

**FIFTY-SEVENTH SESSION OF THE IPCC**  
**Geneva, Switzerland, 27 – 30 September 2022**

IPCC-LVII/Doc. 6  
(19.IX.2022)  
Agenda Item: 5  
ENGLISH ONLY

**REPORT OF THE AD HOC GROUP ON ELECTIONS**

(Prepared by the Ad Hoc Group on Elections)

(Submitted by the Secretary of the IPCC)

# REPORT OF THE AD HOC GROUP ON ELECTIONS

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Rationale and mandate of the Ad Hoc Group on Elections (AHGE)

Rule 7 of Appendix C to the Principles Governing IPCC Work, the Procedures for the Election of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau requires that “The size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau will be reviewed and amended, as necessary, by the Panel at least one Session prior to the Session at which the IPCC Bureau and/or any Task Force Bureau are elected.”

At its 53<sup>rd</sup> (bis) Session, the Panel decided (Decision IPCC-LIII(bis)-2.1) to establish an Ad-hoc Group with the mandate to identify proposals to recommend to the Panel on the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any other Task Force Bureau for the Seventh Assessment cycle, with reference to Rule 7 of Appendix C of the Principles Governing IPCC Work. Per the terms of reference of the Ad-hoc Group on Elections (AHGE), the objectives of the Group include seeking to ensure transparency, inclusiveness and equal opportunity for participation of all its members, noting the importance of the inclusion of the perspectives of developing countries.<sup>1</sup>

The Panel's decision was undertaken with a view towards laying the groundwork for initiating the process with reference to Rule 21 of Appendix C to the Principles Governing IPCC Work, as directing the IPCC Secretary to invite Members of the IPCC to submit to the Secretariat nominations for the seventh assessment cycle Bureau positions.

### 1.2. Structure of this report

This report provides 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.

#### *Summaries of meetings and nature of proposals*

This section gives a summary overview of the AHGE meetings, sets out matters elevated for discussion, actions on the timeline for AHGE outputs, as well as the number of proposals submitted, with the nature of the proposals clarified.

#### *Proposed changes to the Bureau and a summary of the proposals*

This section sets out the proposed changes to the size structure and composition of the Bureau for the seventh assessment cycle in light of the AHGE mandate, presenting excerpts of the clustered options, supplemented by explanations. The proposals are then set out by separate decision points in tables summarizing and comparing options, with text description along with any justifications for each option, and the potential implications of the proposed option as to regional balance, overall size, and any other considerations.

In this report, we have made efforts to faithfully reflect the full proposals from AHGE members. During the discussions at the Panel, additional alternative options and/or combination of proposals may be considered. Agreement on any decision point during these discussions may then lead to shifts in the options for other decision points. The AHGE Co-Chairs have not attempted to generate combinations or packages of proposals or attempted to predict all of the implications of potential decisions.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Annex V.

## **Annexures**

Annexed to this report are:

- I. Annex B of Appendix C to the IPCC Rules of Procedure with incorporated decision point tables
- II. Additional considerations raised by AHGE members that are outside the mandate of the AHGE group
- III. AHGE member submissions
- IV. Minutes from the AHGE meetings
- V. ToRs of the AHGE and current IPCC Bureau
- VI. Membership of the AHGE
- VII. The current Annex B of Appendix C

### **1.3. Background on AHGE process**

#### ***a) Meetings***

The AHGE held three electronic meetings, of 30 June, 10 August and 31 August (see Annex IV), Co-Chaired by Saudi Arabia and the United States of America, with Rapporteur support initially from Venezuela and Germany.<sup>2</sup> To ensure transparency, inclusiveness and equal opportunity for participation of all members, and noting the importance of the inclusion of the perspectives of developing countries, membership of the AHGE is open-ended as to participation of all Members of the IPCC. Current membership of 64 appointed representatives reflected participation from all six WMO Regions.

Over the course of the meetings, discussions included the type and content of proposals to be submitted, as well as source of inputs, including Bureau and Panel, which queries were addressed per the mandate of the AHGE. Written submissions received were reviewed and discussed, as well as all additional oral submissions, along with presentation and explanation of the methodology used for categorizing all submissions. All issues outside of the AHGE mandate were confirmed to be separate from the report to the Panel, but were to be consolidated and provided to the Panel for due consideration. The open-ended membership of the group continued to expand with each meeting, and updated and new proposals submissions were invited throughout the course of the meetings. Member work included review and preparation of an Annex B document with elements requiring Panel consideration and decision, as well as a Final Report for presentation to the Panel.

#### ***b) Nature and process of review of proposals***

**The proposals set out for Panel consideration are derived from the inputs of AHGE members but do not reflect consensus of the AHGE members.** The focus in consolidation of the submissions in this report is not primarily to examine the pros and cons of each proposal in detail, but to present each proposal in the clearest way for consideration and discussion by the Panel. A full text of the all proposals received from AHGE members are attached as annexes to this report. All considerations raised as a part of discussions that went beyond the mandate of the group on size, structure and composition of the AR7 bureau are not included as part of the proposals but appear in the annexures for the Panel's consideration.

Co-Chairs presented the proposals in tabular form, supplemented by slides that consolidated all proposals, with a view to cluster around relevant elements of the Bureau size, structure and composition, as distinguishing between mandated and non-mandated matters.

---

<sup>2</sup> Due to extenuating circumstances, Venezuela had to decline ongoing participation. Requests for nomination for an additional Rapporteur from a developing country were submitted to Panel members, with the position unfilled at the completion of the third AHGE meeting

2. **Proposed changes to the size, structure and composition of the bureau in the seventh assessment cycle:** composition/regional balance is compared with implications on regional representation from proposed structural changes.

**2.1 Proposal 1/Status Quo (no changes to be made from current IPCC Bureau)**

| Structure         | Proposal 1/Status Quo |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| IPCC Chair        | 1                     |
| IPCC Vice-Chairs  | 3                     |
| TFB Co-Chairs     | 2                     |
| WG Co-Chairs      | 6                     |
| WGI Vice-Chairs   | 7                     |
| WGII Vice-Chairs  | 8                     |
| WGIII Vice-Chairs | 7                     |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>34</b>             |

  

| Composition/regional balance                     | Proposal 1/Status Quo   |
|--|---|
| Region I (Africa)                                | 7   |
| Region II (Asia)                                 | 6   |
| Region III (South America)                       | 4   |
| Region IV (North and Central America, Caribbean) | 4   |
| Region V (South-West Pacific)                    | 4   |
| Region VI (Europe)                               | 8   |
| <b>Total</b>                                     | <b>33 (not including IPCC Chair in regional representation)</b> |

**2.2. Proposal 2: two IPCC Chairs, one each from developed/developing country, and gender balance**

| Structure         | Proposal 2 |
|-------------------|------------|
| IPCC Chair        | <b>2</b>   |
| IPCC Vice-Chairs  | 3          |
| TFB Co-Chairs     | 2          |
| WG Co-Chairs      | 6          |
| WGI Vice-Chairs   | 7          |
| WGII Vice-Chairs  | 8          |
| WGIII Vice-Chairs | 7          |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>35</b>  |

  

| Composition/regional balance                     | Proposal 2   |
|--|--|
| Region I (Africa)                                | 7  |
| Region II (Asia)                                 | 6  |
| Region III (South America)                       | 4  |
| Region IV (North and Central America, Caribbean) | 4  |
| Region V (South-West Pacific)                    | 4  |
| Region VI (Europe)                               | 8  |
| <b>Total</b>                                     | <b>33 (not including 2 IPCC Chairs in regional representation)</b> |

Regional representation of Bureau is to remain the same, and not include the two IPCC Co-Chairs. This would provide representation of developed and developing countries at highest level of IPCC leadership; enhancement of scientific dialogue and consensus; increase in inclusivity including as to Gender; For any SYR in AR7, two IPCC Co-Chairs would increase manageability of SYR production and approval session.

### 2.3. Proposal 3: two IPCC Chairs and two IPCC Vice-Chairs

| 3. Structure      | Proposal 3 |
|-------------------|------------|
| IPCC Chair        | <b>2</b>   |
| IPCC Vice-Chairs  | <b>2</b>   |
| TFB Co-Chairs     | 2          |
| WG Co-Chairs      | 6          |
| WGI Vice-Chairs   | 7          |
| WGII Vice-Chairs  | 8          |
| WGIII Vice-Chairs | 7          |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>34</b>  |

Overall number of Bureau members unchanged, but one less member towards Regional representation.

Two IPCC Co-Chairs will decrease some vulnerabilities and ensure that broad scientific knowledge is well rooted at the very highest level in the Bureau; will provide developing/developing country representation at the highest level to increase inclusivity; reducing Vice-Chairs from three to two: keeps Bureau at current size and ensures balance between developing/developed country representation at the ExCom level.

### 2.4. Proposal 4a: two IPCC Chairs, four IPCC Vice-Chairs

| Structure         | Proposal 4a |
|-------------------|-------------|
| IPCC Chair        | <b>2</b>    |
| IPCC Vice-Chairs  | <b>4</b>    |
| TFB Co-Chairs     | 2           |
| WG Co-Chairs      | 6           |
| WGI Vice-Chairs   | 7           |
| WGII Vice-Chairs  | 8           |
| WGIII Vice-Chairs | 7           |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>36</b>   |

  

| Composition/regional balance                     | Proposal 4a                                      |
|--|--|
| Region I (Africa)                                | <b>10</b>  |
| Region II (Asia)                                 | 6  |
| Region III (South America)                       | <b>3</b>   |
| Region IV (North and Central America, Caribbean) | 4  |
| Region V (South-West Pacific)                    | 4  |
| Region VI (Europe)                               | <b>9</b>   |
| <b>Total</b>                                     | <b>36 (including 2 Chairs and 4 Vice-Chairs)</b> |

All Bureau members to count towards Regional representation.

Each Region is represented between the IPCC Chair and IPCC Vice-Chair seats, and in each WGI/II/III and the ExCom.

Two IPCC Co-Chairs one each from a developing and developed country with gender balance increases accountability and equity, and creates balanced governance in ExCom. All six WMO Regions would be represented at the highest levels of IPCC leadership.

## 2.5. Proposal 4b: one IPCC Chair, five IPCC Vice-Chairs

| Structure         | Proposal 4b |
|-------------------|-------------|
| IPCC Chair        | 1           |
| IPCC Vice-Chairs  | <b>5</b>    |
| TFB Co-Chairs     | 2           |
| WG Co-Chairs      | 6           |
| WGI Vice-Chairs   | 7           |
| WGII Vice-Chairs  | 8           |
| WGIII Vice-Chairs | 7           |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>36</b>   |

  

| Composition/regional balance                     | Proposal 4b                                     |
|--|---|
| Region I (Africa)                                | <b>10</b>                                       |
| Region II (Asia)                                 | 6   |
| Region III (South America)                       | <b>3</b>  |
| Region IV (North and Central America, Caribbean) | 4   |
| Region V (South-West Pacific)                    | 4   |
| Region VI (Europe)                               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Total</b>                                     | <b>36 (including 1 Chair and 5 Vice-Chairs)</b> |

All Bureau members to count towards Regional representation.

Each Region is represented between the IPCC Chair and IPCC Vice-Chair seats, and in each WGI/II/III and the ExCom. This will create balanced governance, and allow representation of all five WMO Regions at the highest level of IPCC leadership.

## 2.6. Proposal 5: WG Vice-Chairs to be six per Working Group; IPCC Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs and TFB and WG Co-Chairs to be removed from regional representation

| Structure         | Proposal 5                              |
|-------------------|---|
| IPCC Chair        | 1                                       |
| IPCC Vice-Chairs  | 3                                       |
| TFB Co-Chairs     | 2                                       |
| WG Co-Chairs      | 6                                       |
| WGI Vice-Chairs   | <b>18 WG Vice-Chairs<br/>(6 per WG)</b> |
| WGII Vice-Chairs  |   |
| WGIII Vice-Chairs |   |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>30</b>                               |

  

| Composition/regional balance                     | Proposal 5 |
|--|------------|
| Region I (Africa)                                | <b>3</b>   |
| Region II (Asia)                                 | <b>3</b>   |
| Region III (South America)                       | <b>3</b>   |
| Region IV (North and Central America, Caribbean) | <b>3</b>   |
| Region V (South-West Pacific)                    | <b>3</b>   |
| Region VI (Europe)                               | <b>3</b>   |
| <b>Total</b>                                     | <b>18</b>  |

IPCC Chair, 3 IPCC Vice-Chairs and 6 Working Group Co-Chairs: all removed from Regional representation.

The change in the number of WG Vice-Chairs enhances the balance of regional representation and allows for gender balance. The non-increase in Bureau seats keeps decision-making efficient and manageable.

## 2.7. Proposal 6: Working Group Vice-Chair increase by 3 positions through removal of IPCC Vic-Chairs from regional representation

| Structure         | Proposal 6  |
|-------------------|---|
| IPCC Chair        | 1   |
| IPCC Vice-Chairs  | 3   |
| TFB Co-Chairs     | 2   |
| WG Co-Chairs      | 6   |
| WGI Vice-Chairs   | <b>WG Vice-Chair increase on removal of IPCC Vice-Chairs from regional representation</b> |
| WGII Vice-Chairs  |   |
| WGIII Vice-Chairs |   |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>37</b>   |

Regional balance would not change within the 33 Bureau seats.

WG Vice-Chair increase would address representation of regions across Working Groups, such as the gap in representation from Region III in WGIII Bureau. Important considerations are also Region V lacking IPCC Vice-Chair or WG Co-Chair. Taking away regional representation is counterproductive; a means for fair representation must be ensured.

## 2.8. Proposal 7: addition of the two TG-Data Co-Chairs to join the WG and TFB Co-Chairs

| Structure         | Proposal 7                           |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|
| IPCC Chair        | 1                                    |
| IPCC Vice-Chairs  | 3                                    |
| TFB Co-Chairs     | 2                                    |
| WG Co-Chairs      | 6                                    |
| WGI Vice-Chairs   | 7                                    |
| WGII Vice-Chairs  | 8                                    |
| WGIII Vice-Chairs | 7                                    |
| <b>Additional</b> | <b>Add the two TG-Data Co-Chairs</b> |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>36</b>                            |

Two additional positions to be added in Bureau (Region not specified).

