixty-first and Sixty-second Sessions of the IPCC Bureau were not available to provide the full summary of the challenges and response measures and made a request for the reports of the Bureau meetings to be shared on the Papersmart portal.

The Secretary said that procedurally, the reports are approved during the subsequent Bureau session; that the meetings' reports were sent to Bureau members for their review and the deadline for receiving comments was the following day. He added that the reports would be posted on the Papersmart portal should the Panel and the Bureau would approve.

Canada, France, Ireland, Mauritius, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, Sweden, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Valérie Masson-Delmotte, Co-Chair of Working Group I, Andy Reisinger, Vice-Chair of Working Group III, and Taha Zatari, Vice-Chair of Working Group II took the floor.

The suggestion to post the reports of the Bureau meetings was supported by many delegates. Other comments and suggestions included a short-notice Bureau session called by the Chair to approve the meetings' reports if the comments received on the initial circulated drafts had already been fully incorporated. A Bureau member insisted that the IPCC Principles and Procedures should not be violated and therefore the Bureau should approve the reports before they are posted.

As to the updated information in the SYR, some delegates suggested an update of the data reported through Working Group I report in 2021 including on the global average temperature and GHG concentrations and sought clarity on how this could be done. Some others said it would be premature for the Panel to take a decision regarding updating datasets without considering a draft report and knowing which numbers are being updated.

The Working Group I Co-Chair Ms Masson-Delmotte explained that such an update would be feasible following the IPCC procedures, as the methodology to obtain them had been properly assessed by the IPCC.

Mr Romero thanked the Government of the Republic of Korea for their continued support of the SYR TSU. He also mentioned that structures have been enacted to support and oversee the preparation of the SYR to ensure a high-quality product which should be completed within the stipulated timeframe; that a workplan with associate timelines exists and these are revised if there is a need; that the revised schedule was drawn in consultation with relevant stakeholders, taking into consideration the availability of authors particularly those from the global south; that the Bureau approved the members of the Extended Core-Writing Team (EWT) which was suggested by the Section Facilitators to fill gaps in expertise; that the request to extend the Final Government Distribution (FGD) by one week would be considered in consultation with the authors; that a webinar was planned after the submission of the FGD to allow for an interaction between the authors and governments. He added that there could be another webinar towards the end of the review period; that the review comments which were received were addressed by the authors. The Review Editors would oversee the process to ensure that the comments are adequately addressed.

The Chair added that the Heads of Working Group TSUs and some other TSU staff are members of the CWT and that the request for an extra week for the review period would be conveyed to the authors. He further said that the reports of the Bureau meetings would be made available after consulting the Secretariat and that the suggestion to update the data used in the WG reports would be discussed with the authors.

France, Netherlands and Norway took the floor.

It was suggested that a short-notice Bureau session could be convened to approve the reports of the two most recent Bureau sessions; that the discussion of the SYR progress report would be continued after the Panel gets access to the reports of the meetings.

A Bureau session was convened to approve the reports of the Sixty-first and Sixty-second Sessions of the IPCC Bureau. Noting that some bureau members were still willing to comment on the draft reports before getting approved, the Bureau approved the release of these two reports. Subsequently, the reports were posted on the Papersmart portal.

The Panel took note of the SYR progress report.

7.5. Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories

The Chair invited the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI) Co-Chairs to introduce document [IPCC-LVII/INF.5, Rev. 1](#).

Mr Eduardo Calvo, Co-Chair of the TFI reported the preparatory work for the Methodology Report on Short-lived Climate Forcers (SLCF), which includes technical analysis by the TFI TSU and Expert Meetings was concluded with appreciation for the support from the Government of Norway. He stated that the reports of the first and second Joint Expert Meetings are available on the TFI [website](#); that during the third Expert Meeting which was held virtually in April 2022, experts discussed various cross-sectoral issues such as the applicability of existing general guidance for SLCF inventories and relevant topics in the WGI and WGIII reports; that the preparatory work will form part of the basis for discussion during the scoping of the Methodology Report, which would be held during the AR7; that the TFI continued to improve the IPCC Inventory Software, providing support to its users and participating the outreach events aimed at publicizing the software in events organized by other organizations such as the UNFCCC. He expressed his gratitude to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) for hosting the expert meeting to collect Software and Emission Factor Database (EFDB) users' feedback which was held in Rome, Italy from 26 to 28 July 2022 as well as for providing add-ons for the software regarding land representation for the Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) sector. He said

that such feedback will help upgrade the software and that the upgraded version would be released during the UNFCCC COP 27. He expressed his gratitude to the UNFCCC for providing financial support for the upgrade of the software. He also reported that the TFI Technical Support Unit had started the work to help the UNFCCC Secretariat in facilitating interoperability between the reporting tools that will be used under the Paris Agreement and the IPCC Inventory Software.

Mr Kiyoto Tanabe, TFI Co-Chair referred to a decision by the UNFCCC Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA3), which invited the IPCC to organize a technical training workshop in the second part of 2024 on the IPCC Inventory Software and linkages of the software with the reporting tools under the Paris Agreement. He noted that the AR6 Task Force Bureau (TFB) was not in a position to make a proposal to the Panel on how to respond to the CMA invitation because the workshop dates fall in the next cycle, but wished to express its concern about this invitation. He explained it was because: the training does not fall within the mandate of the IPCC: the training workshop is expected to be large scale with participants from each developing country Parties to the Paris Agreement, which will have budgetary implications. He reported on the work to maintain, improve and promote the Emission Factor Database (EFDB), including the selection of new members of EFDB Editorial Board. He also referred to the 20th annual meeting of the Editorial Board and the joint 19th and 20th data meetings, held in hybrid format from 28 June to 1st July 2022 in Bilbao, Spain with special thanks expressed to the Basque Center for Climate Change, the Government of Spain and the Basque country Government for their support. Also, he reported on the Expert Meeting on Use of Atmospheric Observation Data in Emission Inventories held at the WMO Headquarters in Geneva, in September 2022.

Benin, Cameroon, Canada, France, Germany, Guatemala, Guinea, India, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Togo, Ukraine, United States of America, FWCC and Mr Edvin Aldrian, Vice-Chair of Working Group I took the floor.

Delegates thanked the TFI Co-Chairs for the progress report towards the preparatory work of the Methodology Report on SLCF with appreciation for the support from the Government of Norway. They noted the concerns raised by the TFB in organizing the training workshop as requested by the CMA, while considering the importance of IPCC work in the UNFCCC process and the role training workshop would play in the successful transition to the enhanced transparency framework under the Paris Agreement, and encouraged the TFI Co-Chairs to engage with the UNFCCC Secretariat to work out an appropriate way forward. They said that the issue of compatibility between the IPCC and UNFCCC softwares should be addressed urgently; that the process of preparing the Methodology Report should start soon including launching a call for nomination of participants to the scoping meeting; that the new emission factors which are added to the EFDB should be peer reviewed. It was noted that further research is required to address knowledge gaps related to SLCFs. A suggestion was made to help developing countries with access to satellite data they could use to carry out their greenhouse gas inventories and efforts could be made to improve the greenhouse gas inventories in coastal regions. A question was raised about the quantification of emissions related to the military operations noting that their reporting under the Nationally Determined Contributions is voluntary and some countries decided not to report.

In response to the comments, Mr Kiyoto Tanabe said that while the TFI recognizes the importance of the training workshop on the IPCC Inventory Software, their view was that it would be most appropriate for the UNFCCC Secretariat to organize the workshop with cooperation of IPCC. As to the emissions from military operations he clarified that while all anthropogenic emissions occurring in any country including those from military activities should be included in national greenhouse gas inventories, methodological guidance on estimation of emissions related to military operations is not fully provided in the IPCC inventory guidelines. As to the ocean areas he stated that the current IPCC inventory guidelines do not involve ocean areas but some coastal areas are considered in the [2013 Wetlands Supplement](#). As to the scoping meeting of the SLCFs methodology report, he also stated that there is a need to consult the IPCC Legal Officer

regarding the suggestion for the current TFB to launch a call for nominations of participants to the scoping meeting. On the scoping meeting, the IPCC Legal Officer clarified it is up to the Panel whether to agree on the suggestion.

Mr Eduardo Calvo added that clear mandates from the Panel requesting the TFB Bureau to launch a call for nominations for the scoping meeting and to organize the training workshop are required if they would be expected to carry out these activities; that there are other several efforts by other organizations which are developing small-scale inventories without the involvement of the IPCC; that it would be interesting to have some methodological work associated with the Special Report on Cities, taking into account that organizations such as ICLEI (Local Governments for Sustainability) and C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group were preparing guidelines which are never reviewed by the IPCC.

The Chair noted the suggestion by some governments to launch, before the end of the AR6, a call for nominations of experts who will participate in the Scoping Meeting of the Methodology Report on SLCFs. Having heard no objection on this matter, he then requested TFI Co-Chairs to initiate the process the call for nominations for the scoping meeting of the Methodology Report on SLCFs.

The Panel took note of the TFI progress report.

7.6. Task Group on Data Support for Climate Change Assessments

The Chair asked Co-Chairs of the Task Group on Data Support for Climate Assessments (TG-Data) to present the document [IPCC-LVII/INF. 7, Rev. 1](#).

Mr Sebastián Vicuña, Co-Chair of the TG-Data, presented the document on behalf of his fellow Co-Chair David Huard. He highlighted the regional outreach activities jointly organized with WGI as well as plans of such activities in collaboration with WGIII and International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA). He reported on the completion of the guidelines on recommendations on how the assessment reports can follow the FAIR principles and the final stage of the licensing recommendations for assessment reports. He informed the Panel that the DDC has a new website with support from Meta Data Works, the new UK partner that replaced CEDA last year. He further reported on the efforts to prepare user codes for AR6 figures. In addition, he expressed concerns about the future funding gaps for the DDC and what will be required for the DDC to continue the same level of support as two DDC members from Germany and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have shared information about the uncertainty in the continuation of funding beyond March 2023. He closed the statement by reminding the Panel that this issue was discussed during the Forty-seventh Session of the IPCC, pointing the Panel to the information on the funding options in the document with relevant considerations.

The Chair thanked the Co-Chair of TG-Data for the presentation and opened the floor for comments.

Belgium, Canada, France, India, Switzerland, Ukraine, USA and Mr Hans-Otto Pörtner, Co-Chair of Working Group II took the floor.

Delegates thanked the TG-Data Co-Chairs for the report. They raised concern about the lack of sustainable funding for the DDC and appreciated the information on what was needed to make sure the DDC is on a solid financial footing to continue the current level of support. Governments encouraged the Secretariat to continue exploring funding options in this regard. There was a suggestion to explore the idea of integrating the DDC activities into the IPCC so that the funding is from the Trust Fund. Another suggestion was to explore partnerships. There was an inquiry to confirm if the underlying data for Working Group II contribution to AR6 Atlas would be part of the DDC catalogue. Some governments stressed the importance of including Working Group II related data especially on adaptation to be included in the work of the TG-Data. Others inquired

the extent that the webinars and targeted information for regions could help in improving the downloads in the regions where these are down. In terms of visibility delegates encouraged the Secretariat to increase efforts in making the TG-Data more visible for example through the website. There was an invitation for governments to utilize the Working Group I Atlas and promote it in their countries and regions.

Mr Sebastián Vicuña confirmed that all three Working Groups are represented on TG-Data and data is being curated for all three. He further explained that there are no outreach activities for Working Group II because the Working Group II contribution to AR6 does not have a tool that requires demonstration as the current outreach events are for tools in the Working Group I and III contributions to AR6. He agreed that the aim is to improve visibility through the outreach events which they hope to continue improving. He added that TG-Data is open to exploring different options including private sector and foundations while highlighting the need to avoid copyright and proprietary issues.

Ecuador, India, Germany, Saudi Arabia, and Switzerland took the floor.

Delegates further emphasized the need to treat all three working Groups equally in future outreach with all Working Groups providing the needed tools for the outreach. Delegates who were part of the FiTT informed their fellow delegates that part of the FiTT decision is to ask TG-Data to seek guidance from the Secretariat and Bureau on funding options for the TG-Data.

The TG-Data Co-Chair clarified that data curation is happening for all Working Groups including Working Group II whereas regarding outreach, no outreach activities were organized because of the lack of a data tool for Working Group II and should Working Group II create a tool that needs interactive outreach, this can be done. He further noted this as a lesson learnt from the sixth assessment cycle.

The Panel took note of the report from TG-Data.

7.7. Communication and outreach activities

The Chair invited IPCC Programme Manager for Communications and Outreach, Andrej Mahecic, to present the Progress Report on Communications and Outreach ([IPCC-LVIII/INF.2](#)).

Mr Andrej Mahecic reported on the communication and outreach activities since the 53rd (bis) Session of the Panel, held in March 2021. He highlighted the intense media and communications work linked primarily to the releases of the three Working Group reports in August 2021, February and April 2022 and the related powerful media coverage of IPCC work and strong social media performance. He also stressed the innovative aspects of media relations and communications during the reporting period, and efforts to enhance IPCC's outreach activities to new regions, with an emphasis on developing countries.

Algeria, Democratic Republic of Congo, France, India, Kenya, Luxemburg, Morocco, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United States of America, Mr Edvin Aldrian (Vice-Chair WGI), Ms Diana Ürge-Vorsatz (Vice-Chair Working Group III), Ms Valerie Masson-Delmotte (Co-Chair Working Group I), and Ms Debra Roberts (Co-Chair Working Group II) took the floor.

Delegates stressed they were impressed by what was achieved and expressed their appreciation for the work of the communications team led by Andrej Mahecic. On the basis of past experience, an expert meeting on communication in the transition to the seventh assessment cycle was suggested. The importance of capturing the lessons of virtual work during the pandemic was emphasized and how the communications team is engaged with focal points on a national level vis-à-vis rollouts of reports was inquired. A delegate highlighted the need to preserve the texts of

the SPMs and their nuances while another one inquired about the scope of UNEP and the WMO involvement in the outreach and dissemination strategy and noted that communications should target organizations such as IPBES.