TG-Data would join the three Working Groups and TFI. Inclusion of TG-Data in the Bureau will increase their accountability while supporting IPCC Bureau member awareness of TG-Data current work in view of the following:

- Working with observational data and results of model calculations as used in IPCC reports has increased significantly;
- IPCC data is not only purely climatic data but also impact, risk and adaptation;
- Data organization, archiving and secure storage are essential to support confidence in IPCC estimates.

**2.9 Proposal 8: each of the six Co-Chairs must be drawn from each WMO Region, i.e. one Co-Chair from each Region**

| Structure         | Proposal 8 |
|-------------------|------------|
| IPCC Chair        | 1          |
| IPCC Vice-Chairs  | 3          |
| TFB Co-Chairs     | 2          |
| WG Co-Chairs      | 6          |
| WGI Vice-Chairs   | 7          |
| WGII Vice-Chairs  | 8          |
| WGIII Vice-Chairs | 7          |
| Total             | 34         |

No impact on regional balance or overall numbers of Bureau members  
To promote regional representation within all the WGs.



### 3. Co-Chair summary of proposals

#### 3.1. Decision point 1: Number of IPCC Chairs and Vice-Chairs, including potential regional allocations of these positions

|                         | Option 1 (status quo)                                 | Option 2   | Option 3  | Option 4  | Option 5  | Option 6  |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Chair                   | The IPCC-Chair  | Two IPCC Chairs  | Two IPCC Chairs   | Two IPCC Chairs   | The IPCC Chair  | The IPCC Chair  |
| Regional Representation | The IPCC Chair does not represent a region            | The IPCC Chairs do not represent a region, noting one each from developed and developing countries with consideration for promoting gender balance | The IPCC Chairs count towards regional representation/ are from different regions and respectively from a developing and developed country, with consideration for promoting gender balance | The IPCC Chairs counted towards regional representation/ are from different regions and respectively from a developing and developed country, with consideration for promoting gender balance | The IPCC Chair counts towards regional representation | The IPCC Chair does not represent a region            |
| Vice-Chairs             | Three IPCC Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities | Three IPCC Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities  | Two IPCC Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities   | Four IPCC Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities  | Five IPCC Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities  | Three IPCC Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities |

|                                |  |   |   |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Regional Representation</b> | - the three IPCC Vice-Chairpersons are from different regions including at least one from a developing country and one from a developed country; | - the three IPCC Vice-Chairpersons are from different regions including at least one from a developing country and one from a developed country | - the two IPCC Vice-Chairpersons are from different regions including at least one from a developing country and one from a developed country | - the four IPCC Vice-Chairpersons are from the four regions not represented by the IPCC Chairs | - the five IPCC Vice-Chairpersons are from different not represented by the IPCC Chair | -the three IPCC Vice-Chairpersons do not count towards regional representation, but should continue to come from different Regions and span developing and developed countries in order to preserve/enhance overall regional representation. |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|--|

#### **a) Rationale**

- Option 1: Represents the status quo of one IPCC Chair who does not represent a region, and three IPCC Vice-Chairs that represent a region.
- Option 2: Two IPCC Chairs will provide representation of developed and developing countries and promote gender balance at highest level of IPCC leadership; regional representation of Bureau is to remain the same, and not include the two IPCC Co-Chairs. Two IPCC Chairs will enhance scientific dialogue and consensus; increase in inclusivity including as to Gender; for any SYR in AR7, two IPCC Co-Chairs would increase manageability of SYR production and approval session.
- Option 3: Overall number of Bureau members unchanged, but one less member towards Regional representation. Two IPCC Co-Chairs will decrease some vulnerabilities and ensure that broad scientific knowledge is well rooted at the very highest level in the Bureau; will provide developing/developing country representation at the highest level to increase inclusivity. Reducing IPCC Vice-Chairs from three to two keeps Bureau at current size and ensures balance between developing/developed country representation at the ExCom level.
- Option 4: All Bureau members to count towards Regional representation. Each Region is represented between the IPCC Chair and IPCC Vice-Chair seats, and in each Working Group and the ExCom. Two IPCC Co-Chairs, one each from a developing and developed country and with gender balance and the four IPCC Vice-Chairs with two each from a developed and developing country, increases balanced accountability, equity, and creates balanced governance in ExCom. All six WMO Regions would be represented among the IPCC Chairs and IPCC Vice-Chairs.
- Option 5: All Bureau members to count towards Regional representation. The five IPCC Vice-Chairs with at least two each from a developed and developing country, increases balanced accountability and equity. Each Region is represented between the IPCC Chair and IPCC Vice-Chair seats, and in each Working Group and the ExCom. This will create balanced governance, and allow representation of all six WMO Regions among the IPCC Chairs and Vice-Chairs.

Option 6: Removal of the 3 IPCC Vice-Chairs from regional representation allows for three additional Working Group Vice-Chair positions, without any change to the balance of the Bureau members across regions. This enhances effective representation of regions across Working Groups and the TFB.

***b) Implications as to regional balance or size***

Option 1: As this is status quo, there are no implications as to regional balance or size. The overall size is 34 members; 33 members count towards regional representation (the IPCC Chair is excluded from the regional representation count).

Option 2: The overall size of the Bureau increases to 35 members; 33 members count towards regional representation (the two IPCC Chairs are excluded from the regional representation count).

Option 3: The overall size of the Bureau remains at 34 members; 32 members count towards regional representation (the two IPCC Chairs are excluded from the regional representation count). There is one less position for regional representation through removal of the one IPCC Vice-Chair.

Option 4: The overall size of the Bureau increases to 36 members; 36 members count towards regional representation (the two IPCC Chairs and four IPCC Vice-Chairs count towards regional representation).

Option 5: The overall size of the Bureau increases to 36 members; 36 members count towards regional representation (the one IPCC Chair and five IPCC Vice-Chairs count towards regional representation).

Option 6: The overall size of the Bureau increases to 37 members; 33 members count towards regional representation (the IPCC Chair and the three IPCC Vice-Chairs do not count towards regional representation).

### 3.2. Decision point 2: whether to add TG-Data Co-Chairs to the IPCC Bureau

#### *Whether to add TG-Data Co-Chairs to the IPCC Bureau*

|              | Option 1 (Status quo)               | Option 2   |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| WG Co-Chairs | 8 Co-Chairs (2 for each WG and TFB) | Two Co-Chairs of the Task Group TG-Data (for a total of 10 Co-Chairs in the IPCC Bureau) |

#### **a) Rationale**

Option 1: Represents the status quo of eight Co-Chairs, two for each Working Group and two for the TFB.

Option 2: TG-Data would join the three Working Groups and TFI for an increase in their accountability while supporting IPCC Bureau member awareness of TG-Data current work in view of the following:

- Working with observational data and results of model calculations as used in IPCC reports has increased significantly;
- IPCC data is not only purely climatic data but also impact, risk and adaptation;
- Data organization, archiving and secure storage are essential to support confidence in IPCC estimates.

#### **b) Implications as to regional balance or size**

Option 1: Represents the status quo.

Option 2: The overall size of the Bureau increases to 36 members; 33 members count towards regional representation (the IPCC Chair does not count towards regional representation). The Panel may need to consider the regional balance of the additional positions.

### 3.3. Decision point 3: Regional balance of Working Group Co-Chairs and other considerations for the composition of the Bureau

#### *Regional balance of Working Group Co-Chairs and other considerations for the composition of the Bureau*

|                               | Option 1 (Status quo)   | Option 2  | Option 3  | Option 4   |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Regional Representation       | (No regional balance specified)                                 | Each Co-Chair of a Working Group to represent a separate region for full regional representation across all working groups. |   |  |
| Intra-regional representation | (No intra-regional balance specified)                           |   | Intra-regional balance considerations are promoted within the Bureau. |  |
| Gender representation         | Consideration should also be given to promoting gender balance. |   |   | Bureau should strive for an overall gender balance across all positions throughout the Bureau. |

**NOTE:** These options are not mutually exclusive alternatives to each other and the Panel should consider all options on their merits.

#### *a) Rationale*

- Option 2: Ensuring that each Co-Chair of a Working Group represents a separate WMO Region will result in fair representation overall in the varying Working Groups, supporting the ability of all Regions to undergo tasks improving the quality of the assessment reports, and ensuring the credibility and integrity of the IPCC.
- Option 3: Intra-regional balance would be beneficial for scientific coverage of multiple sub-regions.
- Option 4: A balance of gender representation across all positions throughout the Bureau promotes inclusivity and associated perspectives.

#### *b) Implications as to regional balance or size*

- Option 1: Represents the status quo, with no regional balance specified.
- Option 2: There are no changes in the status quo to overall size, regional composition, or numerical changes in regional balance.
- Option 3: There are no changes in the status quo to overall size, regional composition, or numerical changes in regional balance.
- Option 4: There are no changes in the status quo to overall size, regional composition, or numerical changes in regional balance.

### 3.4. Decision point 4: Overall regional balance

*Overall regional balance – both numbers across regions and which positions are included in the regional balance calculation*

|   | Option 1 (Status quo)  | Option 2<br>(2 IPCC Chairs, 4 IPCC Vice-Chairs)   | Option 3<br>(1 IPCC Chair, 5 IPCC Vice-Chairs)   | Option 4<br>(Removal of IPCC Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs, WG and TFB Co-Chairs from regional representation)             | Option 5<br>(Removal of IPCC Vice-Chairs from regional representation)  | Option 6<br>(2 IPCC Chairs, 2 IPCC Vice-Chairs)  |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| Region I                                | Region I: 7 positions  | 10  | 10   | 3  | 7   | Overall decrease by 1 position   |
| Region II                               | Region II: 6 positions   | 6   | 6  | 3  | 6   |  |
| Region III                              | Region III: 4 positions  | 3   | 3  | 3  | 4   |  |
| Region IV                               | Region IV: 4 positions   | 4   | 4  | 3  | 4   |  |
| Region V                                | Region V: 4 positions  | 4   | 4  | 3  | 4   |  |
| Region VI                               | Region VI: 8 positions   | 9   | 9  | 3  | 8   |  |
| Positions reflected in regional balance | 33 positions:<br>IPCC Vice-Chairs (3)<br>WG and TFB Co-Chairs (8)<br>WG I/II/III Vice-Chairs(7/8/7 – 22 total) | 36 positions:<br>IPCC Chair (2)<br>IPCC Vice-Chairs(4)<br>WG and TFB Co-Chairs(8)<br>WG I/II/III Vice-Chairs (7/8/7 – 22 total) | 36 positions:<br>IPCC Chair (1)<br>IPCC Vice-Chairs(5)<br>WG and TFB Co-Chairs (8)<br>WG I/II/III Vice-Chairs (7/8/7 – 22 total) | 18 positions:<br>WG I/II/III Vice Chairs (6/6/6 – 18 total)<br><br>All other bureau members do not represent regions | 33 positions:<br>WG and TFB Co-Chairs (8)<br>WG I/II/III Vice-Chairs (x/x/x – 25 total with 3 positions added to the Status Quo of 7/8/7) | 32 positions:<br>IPCC Vice-Chairs (2)<br>WG and TFB Co-Chairs (8)<br>WG I/II/III Vice-Chairs(7/8/7 – 22 total) |

#### a) Rationale

Option 1: Represents the status quo.

Option 2: The addition of an IPCC Chair and IPCC Vice-Chair results in an overall increase to 36 members. Given the allocation of member states into six WMO Regions, the percentage values reflect Region I with 53 members, Region II with 32 Members, Region III with 12 Members, Region IV with 20 Members, Region V with 20 Members and Region VI with 50 Members. The indicated number of seats, following the distribution into the six WMO Regions, starts with a total of 187 members and 36 seats available.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> The IPCC currently has 195 member countries.

- Option 3: The addition of an IPCC Chair and IPCC Vice-Chair results in an overall increase to 36 members. Given the allocation of member states into six WMO Regions, the percentage values reflect Region I with 53 members, Region II with 32 Members, Region III with 12 Members, Region IV with 20 Members, Region V with 20 Members and Region VI with 50 Members. The indicated number of seats, following the distribution into the six WMO Regions, starts with a total of 187 members and 36 seats available.
- Option 4: Reducing the number of Working Group Vice-Chairs to six each (three for each Region), with one representative from each Region for each Working Group, enhances the balance of regional representation, and allows for gender balance with an even number of Working Group Vice-Chairs. No increase in the number of Bureau seats means decision-making is efficient and manageable, with no additional costs and a potential savings for the Trust Fund. Removal of IPCC Chair, IPCC Vice Chairs and WG and TFB Co-Chairs from regional representation results in a more balanced composition of the Bureau: they are chosen exclusively according to their scientific excellence without strict constraints on representation, but equal participation of developed/developing countries, genders and regions is nonetheless essential.
- Option 5: Removal of the 3 IPCC Vice-Chairs from regional representation will not change the balance of Bureau members across the Regions but will result in a creation of 3 additional Working Group Vice-Chair positions, which will enhance effective and fair representation of Regions across Working Groups and TFB. This will help address gaps, in particular the Region III South America not represented in the WGIII Bureau.
- Option 6: The reduction of the number of IPCC Vice-Chairs from three to two in conjunction to an added IPCC Chair, keeps the Bureau at its current size and ensures a balance between developed and developing country/gender balance representation in ExCom.

**b) Implications as to regional balance or size**

- Option 1: This represents the status quo. Currently, there is no representative from Region III (South America) in the WGIII Bureau; a representative from Region V (South-West Pacific) is on the Executive Committee only by special arrangement, as they are not holding office as IPCC Vice-Chair or Working Group/TFB Co-Chair.
- Option 2: Regional representation in Region III is reduced.
- Option 3: Regional representation in Region III is reduced.
- Option 4: There will be regional representation in all of the Working Groups through the WG Vice-Chairs.
- Option 5: There is no change from the status quo.
- Option 6: There is an overall reduction in regional representation through removal of one IPCC Vice-Chair.

### 3.5. Decision point 5: number and distribution of WG Vice-Chairs

|  | Option 1 (Status quo)  | Option 2<br>(18 WG Vice-Chairs)   | Option 3<br>(Removal of IPCC Vice-Chairs from regional representation: <i>increase from 22 to 25 WG Vice-Chair positions</i> )   |
|--|--|---|--|
| WG Vice Chairs and their regional representation | <p>4. The Working Group I Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and seven Working Group Vice-Chairs.</p> <p>5. The Working Group II Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and eight Working Group Vice-Chairs.</p> <p>6. The Working Group III Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and seven Working Group Vice-Chairs.</p> | <p>4. The Working Group I Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and six Working Group Vice-Chairs each from a region.</p> <p>5. The Working Group II Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and six Working Group Vice-Chairs each from a region.</p> <p>6. The Working Group III Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and six Working Group Vice-Chairs each from a region.</p> | <p>4. The Working Group I Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and [#] Working Group Vice-Chairs.</p> <p>5. The Working Group II Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and [#] Working Group Vice-Chairs.</p> <p>6. The Working Group III Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and [#] Working Group Vice-Chairs.</p> |

#### a) Rationale

Option 1: This represents the status quo.

Option 2: Reducing the number of Working Group Vice-Chairs to six each (three for each Region), with one representative from each Region for each Working Group, enhances the balance of regional representation, and allows for gender balance with an even number of Working Group Vice-Chairs.

Option 3: Removal of the three IPCC Vice-Chairs from the regional representation count would increase the Bureau size by three (maintaining the three IPCC Vice-Chair positions). These three additional positions could be used to address regional imbalances.

#### b) Implications as to regional balance or size

Option 1: This represents the status quo. Currently, there is no representative from Region III (South America) in the WGIII Bureau.

Option 2: All WMO Regions to be represented in each Working Group. The IPCC Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs, and WG and TFB Co-Chairs will be removed from regional representation but although without strict constraints on representation, equal participation of developed/developing countries, genders and regions is nonetheless essential.

Option 3: Current regional imbalances could be addressed through the removal of the three IPCC Vice-Chairs from regional representation (IPCC Vice-Chairs positions retained and regional and gender balance still to be sought).



### 3.6. Decision point 6: Overall size of the Bureau

|      | Option 1<br>(status quo) | Option 2 | Option 3 | Option 4 | Option 5 |
|------|--------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Size | 34                       | 30       | 35       | 36       | 37       |

#### **a) Rationale**

Option 1: This represents the status quo.

Option 2: The overall size of the Bureau is reduced to 30, keeping decision-making efficient and manageable and potentially reducing costs to the IPCC Trust Fund, through removal of IPCC Chair, IPCC Vice Chairs and WG and TFB Co-Chairs from regional representation and limiting the number of WG Vice-Chairs to 18 (6 pre WG).

Option 3: An increase in the overall size of the Bureau to 35 follows from the addition of an IPCC Chair (for two IPCC Co-Chairs). This will allow for developed/developing country and gender balance at the highest level of IPCC Leadership and increase inclusivity. For any SYR in AR7, two IPCC Co-Chairs increases manageability of SYR production and the approval session.

Option 4: An increase in the overall size of the Bureau to 36 will result from either a) adding one IPCC Chair and one IPCC Vice-Chair; b) adding two additional IPCC Vice-Chairs; or c) adding two TG-Data Co-Chairs to join the WG Co-Chairs.

Option 5: This increase in the overall size of the Bureau follows from an increase through removal of the IPCC Vice-Chairs from regional representation, allowing for three additional positions to address current regional imbalances.

#### **b) Implications as to regional balance or size**

Option 1: This represents the status quo (34 positions)

Option 2: Reduction to 30 positions: possible efficiency and cost gains; possible trade-offs with decisions on reduced regional representation overall.

Option 3: Increase to 35 positions by added one IPCC Chair, for more regional balance on developed/developing country (and gender) representation at highest IPCC leadership level; commensurate cost changes in change from 34 to 35 positions.

Option 4: Increase to 36 positions overall by addition of 2 positions: a) developed and developing country (and gender) representation enhanced; b) developed and developing country and gender representation enhanced; c) potential increase in regional representation through addition of the two TG-Data Co-Chairs.

Option 5: Increase to 37 positions overall: addition of 3 positions will allow current regional imbalances to be addressed; commensurate cost changes.

### **4. Annexes:**

- I. Annex B with decision point tables
- II. Aspects to consider/out of AHGE Mandate issues
- III. AHGE member submissions
- IV. Minutes from AHGE meetings
- V. TORs of AHGE and current IPCC Bureau
- VI. Membership of AHGE
- VII. Current Annex B

## Introduction note by the AHGE Co-Chairs

The proposals received from members of the AHGE have focused on several areas of *Annex B: The Composition of the IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau*. The AHGE Co-Chairs have consolidated the proposals around these points below. Also, since several submissions by AHGE members suggested that the AR6 Bureau Size, Structure, and Composition should not be changed, the current status quo has been included as an option for each of these points.

### Decision Points:

1. Number of IPCC Chairs and Vice-Chairs, including potential regional allocations of these positions
2. Whether to add TG-Data Co-Chairs to the IPCC Bureau
3. Regional balance of Working Group Co-Chairs
4. Overall regional balance – both numbers across regions and which positions are included in the regional balance calculation
5. Number and distribution of WG Vice Chairs
6. Overall size of the bureau

### Notes:

- The document below follows the structure and order of the current Annex B to Appendix C in order to improve traceability to the original document. Decisions should be taken in numerical order, not in the order of appearance in the document below.
- Text related to the same decision point is highlighted in the same color to help readers track all content related to a decision point.
- The aim of grouping proposals into this structure and order is to help the Panel approach the issues raised by AHGE members in a sequential manner. As decisions are taken on one point the options for later decision points may decrease. For example, the overall size of the bureau will be the result of decisions taken elsewhere in the document, therefore the Co-Chairs have assigned that section as the last decision point/number 6.
- Because changes to regional allocations arise as the number of positions change, the proposed changes in regional allocations have been included within the decision point tables where appropriate. This may mean a change to a later section of the text from where the table appears.
- Several proposals outlined below may require the Panel to also consider aspects of the terms of reference for elected positions or the IPCC rules of procedure for elections that go beyond the size, structure, and composition of the Bureau. These considerations have been captured in an annex to the AHGE's report entitled "Aspects to consider – issues deemed outside of the mandate of the AHGE group for Panel consideration." The proposals captured below are without prejudice to Panel considerations of these issues.

## 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.

**Decision point 6: Overall size of the bureau**

|      | Option 1<br>(status quo) | Option 2 | Option 3 | Option 4 | Option 5 |
|------|--------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Size | 34                       | 30       | 35       | 36       | 37       |

It consists of:

1. the IPCC-Chair.

2. three IPCC Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities.

**Decision Point 1: Number of IPCC Chairs and Vice-Chairs, including potential regional allocations of these positions**

|                         | Option 1 (status quo)                                 | Option 2   | Option 3  | Option 4  | Option 5  | Option 6  |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Chair                   | The IPCC-Chair  | Two IPCC Chairs  | Two IPCC Chairs   | Two IPCC Chairs   | The IPCC Chair  | The IPCC-Chair  |
| Regional Representation | The IPCC Chair does not represent a region            | The IPCC Chairs do not represent a region but are from different regions including at least one from a developing country and one from a developed country with consideration for promoting gender balance | The IPCC Chairs counted towards regional representation/ the two IPCC Chairpersons are from different regions including at least one from a developing country and one from a developed country with consideration for promoting gender balance | The IPCC Chairs counted towards regional representation/ the two IPCC Chairpersons are from different regions including at least one from a developing country and one from a developed country with consideration for promoting gender balance | The IPCC Chair counts towards regional representation | The IPCC Chair does not represent a region            |
| Vice-Chairs             | Three IPCC Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities | Three IPCC Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities  | Two IPCC Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities   | Four IPCC Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities  | Five IPCC Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities  | Three IPCC Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities |

|                         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Regional Representation | - the three IPCC Vice-Chairpersons are from different regions including at least one from a developing country and one from a developed country; | - the three IPCC Vice-Chairpersons are from different regions including at least one from a developing country and one from a developed country; | - the two IPCC Vice-Chairpersons are from different regions including at least one from a developing country and one from a developed country; | - the four IPCC Vice-Chairpersons are from the four regions not represented by the IPCC Chairs | - the five IPCC Vice-Chairpersons are from different regions not represented by the IPCC Chair | -the three IPCC Vice-Chairpersons do not count towards regional representation, but should continue to come from different Regions and span developing and developed countries in order to preserve/enhance overall regional representation. |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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.**

**Decision point 2: Whether to add TG-Data Co-Chairs to the IPCC Bureau**

|              | Option 1 (Status quo)               | Option 2  |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| WG Co-Chairs | 8 Co-Chairs (2 for each WG and TFB) | Two Co-Chairs of the Task Group TG-Data (for a total of 10 Co-Chairs in the IPCC Bureau)<br><i>* Implications of this change on regional representation will need to be decided under Decision point 4.</i> |

**Decision point 5: Number and distribution of WG Vice Chairs**

|  | Option 1 (Status quo)  | Option 2<br>(18 WG Vice-Chairs)   | Option 3<br>(Removal of IPCC Vice-Chairs from regional representation: <i>increase from 22 to 25 WG Vice-Chair positions</i> )  |
|--|--|---|---|
| WG Vice Chairs and their regional representation | <p>4. The Working Group I Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and seven Working Group Vice-Chairs.</p> <p>5. The Working Group II Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and eight Working Group Vice-Chairs.</p> <p>6. The Working Group III Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and seven Working Group Vice-Chairs.</p> | <p>4. The Working Group I Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and six Working Group Vice-Chairs each from a region.</p> <p>5. The Working Group II Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and six Working Group Vice-Chairs each from a region.</p> <p>6. The Working Group III Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and six Working Group Vice-Chairs each from a region.</p> | <p>4. The Working Group I Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and [#] Working Group Vice-Chairs.</p> <p>5. The Working Group II Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and [#] Working Group Vice-Chairs.</p> <p>6. The Working Group III Bureau, with two Working Group Co-Chairs and [#] Working Group Vice-Chairs</p> |

**Decision point 4: Overall regional balance – both numbers across regions and which positions are included in the regional balance calculation**

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

|   | Option 1 (Status quo)  | Option 2<br>(2 IPCC Chairs, 4 IPCC Vice-Chairs)  | Option 3<br>(1 IPCC Chair, 5 IPCC Vice-Chairs)  | Option 4<br>(Removal of IPCC Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs, WG and TFB Co-Chairs from regional representation)                       | Option 5<br>(Removal of IPCC Vice-Chairs from regional representation)   | Option 6<br>(2 IPCC Chairs, 2 IPCC Vice-Chairs)  |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| Region I                                | Region I: 7 positions  | 10   | 10  | 3  | 7  | Overall decrease by 1 position   |
| Region II                               | Region II: 6 positions   | 6  | 6   | 3  | 6  |  |
| Region III                              | Region III: 4 positions  | 3  | 3   | 3  | 4  |  |
| Region IV                               | Region IV: 4 positions   | 4  | 4   | 3  | 4  |  |
| Region V                                | Region V: 4 positions  | 4  | 4   | 3  | 4  |  |
| Region VI                               | Region VI: 8 positions   | 9  | 9   | 3  | 8  |  |
| Positions reflected in regional balance | <i>33 positions:<br/>IPCC Vice-Chairs (3)<br/>WG and TFB Co-Chairs (8)<br/>WG I/II/III Vice-Chairs(7/8/7 – 22 total)</i> | <i>36 positions:<br/>IPCC Chair (2)<br/>IPCC Vice-Chairs(4)<br/>WG and TFB Co-Chairs(8)<br/>WG I/II/III Vice-Chairs (7/8/7 – 22 total)</i> | <i>36 positions:<br/>IPCC Chair (1)<br/>IPCC Vice-Chairs(5)<br/>WG and TFB Co-Chairs (8)<br/>WG I/II/III Vice-Chairs (7/8/7 – 22 total)</i> | <i>18 positions:<br/>WG I/II/III Vice Chairs (6/6/6 – 18 total)<br/><br/>All other bureau members do not represent regions</i> | <i>33 positions:<br/>WG and TFB Co-Chairs (8)<br/>WG I/II/III Vice-Chairs (x/x/x – 25 total with 3 positions added to the Status Quo of 7/8/7)</i> | <i>32 positions:<br/>IPCC Vice-Chairs (2)<br/>WG and TFB Co-Chairs (8)<br/>WG I/II/III Vice-Chairs(7/8/7 – 22 total)</i> |

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.

**Decision point 3: Regional balance of Working Group Co-Chairs and other considerations of composition of the Bureau**

|                                      | Option 1 (Status quo) | Option 2  | Option 3  | Option 4   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Regional Representation</b>       |                       | - each Co-Chair of a Working Group to represent a separate region for full regional representation across all working groups. |   |  |
| <b>Intra-regional representation</b> |                       |   | Intra-regional balance considerations are promoted within the Bureau. |  |
| <b>Gender representation</b>         |                       |   |   | Bureau should strive for an overall gender balance across all positions throughout the Bureau. |

- 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.
- Intra-regional balance considerations are promoted within the Bureau.<sup>1</sup>

Consideration should also be given to promoting gender balance throughout the Bureau.<sup>2</sup>

The IPCC Chair does not represent a region.

The Bureau members do not represent a region. Coming from a particular region means only that specific regional perspectives are brought into the deliberations in a well-balanced manner, also assuring an effective liaising with the scientific community.<sup>3</sup>

## **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

---

<sup>1</sup> This is separate proposal of additional text.

<sup>2</sup> This is a proposal of amended text.

<sup>3</sup> This is a separate proposal of text intended to replace the text “The IPCC Chair does not represent a region” for Option 3 and Option 4 of Decision point 1.