Many delegates stressed the need to focus on outreach to young people, especially through existing and new engagement formats, including many social media platforms. Other points made included cautioning against oversimplification of science that risks losing the sense of gravity it needs adding that in some cases the youth have indicated that the IPCC messages make them anxious, and that advancing young people's knowledge is important for solutions and suggested engagement with early career scientists through webinars. Suggestions were made to encourage action to empower people to understand climate change in their communities, where they live and work; to involve psychologists to help with messaging; to use surveys to collect feedback on outreach activities and considering regular engagements in which authors speak to their local communities on how to get involved with the IPCC.

Responding to the comments, Mr Andrej Mahecic highlighted the work with the IPCC Focal Points including on preparations for the releases of major reports, conducting dedicated briefings about communications plans before the approval sessions as well as providing support for national outreach events following the releases of reports. Regarding the expert meeting on communications, he said it was budgeted for 2024, to be held once the new authors for the seventh assessment cycle are selected, as per the relevant Panel's decision. On the use of other platforms and channels of communication, he said that the Communications team is exploring all possibilities of expanding and communicating climate change science to young audiences. As for the selection of specific models and social media platforms, the team needs to be strategic in its choice given the limited capacity to produce content.

The Panel took note of the IPCC Progress Report on Communications and Outreach.

7.8. IPCC Scholarship Programme

The Chair invited the Chair of the Science Board of the IPCC Scholarship Programme Ms Ko Barrett, IPCC Vice-Chair, to introduce the document. Ms Ko Barret asked Mr Mxolisi Shongwe, IPCC Programme Officer responsible for the Scholarship Programme to introduce the document [IPCC-LVII/INF. 8, Rev. 1](#).

Mr Mxolisi Shongwe conveyed the apologies of the Trustees who could not make it to this meeting and referred the other relevant document is the [Trust Deed for the Scholarship Programme](#) which outlines the aims and objectives of the program and outlines the roles and responsibilities of the Science Board, Trustees, and the Secretariat. He informed the Panel that since the Forty-ninth Session of the IPCC (IPCC-49), 12 students were awarded scholarships in the 5th round of awards. The 6th round which is the current cycle, awarded 33 students, the highest number since the program's inception. He thanked the Prince Albert Foundation of Monaco and Cuomo foundation for extending their support and further support received from the Moët-Hennessy Foundation through Prince Albert Foundation. Following a [decision from IPCC-49](#) to mobilize additional resources, the Board approached 35 potential funding agencies as a result the AXA Research Fund contributed about 200,000 Euros. He further informed the Panel that the IPCC received the Sam Rose and Julie Walters Prize for Global Environmental Activism and about CHF 97,000 award money will go toward the Scholarship Programme. He informed the Panel that the boards approached hosting partners and the University of Oxford and the Global Alliance on Agricultural Greenhouse Gases accepted to partner with the IPCC. IPCC is currently having ongoing discussions with the World Academy of Sciences who would like to support the Programme. He added that more institutions have expressed their interest in partnering based on the availability of funding. These include Centre for Marine Socioecology (Australia), Imperial College London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Nord Universitet (Norway)

and Mercator Ocean International (France). He concluded by presenting the status of resources in the Scholarship Trust Fund whose balance was CHF 1,185,196.

The Chair thanked Mxolisi Shongwe for the presentation and Ko Barret for chairing the Science Board. He opened the floor for comments.

France, St Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania, and Mr Noureddine Yassaa, Vice-Chair of Working Group I took the floor.

Among comments governments congratulated the IPCC Chair, the Chair of the Science Board, the Board of Trustees and the Secretariat for the incredible work done to bring the Programme to the level that it has reached. They inquired why the last report of the Board of Trustees was in 2019 when they are supposed to the Panel on an annual basis. They continued to call for more enhancement of the Programme given its importance for developing countries. There was a suggestion to name and acknowledge the students who were selected and the topic of their scholarship in order to acknowledge them as well as including information on gender and regional distribution. There was an inquiry on whether an earlier suggestion to approach IPCC Observer Organizations for more grants and to host PhD students.

In response to the comments and questions, the Chair of the science Board Ms Ko Barrett noted the suggestion to provide more information on regional balance and gender on awardees. She added that the near-term focus of the Scholarship Programme is engaging the scholarship opportunities and contributing to IPCC Assessments.

In addition, Mr Mxolisi Shongwe informed the Panel that the Board of Trustees hadn't reported because due to the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, there has not been a usual business session with the Scholarship Programme on the agenda. On information on geographical distribution, he clarified that this information is usually in the report as it is related to applicants. He added that the Board of Trustees had indeed approached Observer Organizations as was suggested and the current offers from Universities are a result of this effort.

Trinidad and Tobago and Mr Edvin Aldrian, Vice-Chair of Working Group I, took the floor.

Comments were as to a suggestion to increase outreach efforts in order to get more applications from developing countries given the importance of the programme.

Mr Shongwe mentioned that the recent announcement is posted on the IPCC website and IPCC social media.

The Panel took note of the progress report of the IPCC Scholarship Programme.

7.9. Informal Group on Publications

The Chair invited the Co-Chairs of the Informal Group on Publications to introduce the documents [IPCC-LVII/INF. 9](#) and [IPCC-LVII/INF. 9, Add. 1](#).

IPCC Working Group III Co-Chair Mr Jim Skea reported on behalf of his fellow Co-Chair Mr Taha Zatari. He informed the Panel on the expansion of the Group's mandate to consider translations in other UN languages and respective activities undertaken by the Group with the view to develop a formal process to ensure that the non-English translated versions would remain faithful to the English translation. He further informed the Panel that the Group had agreed on a process for translations, already accepted by the Bureau at its Sixtieth Session, summarized as follows: The proposed process will start with a first draft provided by WMO translators guided and assisted by a common glossary developed by Working Groups and supported by an online

system developed by the Secretariat. A Science Editor who will be specifically hired by the WMO for this function will review the first draft. The Science Editor will replace the review process undertaken so far by Bureau members in ad-hoc basis. This step will be followed by an organized review process involving governments and the Science Editor. The Group recommends that five editorial sub-committees be set up to supervise the translation of each language to ensure that translated version is available within 3 months after the English version is available.

In conclusion, Mr Jim Skea said that the process will be greatly facilitated by informal collaboration and communication. He thanked everyone in the Informal Group for working well and agreeing on this framework.

Mr Taha Zatari thanked the Working Group III TSU and the Secretariat for the wonderful job of supporting the Group. He added that the framework that has been described by Jim is a simple one that will help improve the translation of IPCC products.

The Chair thanked the Co-Chairs for their work and introduced the document and opened the floor for comments.

There were no comments.

The Panel took note of the report of the Informal Group of Publications.

8. MATTERS RELATED TO UNFCCC AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL BODIES

The Chair invited Ms Joanna Post from the UNFCCC Secretariat to introduce document [IPCC-LVII/INF. 11](#). She said that Parties to the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement continue to recognize the importance of basing decision-making on the best available science, and this was reaffirmed at the Twenty-sixth Conference of the Parties (COP 26) to the UNFCCC in the [Glasgow Climate Pact](#); that the relationship between the UNFCCC and the IPCC is long-running, integrated and vital, and that the Conference to the Parties (COP) appreciates the work of the IPCC and called on the subsidiary bodies to the Convention, particularly the Subsidiary Board for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) to continue its cooperation with the IPCC and to seek its advice. At COP 26, Parties welcomed the Working Group I Contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report. In the run up to COP 27, Parties are encouraged to build on the conclusions from the SBSTA 56 which welcomed the Working Group II and Working Group III Contributions to the Sixth Assessment Report and to reflect these in the outcome of decisions at COP 27.

Ms Joana Post reported on the collaboration between the IPCC and the UNFCCC after the Fifty-third (bis) Session of the IPCC (IPCC-53 bis) in March 2021, highlighting mandated events which took place under a number of UNFCCC work streams such as the SBSTA-IPCC Special Events on Working Group I which took place at COP 26, and Working Group II and Working Group III which took place at SBSTA 56; IPCC's involvement at every session of the Earth Information Days and Research Dialogues, in support of the SBSTA's agenda on Research and Systematic Observation (RSO); IPCC's input in the Structured Expert Dialogues of the second Periodic Review of the long-term global goal under the Convention and the progress towards achieving it; IPCC's participation in global stocktake (GST) technical dialogue which included plenary sessions, roundtables and the world café; the SBSTA-IPCC Joint working group meetings which assist in substantive planning prior to the UNFCCC sessions; the vital importance of the IPCC pavilion at recent COPs in supporting knowledge sharing for delegates; a large number of side events involving IPCC experts at COPs and Subsidiary Bodies' Sessions (SB).

Ms Joana Post highlighted some COP mandated events relevant to the IPCC, scheduled to take place at COP 27 under the RSO, the GST, the Gender Action Plan, and the Glasgow-Sharm el Sheikh Work Programme. On behalf of the UNFCCC Secretariat, she thanked the Chair of the IPCC, Co-Chairs of IPCC Working Groups and the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, the IPCC Secretariat and IPCC experts for their valuable contribution to the climate change events organized under the UNFCCC process. She appreciated the huge contributions

by the IPCC during COP 26, and in particular, the SB Sessions in June 2022 where there were more than 60 hours of mandated events with IPCC's involvement took place during the first week. She committed that the UNFCCC Secretariat would play its part to continue with strong collaboration with the IPCC Secretariat in the preparation of COP 27 sessions, and other events and meetings to be convened in 2023 and beyond.

Recalling the success of the IPCC in informing the first GST technical dialogue in June 2022, Ms Joana Post reminded the Panel that the Paris Agreement mandates that the second Global Stocktake (GST) would take place in 2028. She further stated that if the GST modalities are not revised such that the next GST runs the same way as the current one, the information collection component of the next GST would provisionally begin in 2026 and run until early in 2028.

Ms Joana Post further mentioned that the implementation of the Paris Agreement involves the support of systematic transformation of global systems, enabling conditions for engagement, for gender and intergenerational equivalence become more intense and must be recognized and integrated as part of the collaborative efforts.

Algeria, Angola, Belgium, France, Germany, India, Luxembourg, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Ko Barret, IPCC Vice-Chair and Jim Skea, Co-Chair of Working Group III took the floor.

Delegates appreciated the report by the UNFCCC Secretariat, particularly the dedicated efforts to strengthen the UNFCCC-IPCC collaboration. They remarked that while the UNFCCC is the most prominent organization to use the outcome of IPCC work, there should ideally be efforts to foster collaboration between the IPCC and other international organizations such as the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). Some delegates invited the IPCC to welcome the decision of the Ninth Session of its Plenary (IPBES 9) in July 2022 inviting IPCC and IPBES Focal Points, IPBES Bureau and their Executive Secretary to explore potential future joint activities and consider making a similar decision regarding the IPCC-IPBES collaboration. Others called for a longer discussion on this matter. A delegate called for greater engagement with other international organizations such as and for a report on climate change and desertification.

In response to the suggestion for a report on climate change and desertification, a Bureau member recalled the Panel that IPCC produced a special report on land that addresses desertification and degradation, ahead of the UNCCD COP 14.

The Chair noted that comments and suggestions related to other international bodies would be included in the report of the session.

The Panel took note of and welcomed with appreciation the report from UNFCCC.

9. UPDATE FROM THE GENDER ACTION TEAM

The Chair invited the Chair of the Gender Action Team (GAT), Ms Ko Barrett, to provide a report on the Agenda Item 9, Update from the Gender Action Team.

Ms Ko Barrett provided a report also on behalf of the GAT Vice-Chair, Ms Thelma Krug, on the work of the GAT including a draft Code of Conduct and a roadmap to developing the institutional process required for the IPCC to adequately deal with complaints (as contained in Annex I and Annex II of [IPCC-LVII/Doc. 5](#)).

The Chair of the GAT informed the Panel that the work of the GAT has been progressing on an accelerated track with the view to learn from the experience with gender, diversity and inclusion issues during this assessment cycle and to put processes in place for the next cycle that will bring

IPCC into the 21st century with regard to gender equity, respectful behaviour, and encouraging the full range of diversity of perspectives.

Ms Ko Barrett said that the IPCC as an organization has evolved tremendously over the years and highlighted the necessity to think of processes to make the IPCC robust when it comes to dealing with gender equity and inclusion issues; that the IPCC as a voluntary organization is unique in the ecosystem of UN bodies and while the IPCC could borrow from some of the existing practices, it's not straightforward to replicate the processes that are in place in WMO, UNEP, or anywhere else in the UN system. She informed that the GAT was now in the process of procuring services for a survey on gender diversity and inclusion with the intention of distributing it broadly to those who have been involved in IPCC activities. The objective was to survey people to gather lessons learned from this cycle before the beginning of the seventh assessment cycle. She reminded the Panel that it [approved](#) funding for this activity in the Fifty-fourth (bis) Session of the IPCC.

Ms Ko Barrett reported that the GAT drafted a Code of Conduct and developed a roadmap to figure out how to put in place processes to address issues that are emerging, using the Code of Conduct developed by the Working Group II as well as the other Working Groups in this cycle. She explained that the Code of Conduct guides the standard behaviour for those taking part in any IPCC activity, outlining discrimination, harassment and sexual harassment, and gives assurance that complaints will be handled in a sensitive and professional manner. Similar to the UN Code of Conduct, it provides the first point of contact in the event of a complaint, noting that the Code of Conduct is not the process for dealing with those complaints as they will be addressed in the institutional process envisioned by the roadmap. She further said that while the GAT has received three formal complaints and are aware of other complaints that have arisen in the context of the Working Groups, the IPCC has no processes in place to resolve these complaints. She clarified that the IPCC cannot simply adopt the process of WMO and UNEP as she previously explained and would have to take some care to craft the procedures that it would put in place. She clarified that the GAT has assessed existing processes and has put before the Panel this roadmap to seek input while a process to approve the eventual procedures may happen at a future Panel session.