**Aspects to consider – issues deemed outside of the mandate of the AHGE group for Panel consideration**

1. Panel to consider duration of next assessment cycle, per election Procedure #8, relevant to duration of Bureau. This is critical for the work programme and resourcing of TSUs, to allow governments and candidate commitment, including as to resources.
2. The Panel to set the date for the next elections: this is critical for clarity of timeline and orderly transition.
3. Clarity and specification is needed on the ToRs for the IPCC Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs and WG Vice-Chairs.
4. A decision is needed on products to be generated in AR7 which may prioritize joint activities that cross-cut WG and TF topics.
5. Further improvement is needed in the now-established practice related to cross-WG cooperation; amplification needed.
6. Working Group Vice-Chairs should be assigned as liaison focal points to ensure cross-collaboration, exploit synergies and ensure consistency between the Working Groups.
7. Discussion is needed on whether and how IPCC will accommodate the timing of the Global Stocktake process.
8. Increase the involvement of experts from developing countries to work in the IPCC: there is a need for developing a systematic approach for attracting experts who work on a permanent basis in developing countries to work in the IPCC. Traditional nominations are insufficient. In furtherance, Decision IPCC/XLI-4 should be evaluated as to implementation, as well as how WMO and UNEP and any other organizations can support this.
9. With a view to Election Rule 10 which sets a one term limit for the IPCC Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs and Working Group and Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs (with a provision of possible nomination for election for a further term in the same office for individual cases if the Panel so decides), but sets no limits otherwise, a recommendation is made to explore the possibility of setting overall term limits for the rest of the Bureau members to two terms.  
  
Two terms will ensure adequate continuity of the IPCC work as newer members learn from the experienced existing Bureau members. This would additionally ensure incorporation of new members with increasingly diverse expertise and perspectives.
10. The role of the IPCC Vice-Chairs is to be strengthened: attribution of lead roles for specific tasks and functions to each of the three IPCC Vice-Chairs for coherence between contributions of the three Working Groups, to address IPCC governance issues and provide guidance to the Secretariat.
11. ToRs for the IPCC Vice-Chairs to include establishment of a Deputy Chair role, to be agreed amongst the IPCC Vice-Chairs.<sup>1</sup>
12. Elected IPCC Vice-Chairs to agree amongst selves on specific tasks to take on, with specificity clarifying responsibilities, enhancing transparency and accountability.
13. IPCC Vice-Chairs to continue to complement each other in activities, share decision-making, embodying the IPCC spirit of inclusiveness, participation and balanced representation.

---

<sup>1</sup> IPCC Election Rule 11 provides for an IPCC Vice-Chair as agreed by the IPCC Bureau to serve as the Acting IPCC Chair, if the IPCC Chair resigns or is otherwise unable to complete the assigned term of office or to perform the functions of that office, until a new IPCC Chair shall be elected at the next Session to serve the remainder of the term of office of the departing IPCC Chair.



### AHGE member submissions

Members of the AHGE were invited to submit proposals on the size, structure and composition of the Bureau and any Task Force Bureau for the seventh assessment cycle. The following written submissions were received from AHGE members, set out in alphabetical order:

- Australia
- Canada
- China
- Germany
- Hungary
- Japan
- Kenya
- New Zealand
- Norway
- Russian Federation
- Saudi Arabia
- South Africa
- Switzerland
- UK
- USA

## AUSTRALIA



Australian Government

Department of Climate Change, Energy,  
the Environment and Water

Co-Chairs, Ad Hoc Group on Elections  
c/o IPCC Secretariat  
World Meteorological Organisation  
CH-1211 Geneva 2  
SWITZERLAND

Dear Co-Chairs

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute initial views on the size, structure and composition of the IPCC's Bureau in the Seventh Assessment cycle.

The composition of the Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) Bureau, as described in the *IPCC Procedures for the election of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau* [Appendix C](#), Annex B, provides a good starting point for these discussions. Our comments below draw on the rules currently in place.

### Size of the Bureau

The size of the Bureau should allow for representation from every region in each of the Working Groups and Task Forces. The number of positions should also have regard to efficient and effective decision-making and costs of operation. For example, a significantly larger Bureau may make it more challenging to reach consensus on decisions and would impose a greater impost on the IPCC's budget, due to travel and meeting costs, notwithstanding that these costs could be defrayed somewhat through continued online meetings.

### Structure of the Bureau

In our view, the current structure generally works well and the efforts made during the AR6 cycle to better coordinate and collaborate across the Working Groups enhanced the quality of the Working Group Reports, and in particular the three Special Reports. We would like such efforts to continue, and be amplified where possible. We consider the current structure is flexible enough to support delivery of a number of different types of products during the next cycle.

We would like to see the development of a clearer mandate for the IPCC Vice-Chairs, to make better use of their leadership roles. The role and responsibilities could include:

- Act in the role of Chair when the Chair is unavailable;
- Responsibility for specific reports that involve coordination between Working Groups;
- Leading committees or task groups, particularly those concerned with governance issues;
- Assisting the Chair in setting strategic priorities;
- Outreach to particular groups or regions, or on particular topics.

**DCCEEW.gov.au**

John Gorton Building - King Edward Terrace, Parkes ACT 2600 Australia  
GPO Box 3090 Canberra ACT 2601 ABN: 63 573 932 849

### Composition of the AR7 Bureau

On the composition of the Bureau, we emphasise the importance of inclusive and equitable participation in the IPCC, in particular having regard to geographical and gender balance, to provide a strong foundation for a broad range of perspectives in IPCC processes.

Regional balance within each Working Group strengthens the work of the Bureau. Maintaining the necessary representation within the current rules is challenging: there is no representative from Region III South America in the WGIII Bureau, and a representative from Region V South-West Pacific is on the Executive Committee only by special arrangement (as they are not from the office of IPCC Vice-Chair or Working Group Co-chair). Consideration could be given to whether the IPCC Vice-Chairs in the next Bureau should represent a region (as is the case at present). In our view having IPCC Vice-Chairs not representing regions would enhance the capacity for effective representation of regions across Working Groups, without changing the current balance of Bureau numbers across regions.

### Other considerations

The Panel should consider the length of the next assessment cycle (and therefore the duration of the Bureau) in the forthcoming decisions about its size, structure and composition. In our view, the term should extend to the end of 2028, to coincide with the Global Stocktake (GST) under the Paris Agreement. A decision on term length will be an important consideration in discussions on the types of reports that should be delivered in that timeframe.

The IPCC Vice-Chairs should be called upon during the forthcoming Plenary session to provide a joint view on this topic. Similarly, the Working Group Co-Chairs could be invited to provide their joint view. Together, their insights and experiences would provide an important perspective to inform our approach to the next cycle.

Finally, we would like the Panel at the 57<sup>th</sup> Plenary meeting to set the date for the next elections, to provide a clear timeline and an orderly transition to the next cycle. Timely elections as early as possible in 2023 will allow the IPCC to quickly commence work on the next reports and ensure that it can help inform the Global Stocktake.

Thank you again for leading the Ad-hoc Group on Elections and supporting the preparation of a report for the next Plenary session. We look forward to hearing from other Panel members on this important issue.

Yours sincerely



On behalf of

Kath Rowley  
IPCC Focal Point  
Head of Division, Climate Change Division  
Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water

15 July 2022

**Proposal for the composition and size of the IPCC's Seventh Assessment Cycle (AR7) Bureau  
Submission from Canada  
July 2022**

**Proposal:** To enhance the leadership of the IPCC by electing two IPCC Co-Chairs.

**Criteria:** Two IPCC co-chairs, of which one co-chair is from a developed country. The IPCC co-chairs do not represent a region. The promotion of gender balance should also be given consideration in the nomination and election of candidates.

**Rationale:** The election of two IPCC Co-Chairs versus one IPCC Chair would have multiple benefits to the organization, its deliverables, and its influence to international and national policy making. These benefits include:

- **Representation of both developing and developed countries at the highest level of IPCC leadership:** In alignment with the Principles Governing IPCC Work (Appendix C) requirement of having IPCC Vice-Chairs represent both developing and developed countries, Canada believes having two Co-Chairs of the IPCC with appropriate representation from developing and developed countries, and with consideration of gender balance, would be highly beneficial to the organization and its deliverables. Representation of developing and developed countries at the highest level of IPCC leadership would ensure balanced representation in the high level decisions and steering of the seventh assessment cycle (AR7), and would reflect the aim of balanced representation in all levels of IPCC management and engagement.
- **Enhanced scientific dialogue and consensus building within the IPCC:** In the spirit of the IPCC, having two Co-Chairs at the highest leadership position would enhance scientific dialogue and support consensus building in all IPCC fora, including in Bureau meetings, Executive Committee meetings, author consultations, and in plenaries. Two Co-Chairs would improve the consideration of multiple views on all high-level decisions that could affect the operations, integrity, and reputation of the IPCC. This could also extend to considerations of the need for balance across disciplines and ways of knowing.
- **Increased inclusivity, including Gender Inclusivity:** With the IPCC Chair being an unpaid position taken on in parallel to existing job and/or responsibilities, sharing the work between two IPCC Co-Chairs could strengthen the appeal and feasibility to a wider pool of active and eligible IPCC candidates. Opportunities to balance the workload and travel requirements that is afforded by having Co-Chairs of the IPCC Chair position would be part of promoting gender equity and inclusivity in the leadership of the IPCC. We ask the Panel to reflect on the lack of female representation in this level of leadership since the IPCC's inception.
- **Shared responsibilities of the Working Groups' Co-Chairs:** Past IPCC assessment cycles have seen heavy workloads on Working Group (WG) Co-Chairs, with demands approaching those of a full-time yet unpaid position. Having two IPCC Co-Chairs could partially alleviate some of the WG Co-Chairs' workload, particularly in high-level outreach and engagement activities. A more balanced workload across IPCC leadership positions could attract candidates with existing, external roles and promote gender inclusivity. To further facilitate balanced workloads, should there be a Synthesis Report (SYR) in AR7, having two Co-Chairs of the IPCC would increase the manageability of the Chair's responsibility to lead the SYR production and approval session.

**CHINA**

气候中心陆春晖 <luchh@cma.gov.cn>

Fri 7/22/2022 4:40 AM

To: IPCC-Sec <ipcc-sec@wmo.int>

Dear Sir/Madam,

Many thanks for your kindly reminding.

About this proposal, we have some ideas. We think that the size, composition and structure of the bureau is closely related to the content settings of the assessment report in AR7. Therefore, at the current stage, we recommend maintaining the current size, composition, and structure of the bureau. Ensuring the balance of different regions and working groups, we think, are the most important things at this stage. We look forward to actively discussing with other representatives on this issue.

All the best!

Chunhui

## GERMANY

### SUBMISSION TO THE AD HOC GROUP ON THE ELECTIONS FROM GERMANY

The German governments thanks for the opportunity to submit a proposal for the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau to the Ad Hoc Group on the Elections.

#### Size

No increase of number of Bureau seats

- Will keep decision making efficient and manageable.
- No additional costs, may even provide potential savings opportunity for the Trust Fund.

Reduce the number of Working Group Vice Chairs to 6 each, 1 representative for each region.

- Enhance balance of regional representation.
- Even number of Working Group Vice Chairs allows for gender balance.

#### Composition

More balanced composition of the Bureau

- Regional representation: equal number of Vice Chairs for each Working Group
- Representation of developed and developing countries:
  - 1 Chair, 3 IPCC Vice Chairs and 8 Co-Chairs
  - Chosen exclusively according to their scientific excellence without strict constraints on representation, but equal participation of developed/ developing countries, genders and regions should be strived for.

#### Structure

Keep the three WGs and the TFI

- Has worked well in AR6 where cross-WG work has been strengthened in comparison to AR5.
- Reflects the three main scientific communities involved.
- Maintains flexibility to produce special reports on specific themes.

#### Proposal

The considerations above lead to the following Bureau composition, size and structure:

| Balance  | Bureau (28 seats)                    |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| Do not count for a region, but strive for equal representation of developed/ developing countries, genders and regions | 1 IPCC Chair                         |
|  | 3 IPCC Vice Chairs                   |
|  | 8 Co-Chairs of the 3 WGs and the TFI |
| Regions, striving for gender balance   | 6 Vice-Chairs of the WG I            |
|  | 6 Vice-Chairs of the WG II           |
|  | 6 Vice-Chairs of the WG III          |

#### Additional note of consideration:

We would like to share these additional considerations since they are relevant to the elections, both to potential candidates and to governments.

- Strengthen the role of the IPCC Vice Chairs
  - We suggest to attribute lead roles for specific tasks and functions to each of the three Vice Chairs. These could for example be, ensuring coherence between contributions of the three WGs to specific reports or address IPCC governance issues and provide guidance to the Secretariat. A deputy to the IPCC Chair could support him and act on his behalf, e.g. in the case of illness.

- The elected IPCC Vice Chairs should agree among themselves about the specific tasks they wish to take the lead on. Attributing specific tasks to the three IPCC Vice Chairs will clarify responsibilities, enhance transparency and accountability.
  - At the same time, the IPCC Vice Chairs will still complement each other in their activities, share decision making, thus reflecting the cooperative of the spirit of the IPCC regarding inclusiveness, participation, and balanced representation.
- We kindly request the secretariat to provide concrete information on the current roles, task and functions of the IPCC Chair, the IPCC Vice Chairs and the Working Group Vice Chairs for the next AHGE meeting. This information is critical for the Ad Hoc Group on the Elections to prepare options for the Panel’s decision for the size, structure and composition and the process of election.

---

**From:** Christian Müller <Christian.Mueller@z-u-g.org>

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 17, 2022 10:31 AM

**To:** IPCC-Sec <ipcc-sec@wmo.int>

**Cc:** ipcc.germany.focalpoint@zentrale.auswaertiges-amt.de <ipcc.germany.focalpoint@zentrale.auswaertiges-amt.de>; de-ipcc@dlr.de <de-ipcc@dlr.de>; stefanie.gastrow (stefanie.gastrow@dlr.de) <stefanie.gastrow@dlr.de>; Carola Best (carola.best@dlr.de) <carola.best@dlr.de>

**Subject:** AHGE submission by Germany

Dear AHGE Co-Chairs, dear Secretariat,

Let me first thank you for your work and for providing the compiled information on the proposals, including the table presenting the proposals clustered into groups. This provides a sound basis for further discussions.