She concluded by saying that the GAT is seeking for the Panel to approve the draft Code of Conduct as contained in Annex I of [IPCC-LVII/Doc. 5](#) and provide further guidance on the roadmap as contained in Annex II of [IPCC-LVII/Doc. 5](#).

The Chair opened the floor for comments.

Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania and the United States of America, as well as Mr Gregory Flato, IPCC Working Group I Vice-Chair, took the floor.

Delegates expressed appreciation to the GAT for its work, including the preparation of the document ([IPCC-LVII/Doc. 5](#)) and the presentation on the progress of activities by the Chair of the GAT. It was acknowledged also with appreciation that the many GAT activities were happening in parallel to an intensive period at the end of this cycle. Some praised the GAT highlighting the importance of considering "gender equity" in addition to "gender equality" in the IPCC Gender Policy and implementation activities. In general, delegates expressed support for having a Code of Conduct and a roadmap to developing the institutional processes required for the IPCC to adequately deal with complaints. It was highlighted how important the GAT work was in terms of putting IPCC on a stronger footing as it regards gender, diversity and inclusiveness issues as the IPCC is shifting to the next cycle.

Several delegations expressed readiness to approve the Code of Conduct as drafted and contained in the document ([IPCC-LVII/Doc. 5](#)). It was stated that the Code of Conduct will ensure a balanced and fair workplace and that is free of all forms of harassment. Recommendations were also made on the wording, for instance encouraging that “abusive authority” be defined. Some speakers also proposed to approve the Code of Conduct as it was with the opportunity to revisit it in the beginning of the next cycle.

Others disagreed with these views and required clarification as to the language used in the drafted Code of Conduct and whether it had been reviewed from a legal perspective as they were of the view that the document does not use language that is previously agreed by Governments in other UN forums. In this context some delegations were requesting for a revision of the terminology and definitions in question. There was also a disagreement of approving the document as it was and revising it later.

Some pointed out that it was important that the Code of Conduct is regularly reviewed and consistently communicated through the next cycle so that it becomes embedded in the culture of the IPCC and informs respectful engagement of all parties in all IPCC activities. The importance of considering cultural differences and nuances in the development of the Code of Conduct was also highlighted. The matter of having a healthy environment, including during long sessions was also raised especially for those leading the meeting being unable to take breaks.

As to the roadmap, overall, there was a support for its development. Some stated that an organization such as the IPCC, which draws on expertise around the world and has participants from various backgrounds and relies on that diversity as one of its key strengths, should have mechanisms protecting these individuals. Suggestions were made to examine what other UN bodies have established in this regard. The importance of building confidence in the effectiveness of the mechanism particularly in dealing with future complaints was highlighted.

Concerns were expressed regarding the three complaints the GAT had received. Some requested further information and reassurance that these would be dealt with. Questions were raised as to how these existing complaints would be addressed while the IPCC is in the process of preparing its own mechanism. As an interim solution, proposals were made to look at WMO and UNEP procedures.

Among other points made, speakers raised questions regarding the survey and its scope, as well as the necessity to procure the services for this activity, as previously surveys have been conducted internally.

In responding to comments, Ms Ko Barrett thanked all members for their overwhelming support to the work of the GAT. She reported that the IPCC Legal Officer has reviewed the Code of Conduct. As to the survey, she reiterated that although in the past some surveys were conducted internally, this time the GAT recommended to contact experts to construct a survey that would look at gender issues and more broadly at diversity and inclusion issues to inform the future for the IPCC in moving to the seventh assessment cycle. She recalled that the cost for this activity was [approved](#) by the Panel at the Fifty-fourth (bis) Session of the IPCC.

As to the complaints, Ms Ko Barrett reported that the GAT is also concerned about the complaints received and that the details of these are confidential. She clarified that without a process in place the transition plan was for her as a Chair of the GAT to be communicating with the complainants to acknowledge the receipt and inform them that these are not forgotten. She said that she will work with the IPCC Legal Officer to see whether or not there is a way to use WMO or UNEP processes to make sure that the complaints received so far are addressed while the IPCC is going through the process of developing its own mechanism. As to the cultural aspects, she clarified that the Code of Conduct was informed by the Working Groups’ experiences in this cycle

and is very much in the context of the cultural challenges and nuances. She said that this discussion was an opportunity to make further changes to the Code as needed and highlighted that the need to consider the cultural nuances will be included in the roadmap and that the survey to be conducted would be useful in this regard. She also emphasised the importance of the training to ensure a smooth transition to the next cycle.

She suggested to hear from delegates the specifics of the concerns expressed related to some of the terminology as this would be helpful in addressing their concerns.

Argentina, Brazil, France, Germany, Indonesia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and the United States of America, as well as Ms Valérie Masson-Delmotte, IPCC Working Group I Co-Chair and Ms Diana Ürge-Vorsatz, IPCC Working Group III Vice-Chair took the floor.

Delegates expressed appreciation to the responses received from the Chair of the GAT. Some still raised concerns as to the language that was used in the Code of Conduct stating that is not language that is generally adopted under other intergovernmental panels and invited the Secretariat to assess this document with the view to reflect language on which consensus has been reached in other UN documents, including the terminologies related to discrimination, harassment and sexual harassment. Some also questioned if this was the right forum to discuss this matter.

In responding to comments, Ms Barrett clarified that this was very much the forum to take up this issue and recalled that the Panel has established the GAT and agreed on [IPCC Gender Policy and Implementation Plan](#) and the actions presented are in alignment with what the Panel has already approved. She offered to meet with the delegates that still have comments, together with the Legal Officer, to see if the wording issues could be resolved.

Some delegates shared the view that having a legal conversation would require having the lawyers from their respective countries to be present in this Session while this is not the case. They further suggested for the Secretariat legal team to go back to the text and use the same language that has been adopted by other UN bodies in this context, instead of introducing new terminology that is not accepted by all Member Countries.

Some delegates highlighted the pertinence of approving the Code of Conduct as proposed by the GAT, especially as it has already been used by the IPCC Working Groups and based on other UN Codes of Conduct. Others suggested the possibility of temporarily applying the Code of Conducts of WMO or UNEP in case of no agreement on the text.

Ms Ko Barrett offered a huddle noting the importance to make progress at this Session on the relevant matters related to this agenda item.

The Secretary invited delegates to consider the proposal of the Chair of the GAT to hold a huddle with the view to understand which elements need improvements and resolve the remaining concerns. He also said that the IPCC Legal Officer will be present if legal advice is sought.

The Chair invited a huddle facilitated by the Chair of the GAT and encouraged participants to reach an agreement on an acceptable language.

Following the huddle discussions on this agenda item Ms Ko Barrett reported that the consultations in the last couple of days were very useful. She said that there was universal support for the IPCC working arrangements that are respectful and harassment free; that looking at the way other UN bodies adopted Codes of Conduct, it became clear that this has been done as an internal organizational document that guides operations but does not require approval from its Member Countries. She shared the example of the UNFCCC Code of Conduct, which is similar

to the one drafted for the IPCC, that has never been brought to the Parties of UNFCCC for approval.

Ms Ko Barrett said that following the huddle discussions, it was determined that a decision from the Panel was no longer required for this Agenda Item 9 and consequently, the relevant conference paper was withdrawn.

She thanked the Panel for the time and support for the GAT.

France, Germany, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Sweden, Türkiye, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America took the floor.

Some welcomed this way forward and congratulated the GAT and its Chair for their work and the IPCC for having a Code of Conduct noting the importance of the work of the GAT and its application of the Code of Conduct and encouraged the GAT to take all necessary steps to address the complaints. Others said they would take note on the views of the Chair of the GAT but should not be considered that the Panel was approving this proposed way forward or this view. Other points included that although there would not be a decision, with this way forward the IPCC will continue to apply the relevant Code of Conduct.

Ms Ko Barrett thanked everyone for the support for the work of the GAT and stated that there is no decision by the Panel on this but in view of UN practices, the relevant applicable Code of Conduct will accordingly be implemented for the IPCC.

The Panel took note of the report by the Chair of the GAT.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

10.1. Working Group Co-Chairs' Perspectives on Lessons Learned from AR6

The Chair invited the Co-chairs to introduce the item. Ms Debra Roberts, Working Group II Vice-Chair introduced the relevant document for this agenda item [IPCC-LVII/INF.12](#).

Ms Debra Roberts highlighted the cycle's unprecedented nature as to the workload and intensity with each Working Group managing a Special Report and their contribution to the Assessment Report. She further added that the intensity of the work was complicated and exacerbated by a number of factors including the volume of scientific literature doubling every 5 years; increased number of review comments; increasing demand for outreach including UNFCCC processes; the work on the Error Protocol; COI procedures; monthly obligations to the ExCom; a strong desire to communicate more and better as well as implementation of FAIR principles that increases the workload around publication of the reports. She explained that the increased workload meant a reduction in the number of Expert Meetings in this cycle even though the number of requests for co-sponsored meetings increased. She highlighted the challenges of managing a large number of diverse author teams without a Human Resources function.

She invited the Panel as IPCC transitions to the next cycle to consider issues (outlined as lessons learnt) such as the continuity between the TSUs especially retaining institutional memory; alignment of the timeline of the assessment report with the UNFCCC Global Stocktake process; consideration of other products and activities other than full Assessment Reports like Special Reports and Technical Papers; how to best coordinate the organizations that would like to engage with the IPCC and consider how to best manage the authors' workloads.

The Chair thanked Ms Debra Roberts and all the Co-Chairs for the lessons learned document, which has a lot of materials for Focal Points and next IPCC Bureau session to consider and opened the floor for comments.

Albania, Algeria, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Canada, France, Jamaica, Kenya, Luxembourg, Mauritius, New Zealand, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Switzerland, Sudan, Türkiye, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Mr Nouredinne Yassa, IPCC Working Group I Vice-Chair, Ms Diana Ürge-Vorsatz, IPCC Working Group III Vice-Chair and FWCC took the floor.

Delegates appreciated the richness and timeliness of the content of the lessons learned document which they hoped the Panel will reflect, consider and implement. They further noted the importance of the document for the next IPCC Bureau session and the need to regularly return to them as it goes forwards. Some delegates noted the need for a smooth transition between cycles specially to preserve the organization's institutional memory. Several delegates expressed concern about the level of participation of women from the global South

Other points made included the need to maintain the innovations implemented for the online approval sessions such as the time management during approval sessions and planning which was well done for the Working Group approval sessions and detailed notes on how to use contact groups and how to involve authors in the approval process. Delegates expressed their hope that these will also be used for the approval of the Synthesis Report. There was a proposal that the Bureau discusses this during their meeting ahead of the SYR approval Session.

There were suggestions to use the future SBSTA-IPCC Joint working Group Sessions to clarify how the IPCC works in order for the UNFCCC to fully understand what the IPCC can and can't do. There was a call to submit this document to the Bureau for them to develop key messages for the Panel to consider as it transitions to the seventh assessment cycle. It was further suggested that as the Bureau considers this, they should also consider how to ease the burden of the work on the Co-Chairs.

The Chair thanked the Working Group Co-Chairs, TSU staff, authors, Working Group Bureau members for their work and the document. He recognized the contribution made by the TFI on their methodology reports. He expressed his expectation that the next Bureau will consider them to improve their work.

A Bureau member suggested that the views of the Bureau and the Task Force Bureau should also be considered including the consideration of the management of the carbon footprint of the IPCC.

The Panel took note of the report by the Working Group Co-Chairs.

10.2. IPCC Copyright Policy

The Chair invited the Secretariat to introduce the agenda item. The IPCC Legal Officer presented this agenda item. She recalled that the IPCC applies the copyright policies of the UN and referred to the 1989 Memorandum of Understanding between WMO and UNEP establishing the IPCC stating that the copyright is vested in UNEP and WMO jointly with all publications indicating as originating from the IPCC. She further recalled the provisions and the principles of the copyright policy as to the use of the IPCC materials, derivative materials, logo, website as well as translation.

Belgium, France, Netherlands, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, and Switzerland took the floor.

Some delegates invited the Panel to consider introducing some flexibility in using IPCC information, as IPCC reports findings often require some simplification due to their complexity. Further noted were the challenges faced due to the related permissions required which sometimes hamper outreach efforts especially in cases where translation to local languages may be required. Others were happy with the current policy which they found reasonable and helpful for avoiding misuse of IPCC materials, which need comprehensive protection.

Some delegates noted that the IPCC has grown and proposed a more detailed consideration of this agenda item perhaps at a future meeting. There was a further request for the presentation made by the Legal Officer to be posted on Papersmart so that Focal Points may be able to refer to it. In addition, delegates asked for the Secretariat to look at copyright policies of similar organizations and how they have evolved in order to look at where the IPCC could make amendments, given the development of means of communication. In addition, there was a proposal for the Informal Group on Publications to explore this matter at a future session.

In her response, the Legal Officer informed the Panel that while considering simplification, the extent to which the figures could be subject to a derivative process will need to be addressed. She explained that the current practice is to defer review to the applicable TSU noting the operating principle which is that SPM figure usage should reflect that as approved by the Panel.

She noted the interest in simplifying IPCC products for the use of the general public. In that regard, the Panel would have to decide the extent to which the adjustments or changes can be made.

Belgium and Saudi Arabia took the floor.

There was a proposal for the Secretariat to prepare a presentation on the copyright policies of WMO and UNEP and other organizations in order to understand how other organizations are dealing with this challenge as an information point. There was a view that questioned the need for such a presentation since IPCC is a standalone entity, and consideration should be given against opening IPCC products to simplification and reinterpretation without IPCC oversight.

The Chair invited the Panel to take note of the presentation and that the proposal for a future presentation be recorded in the report of this meeting.

The Secretary added that if there is a need to consider this agenda item in another session the Secretariat can include it on the agenda upon request from Member Countries.

The Panel took note of the presentation.

10.3. Transition to the Next Assessment Cycle and Related Matters (lessons learned, timing of elections and length of the next cycle)

The Secretary presented Agenda Item 10.3. Transition to the Next Assessment Cycle and Related Matters (lessons learned, timing of elections and length of the next cycle).

Argentina, Canada, France, Germany, Japan, Luxembourg, St.Lucia, Saudi Arabia, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Mr Edvin Aldrian (WGI Vice-Chair), and Ms Diana Ürge-Vorsatz (WGIII Vice Chair) took the floor.

Delegates stressed the need for a clear roadmap to AR7 and that the issues under this agenda item should include the timing of elections, the length of the next cycle and lessons learned as a preparatory action for AR7 with some suggesting an Ad-Hoc Group for the inter-sessional period. A delegate opposed the inter-sessional work stating that they were fully occupied with SYR. Delegates stated the need for a Contact Group to draft a decision text on this agenda item for consideration by the Panel at this session. Other suggestions included alignment of the cycle with

the UNFCCC stock-take; taking stock of the positive lessons in addition to negative and the need to consider the experiences of the Bureau and involving the Bureau in the intersessional work.

The Secretary proposed the establishment of a Contact Group co-Facilitated by Mr Frank McGovern (Ireland) and Mr Ladislaus Changa (United Republic of Tanzania).

The Chair stated the mandate of the Contact Group to draft a decision text aiming to address three points such as the timing of the elections, the length of the next cycle and the lessons learned.

Argentina, Brazil, New Zealand and the Republic of Korea took the floor.

Delegates raised the question about the legal requirements for setting the date of the elections. This was necessary to determine the shortest possible time to set the date of the elections and to allow the Contact Group to work on good grounds. Among other points, they said that legal advice should be given in Plenary so that all member governments can hear it and that more time should be allowed for consultations with capitals. It was also suggested to apply the decision of the Fifty-third Session of the IPCC which should be the starting point for the Contact Group discussion.

The Secretary said that the Legal Officer would attend the Contact Group to provide necessary information at the beginning of its work noting that the Contact Group is a mechanism to prepare the discussion, but that the decision will be taken by the Panel. Secretary added that advice from the Legal Officer would be provided in the Plenary at the end of the current session.

The Legal Officer briefed the Panel on the IPCC election timing rules, noting that Bureau terms last until 12 months after the completion of the Assessment Report and until the election of the new Bureau and that the Secretariat must invite nominations at least six months prior to the election. There is no overall term limit because Bureau members can postulate themselves for other positions or serve two terms in any position other than IPCC Chair.

Ghana, Kenya, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania and United States of America took the floor.

Points made included lack of the specific reference to the SYR in the timing of the elections and the need for a decision on earlier elections; a proposal for a term limit for the Bureau and a call for a decision aiming for earlier and smooth transition to the next cycle. Other points included different interpretation of the timing of the elections in the Rules of Procedures.

The Legal Officer stated that the Panel can decide to shorten the six-month period.

At the resumption of the discussion on this agenda item, the Chair invited the Co-Facilitators of the Contact Group to brief the Panel about the progress on Group's discussion on the Agenda Item 10.3.

Mr Ladislaus Changa reported that there was a convergence of views on the need for a smooth transition, including on learning, operations and budgets.

On the timing of the elections Mr Frank McGovern said that a range of months was mentioned from April to July 2023. Many shared the view that the election would take place after March 2023 when the Plenary session to sign off on the Synthesis Report takes place. A number of delegates did not specify a date but called for adhering to the IPCC rules and procedures as outlined in the IPCC principles.

On the length of the cycle, it was reported that there was consensus on keeping the status quo as it provides enough flexibility to accommodate the provision of reports in the seventh assessment cycle.

On lessons learned, while there were calls for the establishment of an inter-sessional Task Team to capture the lesson learned, there was no consensus on this, with concern about the burden of work. There was consensus that already existing documents and reflections provided by the Bureau in this session provide a useful basis for further development; that this development could be facilitated by the Bureau at its next session; that this could include requesting submissions from IPCC focal points on lessons learned and the review process would likely not be completed until late 2023. While there were calls for the establishment of an inter-sessional Task Team to capture the lesson learned, there was no consensus on this, with concern on the burden of work.

Australia, Belgium, Belize, Canada, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, Germany, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, St Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Switzerland, Sweden, United States of America, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Mr Sergey Semenov (Bureau member), Ms Ko Barrett (IPCC Vice-Chair) and Mr Jim Skea (Co-Chair of the WGII), took the floor.

Delegates shared different understandings and interpretations of IPCC election timing rules with some saying that the term of the Bureau would end at the time of the next election; that the Panel can set the timing of the next election; that the timing of the Secretariat's letter inviting nominations is determined by the timing of the elections; that the Secretariat could issue an invitation for nominations but over a specific period of time when governments can send a formal notification regarding their candidates for the seventh assessment cycle and that this period would start only after the approval of the SYR as scheduled in March 2023. A number of delegations supported this proposal stressing it was in line with the IPCC rules, reiterating arguments for holding elections as soon as possible, including to allow TSUs to plan and ensure a good handover between cycles; avoid prolonging and overstraining the current Bureau, as its duration will pass the maximum term of seven years.

Some delegates said that given the current facts and exceptional situation and the six-month delay of the SYR means the decision of P53bis is no longer valid as slowing the transition to the 7th cycle would put in danger the production of the new reports. Given that the global stock-take takes place every five years, it was proposed that the Panel set the next cycle to 7.5 years. A delegate stressed the need to be humane to those serving in the Bureau emphasizing that some proposals would extend their service to more than eight years. Another one emphasized the need for a clear decision on the timeline to enable planning and discussions with TSUs and those providing funds.

China, Republic of Korea and Saudi Arabia stressed the need to focus on completing the SYR and start the election process once the SYR is completed.

The Chair pointed out that the integrity of the SYR will be damaged if the election process begins before the completion of the SYR, that the IPCC election rules stipulate at least a six-month lapse between the SYR completion and the timing of the Secretary's letter to governments for nominations of the candidates, and that all previous IPCC elections were held on the basis of this rule.

China, Egypt, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, and Venezuela took the floor.

Delegates said that the IPCC should observe the election rules and starting election procedures immediately after the SYR approval would put new candidates at a disadvantage, particularly those coming from developing countries.

Summarizing interventions, the Chair noted the lack of consensus on the proposal at hand and invited the Legal Officer to give views on whether the proposal at hand was consistent with the rules.

The Legal Officer stated that in view of the valid concerns, including those pragmatic and humanitarian as highlighted by some delegates, it may be understood that the IPCC rules are subject to Panel further application. With regard to the proposal of issuing the letter calling for nominations immediately after IPCC-57 she drew attention to the COI policy – paragraphs 11 and 17 emphasizing the importance of the reputation of IPCC and that there should not be any unfair advantage and to prevent any situation where a COI may arise. The individuals involved in the report should avoid being in a situation to approve it after or accept it on behalf of the governments. There needs to be a clear division between those involved in the approval process and those postulating for candidacy.

With regards to the question as if SYR is part of the assessment report she confirmed that SYR is included in the Assessment Report stating that there is a decision at the Forty-first Session of the IPCC, approved by the Panel, which provides that all parts of the Assessment report should be released within one year but no more than 18 months staggering between the Working Group reports allowing the report of one Working Group being reflected in another Working Group report and the SYR.

As to the shortening of the six months period between the invitation letter and elections, as stipulated in Rule 21, The Legal Officer confirmed that the Panel could choose to shorten this period.

The Secretary said that the Panel could set the date either for early September or August 2023.

Australia, Belgium, Belize, Canada, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, Germany, Japan, Indonesia, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Mr Sergey Semenov, Vice-Chair of Working Group II, Ms Ko Barret, IPCC Vice Chair and Mr Jim Skea, Co-Chair of the WGIII, took the floor.

In an attempt to find middle ground across many perspectives, the United States of America proposed that the Secretariat's letter inviting nominations is sent within two weeks of the conclusion of IPCC-57 and elections are held in July 2023, recognizing the extraordinary circumstances due to Covid-19 and the need to ensure a smooth transition between AR6 and AR7, thus addressing the concerns about a revision of procedures. The letter would specify the size, composition and structure of AR7, its length and timing and the process for the elections. The remaining paras of the decision would focus on regional, intra-regional and gender representation, inviting the Focal Points to nominate qualified experts. The last para would note that the current term of the AR6 Bureau would end at the election's plenary.

Many delegations expressed support for the proposal put forward by the United States of America. A delegate opposed the United States of America proposal, stating that less than six months would not be enough time for candidates, and suggested September as a compromise. Several delegations suggested sending the invitation letter immediately after the SYR approval. There was also a proposal to send a letter of invitation, announcing the elections, in January 2023. Some delegates reiterated the need to focus on having a successful SYR approval and upholding the quality of the report' that the Panel should stay focused on SYR at hand and after that the Panel can kick off election procedures in line with rules and procedures.

As to the proposal to sending the letter in January 2023, the Chair stressed that such a letter before the SYR approval session would disrupt the SYR process. The Chair requested that the letter inviting nominations is sent after the SYR approval.

With regard to the deadline for submission of nominations, the delegates noted that sometimes flexibility is desired at the session, allowing for nominations to take place also at the session. They also highlighted the need for lessons learned to be available in a written format prior to the elections. Some called for an interim report before the Sixtieth Session of the IPCC (IPCC-60) and suggested a written report “for consideration” at IPCC-60.

The Legal Officer clarified that the deadline for submission of nominations in the draft decision was in reference to written submissions a month before the session. Nominations can be made at the session orally.

The IPCC Chair invited the Co-Facilitators of the Contact Group to work on a draft decision reflecting the discussion and what has been agreed on Agenda Item 10.3 and to be displayed on Papersmart.

At the resumption of the discussion the Co-Facilitators of the Contact Group (Ireland and United Republic of Tanzania) introduced the draft decision (IPCC-LVII-6) which captured the transition to the next assessment cycle, lessons learned and the time of the elections for elections and the length of the next cycle. The Co-Facilitators took the Panel through the draft text of the decision displayed on the screen in the Plenary.

Argentina, Azerbaijan, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, India, Luxembourg, Norway, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, Ms Diana Ürge-Vorsatz, WGIII Vice-Chair and Mr Eduardo Calvo Buendía, Co-Chair TFI took the floor.

Delegates said the written report should be considered at IPCC-60. They also requested revising a reference to a deadline for nominations one month prior to the Fifty-ninth Session of the IPCC (IPCC-59) and supported the more specific references to intraregional and gender aspects in the lessons learned.

As to the proposal about making the lessons learnt report available before IPCC-60, the IPCC Secretary said that the report can be made available to and posted in the portal for the Panel members prior to the IPCC-59.

The Chair thanked for all interventions and invited the Panel to approve the draft decision on Agenda item 10.3, as amended.

The Panel approved the decision as contained in the document (IPCC-LVIII-6) which requested the Bureau to facilitate the process of collecting and synthesizing the lessons learned from the sixth assessment cycle, starting from the next session of the IPCC Bureau with the view to provide a written report prior to IPCC-59; the Secretary to send the letter inviting nominations for AR7 Bureau and TFB two weeks following the conclusion of the IPCC-58 and the election of the new Bureau to take place at the IPCC-59 in July 2023; and the length of the seventh assessment cycle shall be between five and seven years.

11. PLACE AND DATE FOR THE FIFTY-EIGHTH PLENARY SESSION OF THE IPCC

The Chair invited the Secretary of the IPCC to introduce this agenda item.

The Secretary informed the Panel that the Fifty-eight Session of the IPCC (IPCC-58) will be held in Interlaken, Switzerland from 13 to 17 March 2023. He thanked the Swiss Government for offering to host the Session.

12. CLOSING OF THE SESSION

In his closing remarks, the Chair stressed that the four-day session was intense and productive and thanked delegates for the positive and constructive discussions, flexibility, hard work, and close cooperation manifested throughout the complex and demanding session and exceptional commitment to IPCC.

The Chair underlined the importance of the decisions taken by the Panel at this session highlighting the complexity of the issues as well as the appreciating the passion and dedication of everyone's work.

Thanking the Bureau, national Focal Points, IPCC Secretariat, Vice-Chairs, Co-Chairs of the Working Groups and the TSUs for all their work preparing this session, the Chair also thanked the WMO and the UNEP for their continuous support to the IPCC and declared the Fifty-seventh Session of the IPCC closed.

FIFTY SEVENTH SESSION OF THE IPCC

27 – 30 September 2022

Decisions adopted by the Panel**Decision IPCC-LVII- 1. Adoption of the Provisional Agenda***Documents: IPCC-LVII/Doc.1, Rev. 2 and IPCC-LVII/Doc.1. Rev. 2, Add.1*

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change at its Fifty-Seventh Session adopts the provisional agenda as contained in document IPCC-LVII/Doc.1, Rev. 2, with the inclusion of additional items to be discussed under Any Other Business: IPCC Copyright Policy; and Transition to the Next Assessment Cycle with Related Matters (lessons learned, timing of elections and length of the next cycle). A revised version of the Provisional Agenda (IPCC-LVII/Doc.1, Rev. 3) has been issued to reflect the addition of agenda items as agreed by the Panel.

Decision IPCC-LVII- 2. Approval of the draft report of the Fifty-Sixth Session of the IPCC*Document: IPCC-LVII/Doc. 4*

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change at its Fifty-Seventh Session approves the report of the Fifty-Sixth Session of the IPCC with the deletion of the words “as per the rules” in the last paragraph on page 3 of the report.

Decision IPCC-LVII- 3. Admission of Observer Organizations*Document: IPCC-LVII/Doc. 3*

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change at its Fifty-Seventh Session decides to grant the following organizations IPCC observer status, in accordance with the IPCC Policy and Process for Admitting Observer Organizations:

- 1) AJEMALEBU Self-Help (AJESH);
- 2) China Biodiversity Conservation and Green Development Foundation (CBCGDF);
- 3) League of Women Voters of the US (LWV);
- 4) Minerals Council of Australia (MCA);
- 5) Max Planck Society for the Advancement of Science (MPS);
- 6) Save the Children International (SCI);
- 7) Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS);
- 8) University of California, San Diego (UCSD);
- 9) Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL);
- 10) University of Bonn (Uni Bonn);
- 11) ProVeg International ((ProVeg Int);
- 12) University of Eastern Finland (Uni E Finland);
- 13) Green Orbit Standard System (GOSS);
- 14) Lake Victoria Region Local Authorities Cooperation (LVRLAC);
- 15) Human Rights and Forest Brain Africa (HURIFBA).