The German government also appreciates the opportunity to provide an additional submissions to the AHGE. There are no changes to our initial proposal, but we would like to clarify one element of our proposal which has been misinterpreted and also make a few additional comments:

- During the second AHGE meeting, we noticed a slide in which a part of our proposal concerning the TFI Bureau (proposal E/5) had been interpreted incorrectly. We do not intent to change the composition or regional balance of the TFI Bureau. Instead our proposal was to remove the 2 TFI Co-Chairs from the count towards regional balance of the IPCC Bureau.
- Regarding the IPCC Vice Chairs, our proposal contained the following passage and we would prefer to see this remark be included in the section "Additional considerations" in the overview spreadsheet:
  - "Strengthen the role of the IPCC Vice Chairs*
    - *We suggest to attribute lead roles for specific tasks and functions to each of the three Vice Chairs, e.g. ensuring coherence between contributions of the three WGs, address IPCC governance issues and provide guidance to the Secretariat. A deputy to the IPCC Chair could support him and act on his behalf, e.g. in the case of illness.*
    - *The elected IPCC Vice Chairs should agree among themselves about the specific tasks they wish to take the lead on. Attributing specific tasks to the three IPCC Vice Chairs will clarify responsibilities, enhance transparency and accountability.*
    - *At the same time, the IPCC Vice Chairs will still complement each other in their activities, share decision making, thus reflecting the cooperative of the spirit of the IPCC regarding inclusiveness, participation, and balanced representation."*

Further comments:

- Concerning the clustering of proposals, transparency could be increased by indicating how many submitted proposals support each clustered option/proposal (e.g. how many submissions supported the Status quo/Proposal 1).
- At the second meeting of the AHGE, it was shortly discussed that the report is to be structured according to "Size, Structure, Composition" and "Additional considerations". We feel that comments which would fall into this last section need to be highlighted and brought to the attention of the Panel. Any changes in the size, structure and composition will directly have an affect on any roles in the Bureau. These effects should be taken into consideration and the Panel should be aware of these. To this end, we suggest calling this section in the report "Aspects to consider".

Kind regards  
Christian

For the German IPCC Focal Point

--  
Christian Müller  
b/o Division for Climate Diplomacy, International Climate Policy, UNFCCC (405)  
Federal Foreign Office

Zukunft – Umwelt – Gesellschaft (ZUG) gGmbH



## HUNGARY

Dear AHGE Co-Chairs and Secretariat,

Thank you for your work done so far on coordinating and synthesizing the proposals of AHGE members which enables timely preparation for the elections.

Referring to your letter requesting further input after the second meeting of the AHGE, Hungary would like to take the opportunity to capture and complement our oral contribution in a written format.

On composition of the IPCC Bureau, we would propose to complement the established numerical regional balance considerations with adding intraregional balance (balance within a specific region) as a (non-numerical) aspect to be taken into account. Promoting intraregional balance further to interregional balance would be highly beneficial for the scientific coverage of multiple subregions.

On balance between developed and developing countries within the Bureau, the current 6<sup>th</sup> Assessment Cycle has brought significant advancements in proportional representation of developing and developed countries. This may be further strengthened, being reflected by shared leadership in co-chairing the IPCC. On this regard, we would like to refer to the proposal of electing 2 IPCC Chairs, each from a developing and a developed country. For balanced regional perspectives, 4 Vice-Chairs with specific responsibilities could also be considered, from regions not covered by the two Co-Chairs. As for the co-chairing of the Working Groups, many good practices of cooperation were experienced throughout AR6, which could be continued and may be further enhanced.

Thank you for considering our suggestions. We believe that the proposed changes may positively contribute to the preparations for the 7<sup>th</sup> Assessment Cycle.

**JAPAN**

---

**From:** 足立 宗喜 <MUNEKI\_ADACHI@env.go.jp>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 23, 2022 8:29 AM  
**To:** IPCC-Sec <ipcc-sec@wmo.int>  
**Cc:** 川又 孝太郎 <KOTARO\_KAWAMATA@env.go.jp>  
**Subject:** SUBMISSION TO THE AD HOC GROUP ON THE AR7 ELECTIONS FROM JAPAN

Dear Co-Chairs,

First of all, Japan would like to thank both co-chairs, the ad-hoc group and the Secretariate for taking on this task, and for facilitating so that IPCC members can provide their views and inputs especially on size, structure, and composition of the Bureau to the Seventh IPCC Assessment cycle.

Basically, Japan is content with the size and structure of the Bureau.

However, we would like to propose the following improvement with respect to the functioning of the Bureau.

➤ **Strengthen the role of the IPCC Vice Chairs**

We would like to stress the importance to strengthening the role of the "IPCC Vice Chairs." Currently, since there are already some necessary descriptions in "Appendix C of the Principles Governing IPCC Work" and other decisions, we expect that the AR7 cycle will be well operated by making the most of these principles. In addition, when discussing how to strengthen the role of the IPCC Vice Chairs, we think it would be beneficial to refer to the current role of the IPCC Vice-Chairs in the next discussion. Hence, we would like co-chairs, the ad-hoc group and the Secretariate to well organize the current role of IPCC Vice Chairs prior to the next AHGE meeting in the end of August."

Yours sincerely,

KAWAMATA Kotaro

Head of Delegation, Japan

**KENYA**

Kenya Meteorological Department  
Dagoretti Corner, Ngong Road  
Box 30259, 00100 GPO  
NAIROBI, Kenya.



Tel: 254 20 3867880-5,  
Mobile +254722800945

Website: <http://www.meteo.go.ke>

When replying please quote:

Our Ref: PR-WMO/7/43

Date: 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2022

Abdalah Mokssit  
Secretary of the IPCC  
IPCC Secretariat  
C/O World Meteorological Organization  
7 bis Avenue de la Paix Case Postale 2300  
CH1211 Geneve  
SWITZERLAND

Dear Sir,

**Kenya's proposal regarding the Size, Structure and Composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau for the Seventh Assessment cycle (AHGE)**

We have the honor to respond to your letter dated 8<sup>th</sup> July 2022 Ref: 5201-22/IPCC/GEN. Kenya submits the following proposal regarding the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any task force Bureau for the 7<sup>th</sup> Assessment cycle.

1. Kenya suggests maintaining the current structure of the IPCC Bureau with 1 chair and 3 vice-chairs serving for one term and 3 working groups headed by 2 co-chairs one from a developing country and one from a developed country.
2. Kenya additionally suggests exploring the possibility of introducing term limits for the rest of the bureau members to two. Two terms will ensure adequate continuity of the IPCC work as newer members learn from the experienced existing bureau members. This would additionally ensure incorporation of new members with increasingly diverse expertise and perspectives.

Kenya would like to assure the IPCC of our highest regard and support for the ongoing work.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Patricia Nying'uro'.

Patricia Nying'uro  
IPCC Focal point Kenya

## NEW ZEALAND

### **New Zealand submission on the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau 13 July 2022**

As a member of the Ad Hoc Group on Elections (AHGE) New Zealand welcomes the opportunity to make a short submission as part of the current consideration of the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau for the next IPCC assessment cycle.

In New Zealand's view an important factor in reaching decisions on the size, structure and composition of the Bureau is that the size of the Bureau needs to be limited and that only small changes are needed to help address any regional imbalance in the current arrangements.

We do not consider a fundamental change in the structure of the Bureau to be warranted at this point. In our view, the collaboration across Working Groups during the AR6 has been stronger than ever, driven in part by the need to jointly produce Special Reports. Changes in the structure of the Bureau to support specifically the production of Special Reports would risk reducing, rather than strengthening, integration across the core assessment reports in the AR7 cycle.

We have one suggestion for change to the current composition of the Bureau that could provide for more consistent regional representation at the Working Group Bureau level. We suggest that the three IPCC Vice-Chair roles are taken out of the regional representation count (like the IPCC Chair, who is regarded as not representing any specific region). This would increase the Bureau size by three (if we maintain the three Vice-Chairs positions) to a total of 37 positions. Our view is that this very modest change to the size and composition could help address regional imbalance on the Working Group Bureaux, where currently there is no representation on the Bureau of Working Group III from Region III (South America).

We would note that there are a number of other considerations that have bearing on the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau. These are outside the terms of reference for the AHGE, but have an important bearing on the decisions that P-57 will need to reach to enable a call for nominations for the AR7 bureau to proceed. Some of these considerations include:

- Having a tighter/clearer specification of the roles of the IPCC Vice-Chairs
- The overall duration of the AR7 cycle (as per election procedures rule 8)
- Whether and how the IPCC will accommodate the timing of global stocktake process (GST) under the Paris Agreement, as this will have an impact on the timing of the AR7 assessment reports, as well as the number and timing of other reports produced within the AR7 cycle
- (related to the above) What sort of products will be part of the 7th assessment cycle? We have already agreed to a special report on cities. Should the IPCC undertake more than one special report in the 7th assessment cycle, or focus any other types of products?

We look forward to further discussion on size, structure and composition of the Bureau in the next meetings of the AHGE and for the AHGE to make some practical recommendations to the Panel in its final report in early September.

**New Zealand submission to the IPCC Ad Hoc Group on Elections (AHGE)  
17 August 2022**

New Zealand very much appreciates the submissions made by other governments that were presented to the AHGE at its second meeting on Wednesday 2 August. This follow-up submission includes some initial observations based on the material provided by the IPCC secretariat ahead of that meeting (spreadsheets and presentation) and the discussion that took place at the meeting.

**IPCC rules and procedures**

It seems that there are some proposals or statements that are inconsistent with current IPCC rules and procedures, and we consider that it is important that these are clarified.

- Slide 5, proposal A/1 (and potentially proposal B/2) could be misinterpreted that the Chair currently represents a region. The excel sheet is correct, so it may just be how it comes across from the visual presentation on the slide. Need to be very clear in order that all governments understand the status quo: currently all Bureau members except the Chair are counted towards regional representation.
- Slide 17, issue #9 (explore ability to serve two terms): The ability to serve two terms is already covered in Election Rule 10, which is clear that Working Group vice-chairs can already stand for the same position twice as highlighted below. It is only the chair, co-chairs and IPCC vice-chair positions that are limited to one term, but provision is already made for individual cases if the Panel so decides. We suggest that no change is required to this rule. **Election rule 10** states: “The term of office of the IPCC Chair, the IPCC Vice-Chairs and the Working Groups and Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs will be limited to one term in a particular office, with the provision of a possible nomination for election for one further term in the same office for individual cases if the Panel so decides. The other members of the IPCC Bureau and of any Task Force Bureau shall be eligible for nomination for re-election for a second consecutive term in the same office”

**General comments on proposals**

We consider that the size and composition of the IPCC Bureau is generally fit for purpose. Most proposals seem to agree with this view. Any changes should move in the direction of enhancing regional representation, not decreasing it.

New Zealand would like to reiterate our proposal to remove the IPCC Vice Chairs from the regional representation “count”, noting that both Australia and Germany made similar proposals. This would result in a very modest change to the size of the Bureau (an increase of three), which would help address the regional imbalance across the Working Group Bureaux that has arisen during the AR6 cycle, where currently there is no representation on the Bureau of Working Group III from Region III (South America). This is because one of the four bureau positions allocated to Region III is taken up by one of the IPCC Vice Chairs. If this is not addressed, a similar under-representation in the Working Group Bureaux could arise in future for any Region that has only four Bureau seats in total.

Having a tighter/clearer specification of the roles of the IPCC Vice-Chairs to address cross-cutting issues, as proposed in our earlier submission and also covered in some of the other proposals summarised in the spreadsheet, fits in well with the above proposal for removing the IPCC Vice Chairs from the regional “count”. However, the three Vice Chairs should continue to come from different Regions and span developing and developed countries in order to preserve/enhance overall regional representation.

### **Other considerations**

Several other issues raised in submissions are directly related to the election process and the size/composition of the Bureau. The Panel needs a clear sense of what needs to be decided at P-57 to enable the elections to take place, and for the 7<sup>th</sup> assessment cycle to get off to a smooth and expedited start, and which issues might be worthy of discussion at P-57 but do not need to be decided at that session.

We would place issues #5 (the length of the next assessment cycle), and #7 (setting the date for the elections) as being critical for decision at P-57.

The timing of the completion of the AR7 cycle (including the comprehensive AR7 assessment reports - on the assumption that there will be comprehensive assessment reports) will also be critical for the work programme and therefore the resourcing of TSUs. This means that clarity on the overall length of the AR7 cycle is needed out of P-57 so governments and bureau candidates can commit themselves and resources.

A subsidiary decision to the duration of the AR7 cycle will be whether, and if so when, comprehensive AR7 assessment reports should be produced and completed within the AR7 cycle. It would be very useful for P-57 to provide clarity on this. However, deciding the duration of the AR7 cycle as a whole is more important for elections to proceed than a decision on the timing, let alone content, of the AR7 products. These decisions on timing and content of AR7 products can be taken at a later date.

Issues #2, #3, #4 and #6 as listed in the presentation would be useful to discuss, but the need for decisions on these elements at P-57 is less pressing.

Issue #8 regarding enhancing participation of developing country experts in the IPCC process is an issue that the Panel periodically discusses and that requires continued efforts by all member governments as well as the IPCC's parent organisations. A number of elements of Decision IPCC/XLI-4. FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC taken by the Panel at its 41<sup>st</sup> Session, 24-27 February 2015 are particularly relevant in this regard. Perhaps a good starting point for further consideration of enhancing the participation of developing country experts in the IPCC process would be to take stock of how the IPCC has implemented the relevant elements of Decision IPCC/XLI-4 and to what extent the IPCC's parent organisations, and other global science organisations, could further assist in this.

Issue #9 is already addressed under IPCC rules and procedures above.