The application from the Holy See and the application from NATO will each be treated as pending applications subject to future Panel review.

Decision IPCC-LVII- 4. IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget for the years 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025

Documents: IPCC-LVII/Doc. 2, and IPCC-LVII/Doc.2, Add. 1

Based on the recommendations of the Financial Task Team (FiTT), the Fifty-Seventh Session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change:

1. Takes into account the exceptional circumstances related to the global coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, recognizing the need for contingencies, and without setting a precedent;
2. Appreciates the support that the Secretariat of the IPCC provides to the IPCC process, while especially noting the challenges imposed by the global COVID-19 pandemic;
3. Appreciates the extraordinary contribution and commitment of authors, Working Group Bureaux, Task Force Bureau on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Technical Support Units, and the Scientific Steering Committee to the Synthesis Report, including working through virtual means, under these exceptionally challenging circumstances;
4. Notes the basis for the significant reduction in the 2022 budget is due to implications of the COVID-19 pandemic, including travel restrictions and the inability to hold meetings in-person, and further notes the successful outcomes of holding virtual meetings to include the approval sessions of the 55th Session of the IPCC/12th Session of Working Group II and the 56th Session of the IPCC/14th Session of Working Group III, as well as the 61st and 62nd Sessions of the Bureau and the Working Group II and Working Group III SPM Drafting Meetings;
5. Approves the revised budget for 2022, as contained in **Annex 1**, while recognizing the exceptional circumstances arising from the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in a lower utilization of the budget;
6. Approves the proposed budget for 2023, as contained in **Annex 2**;
7. Notes the forecast budget for 2024, as contained in **Annex 3**;
8. Notes the indicative budget for 2025, as contained in **Annex 4**;
9. Welcomes with gratitude all contributions, pledges and in-kind contributions from member countries, especially from developing countries, UN bodies, intergovernmental organizations and the European Union, and encourages all members of the IPCC to maintain or increase their financial support, also through multi-year pledges, so as to ensure the financial stability of the IPCC. An updated in-kind contributions table is contained in **Annex 5**;
10. Encourages member countries to make first-time contributions to the IPCC Trust Fund in order to broaden the donor base;

- 11.** Expresses its gratitude to member countries that support the Technical Support Units (TSUs) and a number of IPCC activities, including data centres, travel support of IPCC experts, meetings and outreach activities;
- 12.** Encourages member countries to transfer funds as soon as practical, while noting that contributions from IPCC members are due on 1 January of each calendar year, noting that when transferring funds to WMO, members should indicate that the contribution is “for the IPCC Trust Fund” to ensure proper identification of the recipient;
- 13.** Recognizes the sound financial situation of the IPCC Trust Fund and appreciates the efforts of the Secretariat but notes with concern the decline in the level of annual voluntary contributions to the IPCC Trust Fund and calls on member countries to make their annual contributions to the IPCC Trust Fund and, if possible, to increase their annual voluntary contributions.
- 14.** Expresses its gratitude to the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) for their cash contribution to the Trust Fund, for financing one Secretariat position each, and to WMO for hosting the Secretariat and for its continuing and increased support for the IPCC;
- 15.** Expresses its gratitude to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) for its contribution to the IPCC Trust Fund;
- 16.** Decides to continue preparing the budget of the IPCC Trust Fund using the standard costs, bearing in mind that expenditures may be lower than the budget;
- 17.** Requests the Secretariat to provide detailed information in the budget document presented to the Panel;
- 18.** Requests that the Secretariat presents, in addition to statements according to IPSAS, the statement of financial position and financial performance on a modified cash basis which categorizes expenditures per activity as well as by natural account;
- 19.** Requests the Secretariat to provide the Panel with interim statements of expenditure covering the first six months of a given year, as well as the projection of expenditure for the rest of the given year;
- 20.** Decides to allow the use of Trust Fund resources in 2022 and 2023 for enhancing security, participation and IT-related needs in meetings, including reimbursing the cost of connectivity improvement, travel-related health and sanitary measures and other arrangements to enable participation of the delegates and experts from developing countries and countries with economies-in-transition in the activities of the IPCC, if needed, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The rates for reimbursement of such costs incurred by such participants will be determined by the Secretariat, in line with WMO rules and regulations;
- 21.** Notes the detailed information provided by the Secretariat on expenditure for activities held virtually due to the COVID-19 pandemic, including those related to connectivity in the IPCC Trust Fund Programme and Budget document presented to the Panel at its Fifty-seventh Session;
- 22.** Requests the Secretariat to provide the Panel with interim statements of expenditure, covering the first six months of 2022, if relevant, on expenditure related to holding of virtual meetings due to the COVID-19 pandemic as well as the projection of expenditure for the rest of 2022;

23. Approves the costs associated with the creation of a new post (P-4), within the IPCC Secretariat (see **Annex 1** and *IPCC-LVII/Doc.2/Add.1*);
24. Requests the Secretariat to develop a report outlining the core functions of the secretariat and highlighting its needs, going into the next cycle, to better inform the overall staffing requirements within the Secretariat, to be presented to the 60th Session of the IPCC;
25. Requests the Secretariat to provide information on major activities and related costs covered by the Communications budget;
26. Requests the Secretariat to prepare a document presenting the financial implications and estimated associated travel-related greenhouse gas emissions of holding physical, virtual and hybrid meetings, to be presented to the 60th Session of the IPCC;
27. Further requests the Secretariat to explore, with WMO, the possibility of enabling travel itineraries that are more climate-friendly in an effort to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the travel, including of participants who are supported by the IPCC Trust Fund;
28. Recalling Decision IPCC-XLVII-9, para 5, and noting the cost estimates for the activities outlined in the workplan of TG-Data, as contained in *IPCC-LVII/INF.7/Rev.1*, requests the Secretariat and the IPCC Bureau to provide guidance to the TG-Data Co-chairs on mobilizing resources, including in-kind contributions, for their activities and for the Data Distribution Centre (DDC);
29. Invites member countries and observer organizations to consider supporting the activities of the DDC in order to ensure the continuation of its services.

REVISED 2022 BUDGET ADOPTED BY IPCC-LVII

Activity	Purpose	DC/EIT support	Other Expenditure	Sub-total
Governing bodies				
IPCC-55	AR6 WG II	120,000 30 journeys	350,000	470,000
IPCC-56	AR6 WG III	120,000 30 journeys	350,000	470,000
IPCC-57 4 days	Governance & Preparation - Elections	480,000 120 journeys	280,000	760,000
Bureau 4 days	2 sessions	288,000 72 journeys	120,000	408,000
TFB	1 session	36,000 9 journeys	6,120	42,120
UNFCCC and other UN meetings		80,000 20 journeys	0	80,000
SUB-TOTAL				2,230,120
Lead Authors, scoping, expert meetings and workshops				
SYR AR6	CWT-3 meeting (moved from 2021)	164,000 41 journeys	0	164,000
SYR AR6	CWT-4 meeting (moved from 2021)	164,000 41 journeys	27,880	191,880
TG-Data	1 meeting	48,000 12 journeys	0	48,000
EFDB Editorial Board	1 meeting	96,000 24 journeys	0	96,000
EFDB Data meeting	2 meetings	80,000 20 journeys	0	80,000
EFDB and Software Users Feedback (Japan)	1 meeting	44,000 11 journeys	0	44,000
TFI Expert Meeting on Short-lived Climate Forcers	1 meeting	160,000 40 journeys	27,200	187,200
TFI Scoping Meeting on Short-lived Climate Forcers	1 meeting (move to 2023)	0 40 journeys	0	0
TFI Expert Meeting on Atmospheric Observation data in Emission Inventories	1 meeting	160,000 40 journeys	27,200	187,200
SUB-TOTAL				998,280
Other Expenditure				
2006 GL software	maintenance/development			30,000
EFDB maintenance	update/management			70,000
Publications/Translations	IPCC publications (WGI/WGII/WGIII)			300,000
Gender Action Team - Survey	Consultancy			40,000
Communication I	AR6 material/travel/events			623,040
Communication II*	AR6 outreach events*			100,000
Distribution	IPCC publications			100,000
IT Infrastructure	web hosting/cloudflare/upgrades			13,128
External Audit	fee			20,000
Advisory Services	Conflict of Interest			15,000
Co-Chairs	support			200,000
SUB-TOTAL				1,511,168
Secretariat				
Secretariat	staff costs/misc expenses			2,553,050
Resource Mobilization	travel costs (Phase II: 2020-2022)			0
SUB-TOTAL				2,553,050
TOTAL				7,292,618

All activities subject to Panel approval in IPCC-57

* Regional/local events

Revised/new activity

PROPOSED 2023 BUDGET ADOPTED BY IPCC-LVII

Activity	Purpose	DC/EIT support	Other Expenditure	Sub-total
Governing bodies				
IPCC-58 5 days	SYR AR6	480,000 120 journeys	350,000	830,000
IPCC-59 4 days	Elections	480,000 120 journeys	280,000	760,000
IPCC-60 4 days	Future Work of IPCC Programme and Budget	480,000 120 journeys	280,000	760,000
Bureau 6 days	3 sessions	432,000 108 journeys	120,000	552,000
TFB	1 session	36,000 9 journeys	6,120	42,120
UNFCCC and other UN meetings		80,000 20 journeys	0	80,000
SUB-TOTAL				3,024,120
Lead Authors, scoping, expert meetings and workshops				
WG Meetings	contingency	20,000 5 journeys	3,400	23,400
Other Expert Meeting(s) and Consultations	contingency	80,000 20 journeys	13,600	93,600
WG III Workshop on Scenarios	1 meeting (moved from 2022)	240,000 60 journeys	40,800	280,800
Scoping Meeting (SR Cities)	contingency	200,000 50 journeys	34,000	234,000
TG-Data	1 meeting	48,000 12 journeys	8,160	56,160
Expert Meeting on Gender, Inclusivity and Diversity	1 meeting	80,000 20 journeys	13,600	93,600
EFDB Editorial Board	1 meeting	84,000 21 journeys	14,280	98,280
EFDB Data meeting	1 meeting	40,000 10 journeys	6,800	46,800
EFDB and Software Users Feedback	1 meeting	84,000 21 journeys	14,280	98,280
TFI Scoping Meeting on Short-lived Climate Forcers	1 meeting (moved from 2022)	160,000 40 journeys	27,200	187,200
TFI Expert meeting	1 meeting (contingency)	100,000 25 journeys	17,000	117,000
SUB-TOTAL				1,329,120
Other Expenditure				
2006 GL software	maintenance/development			20,000
EFDB maintenance	update/management			20,000
Publications/Translations	IPCC publications (SYR/TFI)			400,000
Communication I	AR6 material/travel/events			673,000
Communication II	AR6 outreach events*			150,000
Distribution	IPCC publications			100,000
IT Infrastructure	web hosting/cloudflare/upgrades			13,128
External Audit	fee			20,000
Advisory Services	Conflict of Interest			15,000
Co-Chairs	support			200,000
SUB-TOTAL				1,611,128
Secretariat				
Secretariat	staff costs/misc expenses			2,553,050
Resource Mobilization	travel costs			15,800
SUB-TOTAL				2,568,850
TOTAL				8,533,218

All activities subject to Panel approval in IPCC-57

* Regional/local events

Revised/new activity

FORECAST 2024 BUDGET NOTED BY IPCC-LVII

Activity	Purpose	DC/EIT support	Other Expenditure	Sub-total
Governing bodies				
IPCC-61 4 days	AR7 plenary	480,000 120 journeys	280,000	760,000
IPCC-62 4 days	Programme and budget	480,000 120 journeys	280,000	760,000
Bureau 4 days	2 sessions	288,000 72 journeys	120,000	408,000
TFB	1 session	36,000 9 journeys	6,120	42,120
UNFCCC and other UN meetings		80,000 20 journeys	0	80,000
SUB-TOTAL				2,050,120
Lead Authors, scoping, expert meetings and workshops				
WG Scoping Meetings (SR/AR7)	contingency	240,000 60 journeys	40,800	280,800
WG Lead Author Meetings (SR/AR7)	contingency	240,000 60 journeys	40,800	280,800
SR Cities LAM 1 and LAM 2	contingency	400,000 100 journeys	68,000	468,000
TG-Data	1 meeting	48,000 12 journeys	8,160	56,160
Expert Meeting - Science of Communicating Science	1 meeting (moved from 2023)	80,000 20 journeys	13,600	93,600
EFDB Editorial Board	1 meeting	84,000 21 journeys	14,280	98,280
EFDB Data meeting	1 meeting	40,000 10 journeys	6,800	46,800
Software and EFDB Users Feedback	1 meeting	84,000 21 journeys	14,280	98,280
TFI - Short-Lived Climate Forcers - LAM 1	CLA/LA Meeting	400,000 100 journeys	68,000	468,000
TFI - Short-Lived Climate Forcers - LAM 2	CLA/LA Meeting	400,000 100 journeys	68,000	468,000
TFI Expert meeting	1 meeting (contingency)	160,000 40 journeys	27,200	187,200
SUB-TOTAL				2,545,920
Other Expenditure				
2006 GL software	maintenance/development			20,000
EFDB maintenance	update/management			20,000
Publications/Translations	IPCC publications			200,000
Communication I	AR7 material/travel/events			543,000
Communication II*	AR7 outreach events			53,960
Distribution	IPCC publications			100,000
IT Infrastructure	web hosting/cloudflare/upgrades			13,128
External Audit	fee			20,000
Advisory Services	Conflict of Interest			15,000
Co-Chairs	support			200,000
SUB-TOTAL				1,185,088
Secretariat				
Secretariat	staff costs/misc expenses			2,553,050
Resource Mobilization	travel costs			15,800
SUB-TOTAL				2,568,850
TOTAL				8,349,978

All activities subject to Panel approval in IPCC-60

* Regional/local events

Revised/new activity

INDICATIVE 2025 BUDGET NOTED BY IPCC-LVII

Activity	Purpose	DC/EIT support	Other Expenditure	Sub-total
Governing bodies				
IPCC-63 4 days	AR7 plenary	480,000 120 journeys	280,000	760,000
IPCC-64 4 days	Programme and budget	480,000 120 journeys	280,000	760,000
Bureau 4 days	2 sessions	288,000 72 journeys	120,000	408,000
TFB	1 session	36,000 9 journeys	6,120	42,120
UNFCCC and other UN meetings		80,000 20 journeys	0	80,000
SUB-TOTAL				2,050,120
Lead Authors, scoping, expert meetings and workshops				
WG Lead Author Meetings	contingency	240,000 60 journeys	40,800	280,800
SR Cities LAM 3 and LAM 4	contingency	240,000 100 journeys	40,800	280,800
TG-Data	1 meeting	48,000 12 journeys	8,160	56,160
EFDB Editorial Board	1 meeting	84,000 21 journeys	14,280	98,280
EFDB Data meeting	1 meeting	40,000 10 journeys	6,800	46,800
Software and EFDB Users Feedback	1 meeting	84,000 21 journeys	14,280	98,280
TFI - Short-Lived Climate Forcers - LAM 3	CLA/LA Meeting	440,000 110 journeys	74,800	514,800
TFI - Short-Lived Climate Forcers - LAM 4	CLA/LA Meeting	440,000 110 journeys	74,800	514,800
SUB-TOTAL				1,890,720
Other Expenditure				
2006 GL software	maintenance/development			20,000
EFDB maintenance	update/management			20,000
Publications/Translations	IPCC publications			100,000
Communication I	AR7 material/travel/events			543,000
Communication II*	AR7 outreach events			53,960
Distribution	IPCC publications			100,000
IT Infrastructure	web hosting/cloudflare/upgrades			13,128
External Audit	fee			20,000
Advisory Services	Conflict of Interest			15,000
Co-Chairs	support			200,000
SUB-TOTAL				1,085,088
Secretariat				
Secretariat	staff costs/misc expenses			2,553,050
Resource Mobilization	travel costs			15,800
SUB-TOTAL				2,568,850
TOTAL				7,594,778

All activities subject to Panel approval in IPCC-60

* Regional/local events

Revised/new activity

**List of In-kind Contributions/Activities
(January – September 2022)**

(In the following cases no financial support for hosting/meeting facilities was provided by the IPCC Trust Fund)

Government/Institution	Activity	Type
France	Technical Support Unit – WG I	Hosting
China	Technical Support Unit – WG I	Hosting
Germany	Technical Support Unit – WG II	Hosting
South Africa	Technical Support Unit – WG II	Hosting
Germany, New Zealand, Norway	Technical Support Unit – WG II (South Africa)	Joint contribution
India	Technical Support Unit – WG III	Hosting
United Kingdom	Technical Support Unit – WG III	Hosting
Japan	Technical Support Unit – TFI	Hosting
Peru	Technical Support Unit – TFI	Hosting
Republic of Korea	Technical Support Unit - SYR	Hosting
Germany	IPCC Data Distribution Centre	Hosting
United Kingdom	IPCC Data Distribution Centre	Hosting
United States of America	IPCC Data Distribution Centre	Hosting
WMO	IPCC Secretariat	Hosting
WMO	Post of Secretary of the IPCC	Salary
UNEP	Post of Deputy Secretary of the IPCC	Salary
Germany	55 th Session of the IPCC/12 th Session of Working Group II, (14-25 March 2022), Berlin, Germany	Hosting
United Kingdom	56 th Session of the IPCC/14 th Session of Working Group III, (21 March-1 April 2022), Surrey, United Kingdom	Hosting
Ireland	SYR – 3 rd Core Writing Team Meeting, (25-28 April 2022), Dublin, Ireland	Hosting
Spain	TFI – 20 th Editorial Board Meeting for the IPCC Emission Factor Database, (28 June-1 July 2022) and TFI – 19 th -20 th Expert Meeting on Data for the IPCC Emission Factor Database, (29-30 June 2022), Bilbao, Spain	Meeting facilities
FAO	TFI – Expert Meeting to collect Software and EFDB Users' Feedback (26-28 July 2022), Rome, Italy	Hosting
WMO	TFI – Expert Meeting on Use of Atmospheric Observation Data in Emission Inventories (5-7 September 2022) and TFI – 34 th Meeting of Task Force Bureau (8-9 September 2022), Geneva, Switzerland	Hosting
Switzerland	57 th Session of the IPCC, (27-30 September 2022), Geneva, Switzerland	Hosting

Decision IPCC-LVII-5. Ad-hoc Group on the Size, Structure and Composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau for the Seventh Assessment cycle

Document: IPCC-LVII/Doc.6

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change at its Fifty-Seventh Session:

Recognizes the importance of maintaining the efficiency and functionality of the current size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau;

Notes the need to accommodate any possible regional imbalances at the time of elections; and

Decides regarding the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau for the seventh assessment cycle that Annex B of Appendix C to the Principles Governing IPCC Work will be amended to be as follows:

Annex B

Composition of the IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau

This Annex will be amended in line with relevant decisions of the Panel.

I. IPCC Bureau

The IPCC Bureau is composed of 34 members.

It consists of:

1. the IPCC-Chair.
2. three IPCC Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities.
3. two Co-Chairs of the Task Force Bureau on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories.
4. The Working Group I Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and seven Working Group Vice-Chairs.
5. The Working Group II Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and eight Working Group Vice-Chairs.
6. The Working Group III Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and seven Working Group Vice-Chairs.

Subject to the following overall regional balance within the IPCC Bureau:

Region I: 7 positions
Region II: 6 positions
Region III: 4 positions
Region IV: 4 positions
Region V: 4 positions
Region VI: 8 positions

In filling elective positions, account should be taken of the need to ensure that:

- The three IPCC Vice-Chairpersons are from different regions including at least one from a developing country and one from a developed country;
- One Co-Chair in each Working Group and any Task Force Bureau is from a developing country;
- At least one Co-Chair in each Working Group and in the Task Force Bureau is from a

country which is ready to host the Technical Support Unit;

- Each Region is represented in each of the following four formations within the Bureau: the Executive Committee, Working Group I, Working Group II, Working Group III. When a Region is not represented in a Working Group, an additional position in that Working Group will be added for that Region.⁴

Consideration should also be given to promoting gender balance.

The IPCC Chair does not represent a region.

II. Task Force Bureau

The Task Force Bureau on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories is composed of 2 Co-Chairs and 12 members, 2 each of which should be drawn from each Region.

⁴ In this case, the overall size of the IPCC Bureau will increase accordingly.

Decision IPCC-LVII- 6. Transition to the Next Assessment Cycle and Related Matters (lessons learned, timing of elections and length of the next cycle)

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change at its Fifty-Seventh Session decides as follows:

Lessons learned

Notes the need for a smooth transition to the seventh assessment cycle (AR7 cycle) and the importance of building on and sharing of lessons learned from the current cycle, including on gender balance and regional balance.

Decides to request the IPCC Bureau and the Task Force Bureau to facilitate the process of collecting and synthesizing the lessons learned from the sixth assessment cycle (AR6 cycle), starting from the next meeting of the IPCC Bureau with the view to provide a written report prior to the 59th Session of the IPCC.

Requests the Secretariat to support the IPCC Bureau and the Task Force Bureau in this task including in requesting all IPCC Focal Points to provide submissions on the lessons learned from the AR6 cycle.

Timing of the elections

Notes the extraordinary circumstances of the AR6 cycle due to the Covid-19 global pandemic and the need to ensure a smooth transition between the AR6 cycle and the AR7 cycle.

Decides the Secretary's letter inviting nominations for the seventh assessment cycle IPCC Bureau and the Task Force Bureau shall be sent to Governments two weeks following the conclusion of the 58th Session of the IPCC. The letter will refer to the size, composition and structure of the seventh assessment cycle IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau, length of the AR7 cycle, and the timing and process for the elections as decided by IPCC-57. The election of the new IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau will take place at the 59th Session of the IPCC in July 2023.

Notes that the term of the AR6 IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau shall end in July 2023 with the election of the succeeding AR7 IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau.

Recognizes with highest appreciation the work and the flexibility of the current IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau throughout this cycle and its contribution to a smooth transition to the AR7.

Length of the next cycle

Decides the length of the seventh assessment cycle shall be between 5 and 7 years.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

FIFTY-SEVENTH SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Geneva, Switzerland, 27 – 30 September 2022

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

BUREAU MEMBERS

LEE Hoesung
Chair of the IPCC
c/o Korea Meteorological Administration
Email: leehoesung@gmail.com

ALDRIAN Edwin
Center for Climate Change and Air Quality of
BMKG
Email: e_aldrrian@yahoo.com

BARRETT Ko
National Oceanographic and Atmospheric
Administration
Email: ko.barrett@ipcc.ch

CALVO Eduardo
Universidad National Mayor de San Marcos
(UNMSM)
Email: e13calvo@gmail.com

DADI Diriba Korecha
USGS/Famine Early Warning Systems
Network
Email: dkorecha@yahoo.com

FISCHLIN Andreas
ETH Zurich
Email: andreas.fischlin@env.ethz.ch

FLATO Greg
Environment and Climate Change Canada
Email: greg.flato@ec.gc.ca

FUGLESTVEDT Jan
Center for International Climate and
Environmental Research Oslo (CICERO)
Email: j.s.fuglestvedt@cicero.oslo.no

HOWDEN Mark
Australian National University
Email: Mark.Howden@anu.edu.au

MAHMOUD Nagmeldin Goutbi Elhassan
Higher Council for Environment and Natural
Resources (HCENR)
Email: goutbi@yahoo.com

MASSON-DELMOTTE Valérie
Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de
l'Environnement (LSCE)
Email: valerie.masson@lsce.ipsl.fr

MENDEZ Carlos
Ministry of People's Power for Science and
Technology
Email: carlos.menvall@gmail.com

PICHS MADRUGA Ramon
Centre for World Economy Studies (CIEM)
Email: rpichsciem@ceniai.inf.cu

PÖRTNER Hans-otto
Alfred-Wegener-Institute
Email: hans.poertner@awi.de

REISINGER Andy
Climate Change Commission
Email: andy.reisinger.ipcc@posteo.nz

ROBERTS Debra
eThekweni Municipality
Email: Debra.Roberts@durban.gov.za

SEMENOV Sergei
Yu. A. Izrael Institute of Global Climate and
Ecology
Email: SergeySemenov1@yandex.ru

SKEA James
Imperial College London
Email: j.skea@ipcc-wg3.ac.uk

SOKONA Youba
Groupe de Réflexion, d'Analyses et
d'Initiatives Novatrices (GRAIN)
Email: ysokona@gmail.com

TANABE Kiyoto
Institute for Global Environmental Strategies
Email: tanabe@iges.or.jp

ÜRGE-VORSATZ Diana
Central European University
Email: vorsatzd@ceu.edu

VERA Carolina
CIMA/Universidad de Buenos Aires-CONICET
Email: carolina@cima.fcen.uba.ar

YASSAA Nouredine
Commissariat aux Energies Renouvelables et
à l'Efficacité Énergétique
Email: n.yassaa@cerefe.gov.dz

ZATARI Taha
Ministry of Energy – Designated National
Authority (DNA)
Email: tahazat@yahoo.com

ZHAI Panmao
Chinese Academy of Meteorological Sciences
Email: pmzhai@cma.gov.cn

MEMBER COUNTRIES

ALBANIA

RABDISHTA Eneida
Ministry of Tourism and Environment
Email: eneida_rabdishta@yahoo.com

ALGERIA

MERABET Hamza
General Directorate for Scientific Research
and Technological Development (DGRSDT)
Email: h.merabet@mesrs.dz

ANGOLA

CONSTANTINO Luis
Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment
Email: luconsta@hotmail.com

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

SIMON Arry Aquille
Department of Environment
Email: arry.simon@ab.gov.ag

ARGENTINA

GANDINI María Victoria
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade
and Worship
Email: vni@cancilleria.gob.ar

ARMENIA

BUDOYAN Nona
Ministry of Environment
Email: nona.budoyan@env.am

AUSTRALIA

BAILEY Maggie
Department Climate Change, Energy, the
Environment and Water
Email: Maggie.Bailey@industry.gov.au

AUSTRIA

OGRIS Manfred
Austrian Federal Ministry of Climate Action,
Environment, Energy, Mobility, Innovation and
Technology
Email: manfredogris@gmx.at

AZERBAIJAN

HUMBATOV Fuad
Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of
the Republic of Azerbaijan
Email: fuad.humbatov@mail.ru

BAHAMAS

SIMMONS Jeffrey
Bahamas Department of Meteorology
Email: jeffreywsimmons@gmail.com

BELGIUM

VAN YPERSELE Jean- Pascal
Université catholique de Louvain (Université
Catholique Louvain), Georges Lemaitre
Centre for Earth and Climate Research
Email:
jean-pascal.vanyperselle@uclouvain.be

MARBAIX Philippe
Plateforme wallonne pour le Groupe d'experts
intergouvernemental sur l'évolution du climat
(GIEC) /UCLouvain
Email: Philippe.Marbaix@uclouvain.be

FERNANDES Alexandre
Belgian Science Policy Office (BELSPO)
Email: alexandre.fernandes@belspo.be

GAINO Bruna
Plateforme wallonne pour le Groupe d'experts
intergouvernemental sur l'évolution du climat
(GIEC) /UC Louvain
Email: Bruna.Gaino@uclouvain.be

BELIZE

YOUNG Shanea
National Meteorological Service of Belize
Email: syoung@nms.gov.bz

BENIN

CHEDE Dakpanon Félicien
National Meteorological Agency
Email: chedef@yahoo.fr

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

TRBIC Goran
University of Banja Luka
Email: trbicg@pmfbl.org

BRAZIL

BALTHAR DE SOUZA SANTOS Leonardo
Augusto
Division of Climate Change
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Email:
leonardo.souzasantos@itamaraty.gov.br