We look forward to the AHGE finalising its work by making practical recommendations to the Panel in its final report in early September.

## NORWAY

**From:** Ole-Kristian Kvissel <ole.kristian.kvissel@miljodir.no>

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 27, 2022 6:42 PM

**To:** IPCC-Sec <ipcc-sec@wmo.int>

**Cc:** Øyvind Christophersen <oyvind.christophersen@miljodir.no>; Elin Anhari <Elin.Anhari@miljodir.no>

**Subject:** Submission to the Ad-hoc Group on Elections from Norway

Sorry for the late response, it is due to summer holidays. Please forward this to the co-chairs of the ad-hoc group on Elections.

First and foremost, we want to thank both co-chairs and rapporteur for taking on this task, and for facilitating so that IPCC members can provide their views and inputs on the upcoming election, and especially on size, structure, and composition of the Bureau to the Seventh IPCC Assessment cycle.

We would also like to take this opportunity thanking the Secretariate for providing support to the ad-hoc group.

As a general comment we would like to emphasise that we believe that the current size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau is well-functioning and quite efficient.

We don't see much merit with regards to increasing the number of seats in the Bureau. On the contrary and in our view, there is a risk that an increase in positions might decrease the Bureaux functionality, in addition to increasing the costs. We believe that it is more important that the individuals that are elected are provided with sufficient time and resources to perform well in their respective functions. Being an IPCC Bureau member is an important task that commits, and those individuals need to have a strong personal motivation, and the possibility from their employers to contribute actively.

We also believe that the current balance between regions is reasonable and well-reflected, especially when considering the extensive expansion during the transition from the AR5 to the AR6 Bureau.

Norway thinks that it is useful to keep the three working groups, and that their current area of focus and mandates are well-reflected to respond to IPCCs main task of providing regular assessments of the scientific basis of climate change, its impacts and future risk, and options for adaptation and mitigation. We would also like to see further improvement in the now established practise related to cross working group cooperation, and we want to especially highlight the extensive collaboration between WG1 and WG3 in the ongoing cycle. We think these activities and initiatives should be further built upon, and that there are great opportunities and benefits from across working group integration. However, such work is both time consuming and resource intensive, so electing individuals to the Working Group Bureaux that can ensure active participation will be key.

We would also like the ad-hoc group on election to discuss and assess the possibility of having two IPCC Chairs instead of one. A list of pros et cons should be developed. We think that such a reorganisation could decrease some vulnerabilities and ensure that broad scientific knowledge is well rooted at the very highest level in the Bureau. To avoid an increase in total number of members in the Bureau and ExCom, one could reduce the number of IPCC Vice-Chairs from three to two positions. That would also ensure balance between developing and developed country at the ExCom level.

Best,  
Ole-Kristian Kvissel



## RUSSIAN FEDERATION

**From:** Татьяна Дмитриева <dmtyanya@mail.ru>

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 27, 2022 12:03 PM

**To:** IPCC-Sec <ipcc-sec@wmo.int>

**Subject:** Re: Friendly reminder : Follow-up on the first meeting of the AHGE and request for submissions on the size, structure and composition of the Bureau

Dear Sirs,

Sorry for a delay but we would like propose following suggestions for a new Bureau IPCC for the IPCC Seventh Assessment Cycle

The results of more than 30 years of work of the IPCC to summarize the assessment scientific information about the state of the global climate and its natural and anthropogenic changes have been widely recognition in the world and were in high demand politicians in the international climate negotiation process, and also at the country level.

However, the increased scale of the climate problem, new sources of global climate data and their increased volumes require certain changes in the organization of work IPCC, including the IPCC Bureau, but while maintaining the main its features that ensured the integrity and efficiency of the work of the IPCC for decades. In this regard, we invite this informal group to consider and discuss next possible steps.

1. Include TG-Data co-chairs in the IPCC Bureau.

Working with observational data and results of model calculations, used in IPCC reports has become very significant. It concerns not only purely climatic data, but also impact, risk and adaptation data. All this is necessary organize, archive and securely store what serves and will serve as an important component of the world community's confidence in IPCC estimates. Inclusion of TG-Data leaders in the Bureau The IPCC will help increase their accountability and greater awareness of all members of the IPCC Bureau in the current work of TG-Data.

2. More clearly define the permanent responsibilities of vice-chairmen of the IPCC.

The IPCC Vice-Chairs (now there are three) perform individual assignments of the Chairman of the IPCC, including directing the work of ad hoc groups created on various issues. Recognizing the importance of such work, we believe that for the vice-chairs it is advisable to define their terms of reference and on an ongoing basis.

These functions may include, among others:

- coordination of target groups for the development of guidelines for assessment of uncertainty and risks, by attribution of changes in the earth system (The sixth evaluation cycle showed that there is a need development and endorsement by the IPCC of such guidelines);

- identification and prevention of conflicts of interest in the IPCC;
- use of the fund of the Nobel Peace Prize, which received IPCC in 2007.

3. Increasing the involvement of experts from developing countries to work in the IPCC.

There is a need for systematic work on attracting experts who work on a permanent basis in developing countries to work in the IPCC. Traditional calls for nominations is obviously insufficient This work is expedient communicate with governments through National Focal Points.

Best regards,  
Tatiana Dmitrieva  
Russian Federation

## **SAUDI ARABIA**

AHGE

Proposals on size, structure and composition of IPCC Bureau, and any Task Force Bureau

### **Working Groups/Co-Chairing**

In addition to the existing guidelines for the Composition of the IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau in Annex B of Appendix C to the Principles Governing IPCC Work, all 6 regions must be represented in co-chairing Working Groups, distinctly each of the 6 co-chairs must be drawn from each Region, that is one co-chair from each region. Co-chairing of the three Working Groups must follow regional distribution. This will result in fair representation, with all regions represented in varying working groups, and the ability of all regions to undergo their tasks, thus improving the quality of the report and ensuring credibility and integrity of the IPCC. (Saudi Arabia)



**01 August 2022**

IPCC Secretariat  
7 bis, Avenue de las Paix, CP2300  
CH-1211 GENEVA 2  
**SWITZERLAND**  
Fax: +41 22 730 8025/13

## **SOUTH AFRICAN PROPOSAL ON THE SIZE, COMPOSITION, AND STRUCTURE OF THE AR7 BUREAU**

As South Africa, we would like to thank the IPCC for the opportunity to submit a proposal on the on the size, composition, and structure of the AR7 bureau.

After a comprehensive review of the size, composition, and structure of the AR4, AR5 and AR6 IPCC bureaus, South Africa is of the view that the current arrangement (AR6) has proven to be balanced and very effective, especially since this was one of the toughest IPCC assessment cycles due to the scope of work as well as the challenge of the COVID19 pandemic. We, therefore, would like to reaffirm our support and view that the current (AR6) size, composition, and structure of the IPCC bureau, should still stand for the AR7 cycle.

Kindest regards,  
South Africa





Sebastian König, v 13.07.2022

Aktenzeichen: BAFU-061.6-03.2-287/66/1

---

## Switzerland

### Proposal on the size, structure and composition of the IPCC AR7 Bureau

---

We refer to the mandate of the Ad Hoc Group on Elections (AHGE) and the call for proposals with respect to the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau for the subsequent 7th assessment cycle.<sup>1</sup>

At the outset, we wanted to note, stress and support, that in accordance with paragraph 5 of the IPCC Principles, *“the overall composition of the IPCC Bureau, the IPCC Working Group Bureaux and the Bureaux of any Task Forces of the IPCC shall reflect balanced geographical representation with due consideration for scientific and technical requirements”*.

Switzerland proposes the following improvements with respect to the functioning of the Bureau. The propositions are also being reflected as track changes amended to the current size, structure and composition of the Bureau, as laid out in Appendix B of the Principles Governing IPCC Work (see below):

- **Two IPCC Co-Chairs, one each from a developing and developed country:** To increase accountability and create a balanced governance, and to equally represent leadership and ownership in developing and developed countries;
- **Four IPCC Vice-Chairs, from the four regions not being represented by the Co-Chairs:** To reflect balanced geographical representation in the Executive Committee (IPCC Co-Chairs and Vice-Chairs);
- **Assigning Working Group Vice-Chairs as liaison focal points:** To assure cross-collaboration, to exploit synergies and to assure consistency between the working groups.

With the proposal presented therein, two more positions (one more IPCC Co-Chair, one more Vice-Chair) are being added to the IPCC Bureau, augmenting the number from 34 to 36 bureau members. Currently, the IPCC has 195 member countries (as of February 2019<sup>2</sup>). Given the allocation of the member states by the WMO into six regions<sup>3</sup>, the appropriate percentage values should be applied to the 36 seats providing us with a balanced representation of members.

Switzerland will introduce proposals on related operational matters that pertain to the new cycle, e.g. on the duration of the cycle or the format of the reports, at a later stage, when the work plan is being considered.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rule 7 of Appendix C of the Principles Governing IPCC Work notes that *“the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau will be reviewed and amended, as necessary, by the Panel at least one Session prior to the Session at which the IPCC Bureau and/or any Task Force Bureau are elected.”*

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2019/02/ipcc\\_members.pdf](https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2019/02/ipcc_members.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> Region I with 53 members, Region II with 32 members, Region III with 12 members, Region IV with 20 members, Region V with 20 members, and Region VI with 50 members, with 187 WMO members in total.

## 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~~36 members.

It consists of:

1. ~~the two~~ IPCC-Co-Chairs.
2. ~~three-four~~ 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 (Africa): ~~7-10~~ positions (10.20)<sup>4</sup>

Region II (Asia): 6 positions (6.16)

Region III (South America): ~~34~~ positions (2.31)

Region IV (North America, Central America and the Caribbean): 4 positions (4.04)

Region V (South-West Pacific): 4 positions (4.04)

Region VI (Europe): ~~98~~ positions (9.63)

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

- the ~~three-four~~ IPCC Vice-Chairpersons are from ~~different- the four~~ regions not being represented by the two Co-Chairs 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 a~~ 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<sub>:-</sub>
- Each Working Group assigns at least two Working Group Vice-Chairs as focal points to actively liaise with the other two Working Groups.

Consideration should also be given to promoting gender balance.

The ~~IPCC Chair~~Bureau members ~~does~~ not represent a region. Coming from a particular region means only that specific regional perspectives are brought into the deliberations in a well-balanced manner, also assuring an effective liaising with the scientific community in the respective 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.

<sup>4</sup> Indicated number of seats, following the distribution into the six WMO regions, starting with a total of 187 members and 36 seats available.



---

## Switzerland (updated version)

### Proposal on the size, structure and composition of the IPCC AR7 Bureau

---

We refer to the mandate of the Ad Hoc Group on Elections (AHGE) and the call for proposals with respect to the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau for the subsequent 7th assessment cycle.<sup>1</sup>

At the outset, we wanted to note, stress and support, that in accordance with paragraph 5 of the IPCC Principles, *“the overall composition of the IPCC Bureau, the IPCC Working Group Bureaux and the Bureaux of any Task Forces of the IPCC shall reflect balanced geographical representation with due consideration for scientific and technical requirements”*.

Switzerland proposes the following improvements with respect to the functioning of the Bureau. The propositions are also being reflected as track changes amended to the current size, structure and composition of the Bureau, as laid out in Appendix B of the Principles Governing IPCC Work (s. below):

- **Two IPCC Chairs, one each from a developing and developed country (OPTION 1) / Status quo with one IPCC Chair, plus one deputy IPCC Chair assigned from the pool of Vice Chairs (Option 2).** To increase accountability and create a balanced governance the working relationship between IPCC Chair(s) and IPCC Vice Chairs needs to be reinforced, the accountability and ownership with the IPCC Vice Chairs are to be increased.
- **Four (Option 1) / five (Option 2) IPCC Vice-Chairs, from the four / five regions not being represented by the IPCC Chair(s):** To reflect balanced geographical representation in the Executive Committee (IPCC Chair(s) and Vice-Chairs) to equally represent leadership and ownership in all six WMO Regions.
- **Assigning Working Group Vice-Chairs as liaison focal points:** To assure cross-collaboration, to exploit synergies and to assure consistency between the working groups.

With the proposal presented therein, two more positions (one more IPCC Chair or two more Vice-Chair) are being added to the IPCC Bureau, augmenting the number from 34 to 36 bureau members. Currently, the IPCC has 195 member countries (as of February 2019<sup>2</sup>). Given the allocation of the member states by the WMO into six regions<sup>3</sup>, the appropriate percentage values should be applied to the 36 seats providing us with a balanced representation of members.

Switzerland will introduce proposals on related operational matters that pertain to the new cycle, e.g. on the duration of the cycle or the format of the reports, at a later stage, when the work plan is being considered. *We request that the co-chairs on behalf of the group will forward and report to the Panel also on the various remarks and considerations made alongside the proposals themselves. We are of the opinion that the Panel shall also be considering all the associated considerations and ramifications in order make an informed decision about the size, structure and composition of the Bureau.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Rule 7 of Appendix C of the Principles Governing IPCC Work notes that *“the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau will be reviewed and amended, as necessary, by the Panel at least one Session prior to the Session at which the IPCC Bureau and/or any Task Force Bureau are elected.”*

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2019/02/ipcc\\_members.pdf](https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2019/02/ipcc_members.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> Region I with 53 members, Region II with 32 members, Region III with 12 members, Region IV with 20 members, Region V with 20 members, and Region VI with 50 members, with 187 WMO members in total.

## 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~~36 members.

It consists of:

1. ~~the two~~ IPCC-Chairs (Option 1) / the Chair (Option 2)
2. ~~three-four~~ (Option 1) / five (Option 2). 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 (Africa): ~~7-10~~ positions (10.20)<sup>4</sup>

Region II (Asia): 6 positions (6.16)

Region III (South America): ~~34~~ positions (2.31)

Region IV (North America, Central America and the Caribbean): 4 positions (4.04)

Region V (South-West Pacific): 4 positions (4.04)

Region VI (Europe): ~~98~~ positions (9.63)

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

- the ~~three-four~~ (Option 1) / five (Option 2) IPCC Vice-Chairpersons are from ~~different the four (Option 1) / five (Option 2) regions not being represented by the IPCC Chair(s) including at least one from a developing country and one from a developed country;~~
- one deputy IPCC Chair is assigned from the pool of IPCC Vice Chairs (Option 2);
- 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 a~~ 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<sub>:-</sub>
- Each Working Group assigns at least two Working Group Vice-Chairs as focal points to actively liaise with the other two Working Groups.