DA SILVA NUNES Tovar
Permanent Mission of Brazil to the United
Nations Office and other international
organizations in Geneva
Email: tovar.nunes@itamaraty.gov.br

BANDEIRA Helges
Permanent Mission of Brazil to the United
Nations Office and other international
organizations in Geneva
Email: helges.bandeira@itamaraty.gov.br

KIKU ISHITANI Cecília
Permanent Mission of Brazil to the United
Nations Office and other international
organizations in Geneva
Email: cecilia.ishitani@itamaraty.gov.br

BURKINA FASO

NAKOULMA Guillaume
National Meteorological Agency (ANAM)
Email: guinabf@yahoo.fr

BURUNDI

HABIMANA Jean De Dieu
Geographic institute of Burundi
Email: kanajdedieu@gmail.com

CAMBODIA

DOEUN Dara
Ministry of Environment
Email: doeun_dara@yahoo.com

CAMEROON

KAGONBE Temothee
Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection
and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED)
Email: kagonbet@yahoo.fr

NGODEBO, Adrien Frédéric
Ministry of Finance
Email: ngodebo2001@yahoo.fr

CANADA

BUSH Elizabeth
Environment and Climate Change Canada
Email: elizabeth.bush@ec.gc.ca

LUCE Sarah
Environment and Climate Change Canada
Email: sarah.luce@ec.gc.ca

CHILE

ULLOA MENARES Priscilla Andrea
Ministry of Environnement
Email: pulloa@mma.gob.cl

CHINA

ZHANG Xingying
China Meteorological Administration (CMA)
Email: zxy@cma.gov.cn

LI Yutong
China Meteorological Administration (CMA)
Email: liyutong66@126.com

LU Chunhui
China Meteorological Administration (CMA)
Email: luchh@cma.gov.cn

PANG Bo
China Meteorological Administration (CMA)
Email: pangbo@cma.gov.cn

SHEN Yanjie
Permanent Mission of the People Republic of
China to the United Nations Office at Geneva
and Other International Organizations in
Switzerland
Email: shenyanj@hotmail.com

YANG Xiao
China Meteorological Administration (CMA)
Email: yangxiaomichelle@outlook.com

COLOMBIA

HERNANDEZ Constantino
Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and
Environmental Studies
Email: chernandez@ideam.gov.co

COMOROS

FAISSOIL Mhadji
Ministère l'Agriculture, de la Pêche de
l'Environnement, du Tourisme et de
l'Artisanat.(DGEF)
Email: faissoil91canneasucre@gmail.com

MHADJI Faissoil
Ministère l'Agriculture, de la Pêche de
l'Environnement, du Tourisme et de
l'Artisanat.(DGEF)
Email: faissoil91canneasucre@gmail.com

MMADI BACAR Said
Ministère l'Agriculture, de la Pêche de
l'Environnement, du Tourisme et de
l'Artisanat.(DGEF)
Email: saidmmadibacar@gmail.com

COSTA RICA

CARVAJAL-TOVAR Kattia
National Meteorological Institute
Email: kcarvajal@imn.ac.cr

COTE D'IVOIRE

DJE Kouakou Bernard
Meteorology Office
Email: dkouakou_b@yahoo.fr

CROATIA

GÜTTLER Ivan
Croatian Meteorological and Hydrological
Service
Email: ivan.guettler@gmail.com

CUBA

PAZOS ALBERDI Celso
Institute of Meteorology of Cuba
Email: celso.pazos@insmet.cu

CZECH REPUBLIC

TOLASZ Radim
Czech Hydrometeorological Institute
Email: radim.tolasz@chmi.cz

VALIK Adam
Czech Hydrometeorological Institute
Email: adam.valik@chmi.cz

DENMARK

CHRISTENSEN Tina
Danish Meteorological Institute
Email: tic@dmi.dk

JACOBSEN Anne Hølmkjær
Danish Meteorological Institute
Email: aja@dmi.dk

DJIBOUTI

OMAR Dini Abdallah
Ministère de l'Environnement et du
Développement Durable
Email: dini.omar85@gmail.com

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

TABOADA FLORES Claudia Marcela
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Email: ctaboada@mirex.gob.do

ECUADOR

GONZALEZ BENITEZ Rosa Ana
Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological
Transition of Ecuadorian
Email: roxgonzalez1209@gmail.com

BORJA Patricia
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Email: pborja@cancilleria.gob.ec

EGYPT

IBRAHIM Sherif
Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency
Email: ipcc_eg.ccu@yahoo.com

SALAMA Ahmed
Mission of Egypt to the United Nations Office
and other international organizations in
Geneva
Email: ahmedsalama99@hotmail.com

ESTONIA

ALA Taimar
Environment Agency
Email: taimar.ala@envir.ee

ANGER-KRAAVI Annela
Environment Agency
Email: annela@hotmail.co.uk

ETHIOPIA

TOLA Fetene Teshome
National Meteorological Agency
Email: fetenekoket@yahoo.com

FINLAND

TUOMENVIRTA Heikki
Finnish Meteorological Institute
Email: heikki.tuomenvirta@fmi.fi

FRANCE

PAILLER Stéphane
Ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires
étrangères (MEAE)
Email: stephane.pailler@diplomatie.gouv.fr

LAIGNEL Benoît
Ministère de l'éducation supérieure et de la
Recherche (MESRI) / Direction générale de la
recherche et de l'innovation (DGR1)
Email: benoit.laignel@univ-rouen.fr

LACHAUSSEE Emmanuelle
Ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires
étrangères (MEAE)
Email:
emmanuelle.lachaussee@diplomatie.gouv.fr

FARRET Régis
Representation permanente à l'organisation
des Nations Unies à Genève
Email: regis.farret@diplomatie.gouv.fr

BRUN Eric
Ministères Écologie Énergie Territoires (MTE)
Email:
eric.brun-barriere@developpement-
durable.gouv.fr

BONNAFONT Jérôme
Ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires
étrangères (MEAE)
Email: jerome.bonnavont@diplomatie.gouv.fr

GAMBIA

TOURAY Lamin Mai
Department of Water Resources
Email: touraylm@yahoo.co.uk

GEORGIA

CHITANAVA Ramaz
Hydrometeorological department of Georgia
Email: chitanavaramaz@gmail.com

GERMANY

MUELLER Christian
Zukunft – Umwelt – Gesellschaft (ZUG),
gemeinnützige Gesellschaft mit
beschränkter Haftung (gGmbH)
Email: christian.mueller@z-u-g.org

GASTROW Stefanie
Project Management Agency, part of the
German Aerospace Center
Email: stefanie.gastrow@dlr.de

REINEKE Thomas
Project Management Agency, Part of the
German Aerospace Center
Email: thomas.reineke@dlr.de

TEXTOR Christiane
German Aerospace Center, Project
Management Agency, German IPCC
Coordination Office
Email: christiane.textor@dlr.de

GHANA

KLUTSE Nana Ama Browne
Department of Physics University of Ghana
Legon
Email: amabrowne@gmail.com

GUATEMALA

BARRERA GARCIA David Estuardo
Ministerio de Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
Email: dbarreragarcia@gmail.com

VALDES RANK DE SPERISEN Ana Elizabeth
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores de
Guatemala (MINEX) Guatemala
Email: aevaldes@minex.gob.gt

GUINEA

KOIBA Goikwia
Chef de la section Prévisions générales
Email: koibayah@gmail.com

GUINEE BISSAU

TCHEDNA Joao Lona
National institute of meteorology of Guinea-
Bissau
Email: j_lona@yahoo.fr

HUNGARY

GALAMBOS Eszter
Ministry of Technology and Industry
Email: eszter.galambos@tim.gov.hu

CSONTOS Kinga
Ministry of Technology and Industry
Email: kinga.csontos@tim.gov.hu

INDIA

BHATT Jaivardhan Ramanlal
Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate
Change
Email: jrbhatt@nic.in

ELAVUMKUDI PAULOSE Nobi
Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate
Change
Email: nobi.ep@nic.in

KUMAR Amit
Permanent Mission of India to United Nations
Office in Geneva
Email: hoc.genevapmi@mea.gov.in

RAGHAVA Ajay
Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate
Change
Email: ajay.raghava@nic.in

INDONESIA

NURBI Esfandri
Permanent Mission of the Republic Indonesia
to the United Nations, WTO and other
International Organizations in Geneva
Email: esfandri.nurbi@mission-indonesia.org

UMAR Real Sukmana Faesal
Ministry of Environment and Forestry
Indonesia
Email: realsukmana@gmail.com

IRAN

ZEYAEYAN Sadegh
Islamic Republic of Iran Meteorological
Organization
Email: s.ziayan@yahoo.com

IRELAND

MCGOVERN Frank
Environmental Protection Agency, Richview,
Clonskeagh Road
Email: f.mcgovern@epa.ie

ITALY

PERUGINI Lucia
Fondazione Centro Euro-Mediterraneo sui
Cambiamenti Climatici
Email: lucia.perugini@cmcc.it

JAMAICA

SPENCE-HEMMINGS Jacqueline
Meteorological Service
Email: j.spence@metservice.gov.jm

JAPAN

KAWAMATA Kotaro
Ministry of the Environment (MOE)
Email: KOTARO_KAWAMATA@env.go.jp

ADACHI Muneki
Ministry of the Environment (MOE)
Email: MUNEKI_ADACHI@env.go.jp

DEGUCHI Tetsuya
Research Institute of Innovative Technology
for the Earth (RITE)
Email: deguchi@rite.or.jp

KIMURA Norihiro
Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry
(METI)
Email: kimura-norihiro@meti.go.jp

TAKATANI Mariko
Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry
(METI)
Email: takatani-mariko@meti.go.jp

UEDA Hiroko
Global Environmental Forum (GEF)
Email: hiroco0517@gmail.com

KENYA

NYING'URO Patricia A.
Kenya meteorological department
Email: pnyinguro@gmail.com

KIMUTAI Joyce
Kenya Meteorological Department
Email: kimutaijoy@gmail.com

LAO PDR

INTHABOUALY Immala
Ministry of Natural Resources and
Environment
Email: inthaboualy@gmail.com

LIBERIA

GAR-GLAHN Arthur
Ministry of Transport
Email: agarglahn98@gmail.com

LUXEMBOURG

FERRONE Andrew
Administration of agricultural technical
services
Email: Andrew.Ferrone@asta.etat.lu

LANG Dana
Administration of Technical Agricultural
Services - Meteorological department
Email: Dana.Lang@asta.etat.lu

MADAGASCAR

RANAIVOSON Andriamihaja Andre
Direction Generale de la Meteorologie
Email: andriamihajaranaivoson@yahoo.fr

MALAYSIA

BIN ADZMI Mohd Hafdzuan
Ministry of Environment and Water Malaysia
Email: hafdzuan@kasa.gov.my

MALDIVES

WAHEED Ahmed
Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and
Technology
Email: ahmed.waheed@environment.gov.mv

MALI

TOURE Moussa
Agence nationale de la Météorologie
Email: mositoure@yahoo.fr

MAURITANIA

CHAHE Mohamed Yahya
Ministry of Environment and Sustainable
Development
Email: lafdal@environnement.gov.mr

MAURITIUS

BOONEEADY Prithiviraj
Mauritius Meteorological Services
Email: pbooneeady@govmu.org

MONGOLIA

GANJUUR Sarantuya
Information and Research Institute of
Meteorology, Hydrology and Environment
Email: sar_od@yahoo.com

MONTENEGRO

MITROVIC Luka
Institute of Hydrometeorology and Seismology
of Montenegro
Email: luka.mitrovic@meteo.co.me

MOROCCO

CHAFKI Omar
Direction de la Météorologie Nationale
Email: omar_chafki@yahoo.fr

MYANMAR

OO Kyaw Lwin
Department of Meteorology and Hydrology
Email: kyawlwino5@gmail.com

NETHERLANDS

VAN DORLAND Rob
The Royal Netherlands Meteorological
Institute (KNMI)
Email: rob.van.dorland@knmi.nl

BERK Marcel
Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate
Policy
Email: m.m.berk@minezk.nl

NEW ZEALAND

PLUME Helen
Ministry for the Environment
Email: helen.plume@mfe.govt.nz

BRANDON Andrea
Ministry for the Environment
Email: andrea.brandon1@mfe.govt.nz

NICARAGUA

BOHORQUEZ Rosalía
Ambassador of the Republic of Nicaragua in
Geneva, Switzerland
Email: bohorquez.mpng@gmail.com

BAUTISTA CHAMORRO Geraldine
Mission of Nicaragua
Email: gbautista.mpng@gmail.com

PEREZ LOPEZ Claudia Mercedes
Claudia Mercedes
Mission of Nicaragua
Email: cperez.mpng@gmail.com

NIGER

BOUBACAR A DIALLO Aissa
Direction de la metereologie nationale
Email: Limanaissa@yahoo.fr

NIGERIA

OKEBUGWU Chukwuemeka
Department of Climate Change, Federal
Ministry of Environment
Email: chuksokebugwu@yahoo.com

NORTH MACEDONIA

MARKOVSKA Natasa
Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Email: natasa@manu.edu.mk

NORWAY

ANHARI Elin
Norwegian Environment Agency
Email: Elin.Anhari@miljodir.no

CHRISTOPHERSEN Øyvind
Norwegian Environment Agency
Email: chr@miljodir.no

KVISSEL Ole-kristian
Norwegian Environment Agency
Email: okk@miljodir.no

RANDALL Scott
Norwegian Environment Agency
Email: Scott.Randall@miljodir.no

PAKISTAN

SIDDIQI Muhammad Saeed Ashraf
Ministry of Climate Change Islamabad,
Pakistan
Email: saeedsiddiqi@gmail.com

KHALID Umair
Mission of Pakistan to the United Nations
Office and other international organizations in
Geneva
Email: umair.khalid@mofa.gov.pk

PANAMA

DOMINGUEZ LOPEZ Ana Silvia
Ministry of Environment
Email: adominguez@miambiente.gob.pa

TANG Erika
Permanent Mission of Panama in Geneva
Email: etang@mire.gob.pa

PARAGUAY

TORRES Gilda Juana Maria
Ministry of Environment and Sustainable
Development
Email: gildatorres.py69@gmail.com

PERU

LECAROS TERRY Ana Teresa
Minister of Foreign Affairs
Email: alecarost@rree.gob.pe

REPUBLIC OF CONGO

ITSOUA MADZOUS Gervais Ludovic
Ministère de l'Environnement du
Développement Durable et du Bassin du
Congo
Email: imadzous2@gmail.com

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

CHAE Yoojeong
Korea Meteorological Administration
Email: yoojchae@korea.kr

LEE Mi-seon
Korea Meteorological Administration
Email: miseonlee23@korea.kr

OH Yaewon
Korea Meteorological Administration
Email: ywohv3@korea.kr

YIM Nayoung
Korea Meteorological Administration
Email: nyyim@korea.kr

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

NOROEA Galina
Ministry of Environment
Email: galina.norocea@mediu.gov.md

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

DMITRIEVA Tatiana
Hydrometservice
Email: dmtanya@mail.ru

GLADILSHCHIKOVA Anna
Yu.A. Izrael Institute of Global Climate and
Ecology
Email: anna.igce@gmail.com

DEMIDOV Ilia
Adviser to the Permanent Mission of the
Russian Federation at the UN Office in
Geneva
Email: idemidow@mail.ru

SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS

JEFFERS Cheryl
Department of Environment
Email: jeffers31@gmail.com

NAUELS Alexander
Climate Analytics
Email: alex.nauels@climateanalytics.org

SAINT LUCIA

JOSEPH Benise
Caribbean Cooperative Measurement,
Reporting and Verification Hub (CCMRVH)
Email: benise.joseph@gmail.com

SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE

NASCIMENTO DIAS Cosme Manuel
National Institute of Meteorology
Email: cosmemanuel@hotmail.com

SAUDI ARABIA

AL NORRY Malak
Ministry of energy (MoEn)
Email: Malak.Nory@moenergy.gov.sa

ALHAMDAN Hussah
Ministry of energy (MoEn)
Email: Hussah.hamdan@moenergy.gov.sa

ALHARTHI Aseel
Ministry of energy (MoEn)
Email: a.alharthi@cdmdna.gov.sa

ALSUDAIRY Nourah
Ministry of energy (MoEn)
Email: Nourah@cdmdna.gov.sa

HAKAMI Amro
Ministry of energy (MoEn)
Email: mr.hakami@live.com

JISHI Maria
Ministry of energy (MoEn)
Email: maria.jishi@moenergy.gov.sa

SENEGAL

NDIAYE Ousmane
Agence Nationale de l'Aviation Civile et de la
Météorologie (ANACIM)
Email: ousmane.ndiaye@anacim.sn

SEYCHELLES

AGRICOLE Will
Ministry of Agriculture, Climate Change and
Environment
Email: w.agricole@meteo.gov.sc

SLOVENIA

KLEMEN Ana
Ministry of the Environment and Spatial
Planning
Email: ana.klemen@gov.si

SOUTH AFRICA

KEKANA Maesela John
Department of Environmental Affairs
Email: mjkekana@dffe.gov.za

MOTSHWANEDI Sandra
Department of Environmental Affairs
Email: mjkekana@dffe.gov.za

SPAIN

GONZALEZ ESCOLANO Flavia
Ministry for Ecological Transition
Email: fgonzalez@miteco.es

SRI LANKA

CHANDRAPREMA Candauda Arachchige
Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka to the
United Nations Office and other international
organizations in Geneva
Email: prun.geneva@mfa.gov.lk

KARUNANAYAKE Athula
Department of Meteorology
Email: athu1970@yahoo.com

LENAGALA Dilini
Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka to the
United Nations Office and other international
organizations in Geneva
Email: dilini.lenagala@mfa.gov.lk

MENDIS Dayani
Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka to the
United Nations Office and other international
organizations in Geneva
Email: dayani.mendis@mfa.gov.lk

SUDAN

MOHAMED HAMADALLA Hana Hamadalla
High Council for Environment and Natural
Resources
Email: hanahamadalla2@yahoo.com

SURINAME

KADOSOE Sergio
Ministry of Public Works
Email: sergiokadosoe28@gmail.com

SWEDEN

RUMMUKAINEN Markku
Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological
Institute (SMHI)
Email: markku.rummukainen@smhi.se

ANDERSSON Camilla
Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological
Institute (SMHI)
Email: Camilla.Andersson@smhi.se

BRUNDIN Nina
Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological
Institute (SMHI)
Email: Nina.Brundin@smhi.se

SWITZERLAND

KÖNIG Sebastian
Federal Office for the Environment
Email: sebastian.koenig@bafu.admin.ch

CROCI-MASPOLI Mischa
MeteoSwiss
Email: mischa.croci-maspoli@meteoswiss.ch

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

AFESA Sonia
Ministry of Local Administration and
Environment
Email: soniaafesa@yahoo.com

TAJIKISTAN

RAJABOV Nasimjon
Agency for Hydrometeorology, Committee for
Environmental Protection
Email: nasim.rajabov@gmail.com

TANZANIA

CHANGA Ladislaus
Tanzania Meteorological Agency
Email: ladislaus.changa@meteo.go.tz

MSHANA Juwairia
Tanzania Meteorological Authority
Email: juwairia.mshana@meteo.go.tz

TOGO

SABI Kokou
Universite de Lome
Email: sabikokou@yahoo.fr

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

KISSOON Kaidar
Trinidad And Tobago Meteorological Service
Email: kaidarkissoon@gmail.com

TUNISIA

ZMERLI Mohamed
Ministry of Environment
Email: zmerli_mohamed@yahoo.com

TÜRKIYE

KARACA Erdogan
Presidency of Climate Change, Ministry of
Environment Urbanisation and Climate
Change, Republic of Türkiye
erdogan.karaca@csb.gov.tr

UKRAINE

KRAKOVSKA Svitlana
Head of Applied Climatology Laboratory of the
Ukrainian Hydrometeorological Institute
Email: Krasvit@ua.fm

UNITED KINGDOM of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

PRESCOTT Caroline
Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
Email: caroline.prescott@beis.gov.uk

REES-OWEN Rhian
UK Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
Email: rhian.reesowen@beis.gov.uk

WEBSTER Eleanor
Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
Email: eleanor.webster2@beis.gov.uk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

AKHTAR Farhan
United States Department of State
Email: AkhtarFH@state.gov

CROLL Brittany
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Email: brittany.croll@noaa.gov

MOCH Jonathan
United States Department of State
Email: MochJM@state.gov

PIEREL Eleanor
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Email: eleanor.pierel@noaa.gov

SPINNLER Jake
United States of America mission to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva
Email: spinnlerja@state.gov

URUGUAY

KASPRZYK Mariana
Ministry of Environment
Email: mariana.kasprzyk@ambiente.gub.uy

VENEZUELA

CAMPOS Genoveva
Misión Permanente de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela ante la Oficina de las Naciones Unidas y demás Organismos Internacionales con sede en Ginebra
Email: camposg@onuginebra.gob.ve

SALAS CASTILLO Ricardo
Ministry of People's Power for Foreign Relations
Email: ricardosalas68@gmail.com

ZAMBIA

CHONGO Beausic
Ministry of Green Economy and Environment
Email: beausique@gmail.com

ZIMBABWE

EDITH TIBAHWA Bagambe
Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)
Email: edith_tb@yahoo.com

NDIDZANO Kudzai Faron
Ministry of Environment, Climate, Tourism and Hospitality Industry
Email: kudzie013@gmail.com

OBSERVER ORGANIZATIONS

AFRICAN NETWORK FOR A CLIMATE COMMUNITY(ANCC)

MOMO TSOMBENG Regis Stephane
ANCC
Email: regismomo45@gmail.com

**BASEL ROTTERDAM AND STOCKHOLM
COVENTIONS (BRS Conventions)**

MARTIN-NOVELLA Carlos
BRS Conventions Secretariat
Email: cmartin-novella@un.org

**CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL
DIVERSITY (CBD)**

TYRRELL Tristan
CBD
Email: tristan.tyrrell@un.org

**EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF
ENVIRONMENTAL AND RESOURCE
ECONOMISTS (EAERE)**

RAVAZZI Aldo
EAERE Policy Committee
Email: aravazzi@luiss.it

EUROPEAN UNION (EU)

RAKONCZAY Zoltan
European Commission
Email: Zoltan.RAKONCZAY@ec.europa.eu

TULKENS Philippe
European Commission
Email: Philippe.TULKENS@ec.europa.eu

ZENKO-ULEZIC Maja
European Commission
Email: Maja.ZENKO-ULEZIC@ec.europa.eu

**FRIENDS WORLD COMMITTEE FOR
CONSULTATION (FWCC)**

COOK Lindsey
Quaker United Nations Office (QUNO)
Email: Lfcook@quno.ch

CARLSON Alana
Quaker United Nations Office (QUNO)
Email: alana.carlson@graduateinstitute.ch

GREEN PLANET

MEMON Lukman Aabidhushen
Green Planet
Email: admin@greenplanets.org

STOCKHOLM RESILIENCE CENTER

HERTZ Ashanapuri
Stockholm Resilience Centre
Email: ashanapuri.hertz@su.se

UN ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (UNEP)

LIU Jian
UNEP
Email: jian.liu@un.org

**UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK
CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE
(UNFCCC)**

POST Joanna
UNFCCC
Email: jpost@unfccc.int

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

DE PRYCK Kari
University of Cambridge
Email: karidepryck@gmail.com

**WORLD METEOROLOGICAL
ORGANIZATION (WMO)**

TAALAS Petteri
WMO
Email: sgomm@wmo.int

EGERTON Paul
WMO
Email: pegerton@wmo.int

TG-DATA

VICUNA Sebastian
Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile
Email: svcuna@ing.puc.cl

IPCC TECHNICAL SUPPORT UNITS

WORKING GROUP I TECHNICAL SUPPORT UNIT

PIRANI Anna
WGI TSU Head
Email: anna.pirani@universite-paris-saclay.fr

PEAN Clotilde
WGI TSU
Email:
clotilde.pean@universite-paris-saclay.fr

ZHOU Lanyue
WGI TSU
Email: lanyue1109@gmail.com

WORKING GROUP II TECHNICAL SUPPORT UNIT

TIGNOR Melinda
WGII TSU Head
Alfred-Wegener-Institut
Email: melinda.tignor@ipcc-wg2.awi.de

POLOCZANSKA Elvira
WGII TSU
Alfred-Wegener-Institut
Email: elvira.poloczanska@ipcc-wg2.awi.de

WORKING GROUP III TECHNICAL SUPPORT UNIT

FRADERA Roger
WGIII TSU Head
Imperial College London
Email: r.fradera@imperial.ac.uk

SYNTHESIS REPORT TECHNICAL SUPPORT UNIT

ROMERO José
SYR TSU Head
Email: jromero@ipcc-syr.org

BIRT Arlene
SYR TSU
Email: arlene@ipcc-syr.org
HA Meeyoung
SYR TSU
Email: meeyoung.ha@ipcc-syr.org

KIM Jin Mi
SYR TSU
Email: jkim@ipcc-syr.org

TECHNICAL SUPPORT UNIT OF THE TASK FORCE ON NATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORIES (TFI)

FEDERICI Sandro
TFI TSU Head
Email: federici@iges.or.jp

ENOKI Takeshi
TFI TSU
Email: enoki@iges.or.jp

IPCC SECRETARIAT

MOKSSIT Abdalah
IPCC Secretariat
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: amokssit@wmo.int

FIDA Ermira
IPCC Secretariat
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: efida@wmo.int

ABDALLAH Mudathir
IPCC Secretariat
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: mabdallah@wmo.int

BAIDYA Jesbin
IPCC Secretariat
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: jbaidya@wmo.int

BIAGIONI Laura
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: lbiagioni@wmo.int

EKZARKHO Oksana
IPCC Secretariat
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: oekzarkho@wmo.int

EWA Judith
IPCC Secretariat
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: jewa@wmo.int

FERNANDEZ Joelle
IPCC Secretariat
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: jfernandez@wmo.int

LARRODÉ Emelie
IPCC Secretariat
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: elarrode@wmo.int

LEW SCHNEIDER Jennifer
IPCC Secretariat
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: jlewschneider@wmo.int

MAHECIC Andrej
IPCC Secretariat
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: amahecic@wmo.int

PEEVA Nina
IPCC Secretariat
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: npeeva@wmo.int

SHONGWE Mxolisi E
IPCC Secretariat
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: mshongwe@wmo.int

WALSH Melissa
IPCC Secretariat
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: mwalsh@wmo.int

ZABULA Werani
IPCC Secretariat
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: wzabula@wmo.int

ESPEJO Gabriela
IPCC Intern
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: gespejo@wmo.int

LA PLACA Marta
IPCC Intern
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: mlaplaca@wmo.int

ZHANG Weijia
IPCC Intern
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: weijiazhang@wmo.int

ZHONG Yuwei
IPCC Intern
c/o World Meteorological Organization
Email: yzhong@wmo.int

**INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (IISD)
EARTH NEGOTIATIONS BULLETIN (ENB)**

DAVENPORT Deborah
International Institute for Sustainable
Development (IISD) Reporting Services (ENB)
Email: deborah@iisd.net

HANSEN Gerrit
International Institute for Sustainable
Development (IISD) Reporting Services (ENB)
Email: gerrit@iisd.net

TEMPLETON Jessica
International Institute for Sustainable
Development (IISD) Reporting Services (ENB)
Email: jessica@iisd.net

MOUZOURAKIS Michail
International Institute for Sustainable
Development (IISD) Reporting Services
(ENB)Email: mike@iisd.net

RODOPOULOU Anastasia
International Institute for Sustainable
Development (IISD) Reporting Services (ENB)
Email: anastasiarodop@gmail.com