Consideration should also be given to promoting gender balance.

The ~~IPCC Chair Bureau members~~ does not represent a region. Coming from a particular region means only that specific regional perspectives are brought into the deliberations in a well-balanced manner, also assuring an effective liaising with the scientific community in the respective 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.

<sup>4</sup> Indicated number of seats, following the distribution into the six WMO regions, starting with a total of 187 members and 36 seats available.





Department for  
Business, Energy  
& Industrial Strategy

1 Victoria Street  
London SW1H 0ET

T +44 (0) 20 7215 5000  
E [www.beis.gov.uk/contact](http://www.beis.gov.uk/contact)

[www.beis.gov.uk](http://www.beis.gov.uk)

Malak Al-Nory and Farhan Akhtar  
Co-Chairs of the AHGE

Your ref: 5201-22/IPCC/GEN

13/07/2022

Dear Co-Chairs,

Thank you for inviting the UK to submit its proposals on the size, composition and structure of the IPCC Bureau for the Seventh Assessment Cycle.

The UK is content with the size and structure of the Bureau and would prefer to focus on proposals that will enhance its efficiency. We believe the structure of the three Working Groups (WGs) works well, and maps on to largely distinct scientific communities who deliver comprehensive knowledge across these areas. There is also benefit in retaining the current structure as policy audiences for the WGs II and III reports tend to sit within different government departments.

The products within the Sixth Assessment Cycle demonstrated significant value in enhancing cross-WG working, particularly through the Special Reports and the cross-WG boxes within the full assessment report. Where there are clear areas of synergy, further cross-WG collaboration within the Seventh Assessment Cycle products could be supported by a function in the Bureau, for example part of the Vice Chairs' or WG Co-Chairs' mandate.

The Sixth Assessment Cycle was the most challenging yet in terms of the demands made on the Bureau. A more streamlined approach to delivering AR7 products would enable the IPCC to deliver its products in the most effective and efficient way. The UK suggests considering a bespoke approach to delivery of individual Special Reports. This could include greater involvement of the IPCC Vice Chairs and WG Vice Chairs or other approaches that would enable the WG Co-Chairs to focus on producing the Assessment Reports efficiently and lead to a more streamlined cycle.

Yours sincerely,

**Dr Rhian Rees-Owen**

Deputy UK National Focal Point for the IPCC

D: +44 (0)7442 998770  
E: [Rhian.reesowen@beis.gov.uk](mailto:Rhian.reesowen@beis.gov.uk)

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

### US comments on the structure, size, and composition of the AR7 IPCC bureau

The United States welcomes the opportunity to comment on the structure, size, and composition of the IPCC bureau in the Seventh Assessment Cycle. Overall, we support maintaining the current structure, size, and composition of the Bureau in the next cycle with some adjustments based on the experience in the last cycle. As it considers the size, structure, and composition of the next bureau, the Panel should consider the following issues:

- *Move from a single IPCC chair to two IPCC Co-Chairs:* The co-chair leadership structure of the working groups has worked well across cycles in ensuring that the working groups are led by a diversity of expertise. A similar leadership structure for the IPCC overall should be considered by governments. Two IPCC co-chairs will be able to share the burden of leading plenary meetings and of representing of the IPCC in international settings. It will also allow for collaborative decision-making that can include a diversity of scientific and personal backgrounds and experiences. The two co-chairs would work together to reach consensus on decisions, taking input from the rest of the members of the executive committee where appropriate. Moving to this model will require revisiting certain elements of the IPCC procedures and terms of reference for the IPCC bureau, something that can be assessed ahead of the elections and adopted by the Panel at the session where the elections will be held.
- *The role of the IPCC vice-chairs:* In addition, the role of the three IPCC vice chairs should also be discussed by the Panel in updating the terms of reference of the Bureau. The experience of AR6 has shown the benefits of having IPCC vice chairs support both specific tasks under the IPCC, such as the conflict of interest committee and the gender task team, as well as within the process to develop and approve IPCC reports including by promoting cross-working group collaboration. The Panel may wish to encourage the nomination IPCC vice chair candidates with diverse experience within the working group focus areas with a view to electing a balance of expertise across the IPCC vice chairs.
- *The number of working groups and task force:* The current structure and topical focus areas of the three working groups and task force should be maintained in AR7. This structure represents four broad communities of practice each of which is important to the development of IPCC reports and guidance. This does not preclude a needed discussion over the products that may be generated by this structure in AR7 which may prioritize joint activities which crosscut the topics of the respective working groups and task force. In this regard, we note that two products in AR7 – a special report on cities and a methodology report on emission inventories for short-lived climate forcers – have already been decided by the Panel and will benefit from cross working group and task force collaboration.
- *Composition of the working group bureaus:* The current overall size and regional balance of the Bureau should be maintained in AR7 with adjustments only made where necessary to support the inclusion of specific expertise. For example, given the focus of the special report on cities, there should be an encouragement for experts on urban issues be members of all three working group bureaus.

**Teleconference - First meeting of the Ad hoc Group on Elections – AHGE – 1**

**30 June 2022 (11:00-13:00)**

Participants

*Co-Chairs*

Malak Al-Nory (Saudi Arabia), Farhan Akhtar (USA)

*Rapporteurs*

Stefanie Gastrow (Germany)

*Members*

Maggie Bailey (Australia), Mr Alexandre Fernandes (Belgium), Bruna Gaino (Belgium), Paulo Braga (Brazil), Sarah Luce (Canada), Lu Chunhui (China), Paul Salvaire (replaced by Eric Brun) (France), Lamin Mai Touray (Gambia), Mr Irawan Asaad (Indonesia), Kawamura Reo (Japan), Mr Andrew Ferrone (replaced by Dana Lang for the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting)(Luxembourg), Helen Plume (New Zealand), Ole-Kristian Kvissel (Norway), Nourah AlSudairy (Saudi Arabia), Aseel Alharthi (Saudi Arabia), Itchell Guiney (South Africa), Alfonso Pino Maeso (Spain), Markku Rummukainen (Sweden), Sebastian J. König (Switzerland), Svitlana Krakovska (Ukraine), Rhian Rees-Owen (replaced by Eleanor Webster for the 1st meeting) (United Kingdom)

*IPCC Secretariat*

Abdalah Mokssit (IPCC Secretary) Ermira Fida (Deputy Secretary), Jennifer Lew Schneider (Legal Officer), Laura Biagioni.

**1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

Co-Chairs opened the meeting, welcoming participants.

Abdalah Mokssit (IPCC Secretary) informed AHGE members that Venezuela has requested to step down as one of the two Rapporteurs for this group. The Co-Chairs took note and requested the Secretariat to inform the Panel and to request that a new nomination for this additional Rapporteur be sent out in order for the AHGE to fulfil its composition and operation of 2 Rapporteurs for balanced representation from developed and developing countries. Additionally, the Co-Chairs encouraged the AHGE members to volunteer to take on this role, with any AHGE member who may be interested to please contact the Secretariat. Also, the IPCC Secretary said that the Secretariat will facilitate the work of the AHGE and in order to do so effectively, it was requested a timely feedback on the information and discussion points shared in advance for comments and feedback.

The provisional agenda (AHGE-I/Doc.1) was adopted without any changes (see Annex I).

**2. DRAFT ACTION PLAN FOR THE AHGE**

The Co-Chairs introduced the revised draft Action Plan (version 29.06) which was shared shortly before the meeting (see Annex II). After a short overview, the floor was opened to all

AHGE members to comment and contribute to the content and timeline of the draft Action Plan.

Comments and questions with answers concerning the draft Action Plan included the following:

The member from France asked on the last point of the Action Plan if the final report would be posted to Focal Point portal or if the final draft report would come before the IPCC57 Plenary session. The answer was that the report posted will be for comments, with discussion will take place in Plenary at the end of September on the given proposals, and that what is to be posted on the Focal Point portal means the group is ready to take this to the Plenary for a final decision.

The member from Belgium requested if the dates of the next meeting be fixed for planning purposes. The answer was that a poll would be sent to decide between two days and left up to members to discuss dates.

The member from Switzerland asked what kind of proposals are expected from the group by next week, noting that it would be helpful to add 57bis as an activity in the timeline, since the group is tasked to report to the Panel. The answer was that the objective of this first meeting under this agenda item is to clarify and have an understanding of what to expect of proposals, reflecting on the current structure, to enhance the current size and structure of the IPCC Bureau and Task Forces. The work of the AHGE is to be presented at the Plenary at the end of September. The scheduling for the SYR approval will be informed to all the Focal Points on the final scheduling as soon as it is concluded.

The member from Japan asked for clarification on the official deadline for the group's work, and when the IPCC bis is to be held – nor the SYR approval, asking if it is necessary to finalize the work of the AHGE by the end of August, since an extension would be good if the group is not under pressure. The answer to this was that the work of the AHGE is to be presented at the Plenary at the end of September, and if the Panel decides to give the group further work, that this remains for the Panel to decide.

The member from New Zealand expressed that on seeking views on proposals, it would be useful to consult with IPCC Bureau members to bring their input into this process. The answer to this was that the AHGE is for members specifically, with no provisions for Bureau consultations. The members of the AHGE were encouraged to reach out to Bureau members and to include any insights thereby gained in their proposals, but avoiding any formal outreach to the Bureau, noting that as this is directly related to their Bureau member elections, a formal outreach could be an issue. The member from Belgium supported this approach in view of potential conflict of interest in any formal outreach to the Bureau.

The member from China said that it was not clear what proposals are to be made, also asking if the schedule of SYR and the Plenary dates are fixed for the last week of September 2022, whether these dates have been decided. The Secretariat confirmed that the was that the Plenary for the last week of September 2022 is confirmed and decided, to be held in Geneva, a normal business Plenary to consider the work of the AHGE.

Regarding the timeline of activities:

The members from Belgium, Switzerland, Japan, and Norway noted a need for a clear understanding of dates given the projected scheduling of the second Zoom meeting and likely absences from offices, in particular for those in the Northern hemisphere. Suggestions were made to shift the last four activities to later in August. The member from France noted that reports to Plenary have to be submitted one month prior to the Session, so that there needs

to be enough time for consultation with members governments before the election process begins. It was clarified that feedback could be given on the final draft before finalization and posting to the Focal Point portal. It was decided to move the entire schedule back by one week, giving three weeks' time before the finalized report would be posted in the FP portal, with the third meeting to take place the last week of August, subject to a Doodle poll, and extending by a week to 13 July the time for the initial responses. The Secretariat was requested to adjust and revise the Action Plan accordingly.

The Co-Chairs later undertook to finalize the Action Plan (see Annex III): the members to identify and submit proposals in the first two weeks of July; the Secretariat to consolidate and summarize the submissions the second half of July; the Co-Chairs to finalize the first draft the final week of July; the second Zoom meeting to take place during the first week of August; with feedback on the second draft sought in the third week of August; the third Zoom meeting to be during the final week of August, and the posting of the finalized report on the Focal Point portal in the first week of September. As requested by the members of France and Switzerland, a footnote was added that the posting of the finalized report to the Focal Point portal is for presentation to the Panel, clarifying that the document is an input to the Plenary Session.

### **3. BACKGROUND ON CURRENT SIZE, STRUCTURE AND COMPOSITION OF THE IPCC BUREAU**

The Secretariat presented the background on the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau, covering an overview of legal principles (Rule 7, Appendix C of the Principles; Annex B Sections I and II on the composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau), the regional number of positions, the mandate of the AHGE and its terms of reference, its objectives, as well as its term and composition.

The importance of respecting regional balance across the entirety of the Bureau was emphasized. The member from New Zealand noted that the Chair does not represent a region but is counted in the Bureau with 33 Bureau members with regions and the Chair totalling 34. The Secretariat confirmed regional balance on the 33 members, and noted that the election of the Chair is separate from the Bureau. The member from France noted that the classification as between developing and developed countries is not stated in the Principles on how this classification is made and open to interpretation for the Plenary. The Secretariat noted that until now, the approach to classification on developed and developing countries is as previously applied, and can be discussed but the current understanding follows this approach. For questions on regional balance and the need for additional seats, the Co-Chairs said that this information would be shared.

The importance of views of all members was noted, with the question of outreach to the full Panel for views raised, with the Co-Chairs suggesting that it should be kept to the AHGE, and recalling that the AHGE were appointed by governments for this process, and would be working closely with members to represent proposals to meet expectations and views into the process. The member from Saudi Arabia supported the Co-Chairs' points on keeping input from the AHGE, and also requested information on guidelines or the structure of how proposals are to be made. The Co-Chair agreed to keep input to the members of the AHGE, who had volunteered to represent the regions on collecting proposals. It was clarified that there are no guidelines as such ready to share but that such a structure could be developed over the next week, but that the current information on the size and structure should be enough to provide enough context for proposals to come forward.

The member from France said that the consultation should be addressed to the group members or entire Panel, there were both pros and cons, and requested information whether the AHGE was representative of the whole Panel, with a preference for a broad consultation. The member from Switzerland expressed that on the matter of consultation, the group was representative of all the regions; yet finally it is the Panel to decide on the elements and the proposals, so that is important to have as many members on board to have ownership with as many member states as possible which would tend toward having broader consultation early on in the process. The member also requested decisions from leading into the 6<sup>th</sup> cycle, and any supporting information. The Co-Chair said that the Secretariat has prepared a longer information note with historical information note, addition of seats and considerations for size, structure and composition of the Bureau. It was also recalled that the invitation was sent out to volunteer and join, and that while there was a minimum as to participation, there was no maximum number of members. The full Panel could comment on any of the proposals generated at the Panel meeting. The Secretariat confirmed that all WMO regions are represented and assured that the condition of two representatives was fulfilled.

It was noted that the list was to be updated to include the member of Norway (see Annex IV). The member of France expressed uncertainty as to regional balance of the AHGE reflecting the same as the Plenary, and stated a preference for broader consultation with the Plenary instead of just the AHGE members, with the more views the better. The Co-Chairs stated that a note could be sent out to Focal Points but that they would not have reviewed the documents or been part of the discussions, and so suggested to keep consultations to the members of the AHGE. The member of Saudi Arabia agreed with the Co-Chair, stating that those outside of the group would not be part of the consecutive meetings or see the documents, and that this would lead to inputs without the opportunity for the individuals to be part of the meetings to explain their points of view or additional inputs; further noting these individuals have been given the chance to join the AHGE, and that if these people outside of the AHGE had any questions, these could be discussed in Plenary later on.

The member from South Africa asked whether the AHGE was still open, since there might be those who were unable to join earlier but would have valuable inputs. The Secretariat confirmed that the AHGE by definition is open-ended, still open and that another letter could be sent to once again requesting participation. A question was raised whether open-ended groups remain open until the end of the work of the group, if this was a practice, and noting from a practical point of view that this would mean going back over past material. The member from New Zealand recalled the Terms of Reference that there are to be two members from each region, but these are not regional representatives, but that participants are representing governments, with views reflecting the participant's specific government. The member from France echoed this view, also supporting the approach of inviting additional members to join the AHGE. The Secretariat noted that open-ended means that AHGE is not limited, and that this is the past practice; however, for practicality reasons, a deadline could be indicated for those countries that want to join before the beginning of the next meeting, highlighting the decision behind open-ended participation being open for everyone but seeking participation while the work remains to be done.

Concerning the structure of proposals, the Co-Chairs noted that Annex B could be used as a structure to start on the development of proposals on the current regional representations for changes that members might seek. This would help on consolidation of the proposals. The Co-Chairs further requested that the Annex B of Appendix C be circulated to the AHGE to support this proposal work.

#### **4. NEXT MEETING DATE**

Noting that the deadline for proposal of submissions is 13 July, it was further noted that the next meeting date, the second Zoom meeting, is to be the first week of August, the date to be confirmed through a Doodle poll; and that the third Zoom meeting is to take place the last week of August, with the date to be confirmed through a Doodle poll.

## **Teleconference - Second meeting of the Ad hoc Group on Elections – AHGE – 2**

**10 August 2022 (15:00-17:00 CEST)**

### Participants

#### *Co-Chairs*

Malak Al-Nory (Saudi Arabia), Farhan Ahktar (USA)

#### *Rapporteur*

Stefanie Gastrow (Germany)

#### *Members*

Maggie Bailey (Australia), Manfred Ogris (Austria), Humbatov Fuad (Azerbaijan), Bruna Gaino (Belgium), Sarah Luce (replaced by Lesley Craig for the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting) (Canada), Chunhui Lu (China), Hector Gonzalez (Colombia), Tina Christensen (Denmark), Lamin Mai Touray (Gambia), Carola Best (Germany), Barbara Kovacs (Hungary), J.R. Bhatt (India), Irawan Asaad (Indonesia), Frank McGovern (Ireland), Muneki Adachi (Japan), Joyce Kimutai (Kenya), Patricia Nying'uro (Kenya), Winne Khaemba (Kenya), Mr Andrew Ferrone (Luxembourg), Helen Plume (New Zealand), Ole-Kristian Kvissel (Norway), Yaewon Oh (Republic of Korea), Naeyoung Yim (Republic of Korea), Aseel Alharti (Saudi Arabia), Ousmane Ndiaye (Senegal), Itchell Guiney (South Africa), Alfonso Pino Maeso (Spain), Markku Rummukainen (Sweden), Sebastian J. König (Switzerland), Svitlana Krakovska (Ukraine), Rhian Rees-Owen (replaced by Eleanor Webster for the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting) (United Kingdom), Ruben Dario Molina (replaced by Yoliangel Rivas for the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting) (Venezuela), Beausic Chongo (Zambia)

#### *IPCC Secretariat*

Abdalah Mokssit (IPCC Secretary), Jennifer Lew Schneider (Legal Officer)

## **1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

Co-Chairs opened the meeting, welcoming participants.

India appreciated the work of the AHGE but noted with dismay that they had not received proper notification for the first AHGE meeting, and so were unable to participate, despite having replied to the IPCC letter and having formally submitted their information in a timely manner. They wished to cite these remarks in the minutes of the meeting and requested that the Secretariat look into it. The Secretariat noted this concern, expressed thanks for comments on how to best inform on the process, and any specific proposals to be incorporated to keep the process moving. The Co-Chairs noted that India's concern would be looked into, apologized that the invitation was not gotten out to India, and recalled that the full minutes of the first meeting were shared with all members and were happy to provide these again to provide full transparency with all members. The Co-Chairs moreover recognized the importance of transparency for this and further meetings.

The provisional agenda (AHGE-II/Doc.1) was adopted without any changes (see Annex I).

## **2. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF PROPOSALS RECEIVED**

The Co-Chairs, expressing thanks for all the proposals submitted, 13 in total, presented these in a slide presentation. The methodology used was presented, as focusing on elements of



size, structure and composition along with regional and gender balance. Each proposal was compared with the status quo as a point of reference. On examining individual proposals (see Excel sheet “all proposals – matrix”), similar proposals were clustered into groups. Clarifications included: “structure” as composed of different roles within the IPCC Bureau; Proposal No. 1 was identified to the status quo in order to capture the current structure as one of the proposals to be forwarded to the Panel; regarding “size”, some proposals led to a respective increase or decrease in size. On composition and regional balance, the effect of the proposals on the number for each region or overall Bureau size was shown for comparison.

On reading the tables, it was explained that a number and letter presented together referenced compositional changes/regional balance changes that followed from the indicated proposal number, e.g. Proposal C/3 set out any changes in composition or regional balance as related to structural changes from Proposal 3. The Co-Chairs also noted that any other elements sent in as part of the proposals but not directly affecting the size, structure and composition would be put forward to the Panel in an annex, but being outside its mandate, would not be included in considerations of the AHGE.

The overview, as illustrated with the slides, clarified the proposals made:

A/1 – referred to status quo of the AR6 IPCC Bureau and Task Force Bureau;

B/2 – 2 Chairs (No change to regional representation of Bureau);

C/3 – 2 IPCC Chairs; 2 IPCC Vice-Chairs (1 less member towards regional representation – no specification as to which region affected);

D/4 – 2 IPCC Chairs, 4 IPCC Vice-Chair (1 region for each seat). Number of seats in proposal related to distribution into the six WMO regions;

E/5 – Evenly distribute WG Vice-Chair positions across all regions (reducing the number of positions to 6 for each WG) ;

F/6 – Remove IPCC Vice-Chairs from regional representation – the 3 additional seats to be allocated across WGs for additional Vice-Chairs, to address gaps such as from Region III in WGIII Bureau and Region V lacking IPCC Vice-Chair or WG Co-Chair (proposal didn't exactly specify which WG should get seat);

G/7 – TG-Data Co-Chairs to be added – the proposal did not specify the regional representation;

H/8 –WG Co-Chairs to follow regional distribution, with the 6 Co-Chair positions respectively reflecting a WMO Region, i.e. all WMO Regions to be represented across the Co-Chair positions.

The Co-Chairs pointed out that the Excel tables included a section on “Considerations”, which were explanations provides for a specific submitted proposal, as well as a section on “Additional remarks”, that covered nine broad issues, such as the functioning of the Bureau and roles of Vice-Chairs, which were outside of the mandate of the AHGE but would be forwarded to the Panel in a separate annex. These nine issues were set out and briefly reviewed. The Co-Chairs emphasized that the elements agreed to by the AHGE would be sent to the Panel, e.g. two IPCC Chairs vs one IPCC Chair; accordingly, these key elements needed to be discussed and agreed at this meeting. The Co-Chairs concluded the presentation by reviewing the next steps for the AHGE, asking that members should consider possible further merging of the proposals while taking into account concerns and regional

composition, reverting by 17 August with any further proposals; the proposals already received would be sent to AHGE members in a zip file, and a request for a response to a poll for the next meeting was made.

Comments and questions from the floor with answers from the Co-Chairs included the following:

The member from Senegal questioned the need for two Chairs, noting that the Vice-Chairs should suffice, making two Chairs unnecessary, and that the Vice-Chairs could further ensure regional representation. The member from Senegal also posed a question on whether the AHGE would make a final decision on the proposals. Further observations included that membership of WGs, especially of WGII, should have as many members as possible, due to impacts of climate change especially on developing countries to ensure proper representation for views on vulnerabilities from these countries; the proposal on WGs done by Region – there should be a mixture for all voices to be heard, especially within WGII. Moreover, a proposal indicating there is not enough developing country representation is accurate: to address this, it should be considered how to bring in more young scientists; one channel is through IPCC national Focal Points, another could be through universities.

The Co-Chairs response to the question on who would make a final decision recalled the mandate of the group to collect proposals that the members would like to see in AR7, and that the AHGE is not a decision-making group but is to collect proposals and share with the Panel; the Panel makes the decision on which elements will or will not be changed.

The member from Norway had a comment on process, i.e. what is planned to be forwarded to the Panel. Would this be a presentation as made in this meeting, or a report which lays out the options, and how will this best be presented to the Panel. Norway also queried on not finding reference to its comment per the importance of perspective representation and regionality, and asked this be noted.

The member from Saudi Arabia stated that the structure as in the status quo is working successfully and should be kept; also, that it was unproductive to take away seats as this would disturb regional representation. Finally, that any elements outside the mandate of the AHGE should not be included in the report.

The member from New Zealand said that there was not enough time to go through each of the options presented in the proposals and to examine the pros and cons, but that such a discussion should be undertaken by the Panel. She agreed with much of the intervention made by the member from Saudi Arabia, noting that taking away regional representation would not be well received by the Panel. Instead, means for fair representation must be ensured, and that small tweaks should be carried out but no complete overhaul. Finally, she emphasized the importance for the Panel to receive the other issues raised, being relevant to the structure of the Bureau, especially the work the Bureau is to do and the duration of appointment, as these are part of the decision-making process even if not within the ToRs of the AHGE.

The Co-Chair response to the question on the process queries from Norway and New Zealand was that a report with elements was to be submitted to the Panel, that the AHGE was not going to provide specific proposals but elements of specific proposals, with a presentation to share and explain, along with the spreadsheets. Also, that additional related remarks would be forwarded to the Panel for consideration, and that it was up to the Panel to decide how to use the additional information, such as possibly requesting another group for these. Finally, it was noted that it was the aim to share the document within the AHGE in advance for feedback, that would finally be shared with the Panel.

The member from Japan expressed that with regard to the number of Chairs, increase would have merit but on the other hand, the increase in Chairs should not be accompanied by a decrease in Vice-Chairs which could complicate the operation of the Panel. The discussion of the number of Chairs and Vice-Chairs should be discussed separately to avoid any trade-off. Further comments included the importance of the Panel at the 57<sup>th</sup> plenary including an agenda item for a decision on the exact date of the AR7 election plenary; and that the AHGE could propose a schedule for a feasible work plan for AR7 to the Panel; while the number of Chairs and Vice-Chairs has been noted as a priority concern, other relevant issues should also be shared with the Panel.

The Co-Chairs noted it could be considered whether any element on reduction of seats should be forwarded to the Panel, in addition to regional representation as raised by Saudi Arabia.

The member from Switzerland found the spreadsheets provided transparency and a helpful digest of the proposals, and further commented on process that it was important to present results to the Panel without reopening discussions as undertaken by the AHGE. It would be important to focus on key issues, but helpful to further narrow down a cluster version of three or four proposals that the Panel could address, to be accompanied by a report built on the spreadsheets; focused on the three sections: firstly around structure and size, secondly on composition, and thirdly on all considerations that are tied to the first two sections. For the delegations not involved in the AHGE, the starting point should be the text of Appendix B, and not to develop new text: this would provide more structure.

Co-Chairs responses included that the report will be structured around the three main aspects of the AHGE mandate, and that it is planned to present to the Panel specific text based on Annex B. The plan for the next meeting for the AHGE is how the different alternative proposals are to be integrated into the text. For the report, all the elements of the proposals will be structured under the same structure followed in the Excel table, which follows the mandate of the group; Panel discussions would not be 'from scratch' as specific options based on proposals will be presented for the Panel to choose from based on the text from Annex B.

The member from Azerbaijan expressed support for two Chairs, with one Chair to be responsible for developing countries, and that this would increase inclusivity. The elements of the proposals to be discussed, with fewer proposals to be forwarded to the Panel. Support was expressed for Senegal's suggestion to engage with and include young scientists from developing countries for the next cycle, noting the importance of cooperation with other countries. The Co-Chair response confirmed the intent to streamline the number of proposals sent to the Panel, and that important comments not within the mandate would be forwarded to the Panel for further discussion.

The member from Germany noted that an alternative to the proposal for two Co-Chairs could be to have a deputy Chair. Also, for merged proposals, a suggestion was made to indicate how many proposals are represented in the clustered groups proposals to determine those that are broadly supported as opposed to those that are outliers. It was noted that an indication on envisioned roles of Vice-Chairs was requested, having potential impacts on distribution of the role over the Bureau and prospective size, and that this should be added to the additional remarks section. Finally, there was a request for the current roles that was not evident. The answer from the Co-Chairs was that there would be additional time given for additional proposals and comments; also that the Co-Chairs would discuss how to present the number of proposals behind the clusters, given the need for transparency and that a proposal by perhaps one country alone would still be relevant to put before the Panel, and that there might be support for a one country proposal but that members had not specifically indicated this.

The member from Ukraine stated support for two Co-Chairs and for three Vice-Chairs, with each Vice-Chair to support one of the three Working Groups.

The member from New Zealand asked about the expectations for the AHGE for this second meeting: 1) if the AHGE was being asked to comment on all proposals; or 2) further proposals; or 3) corrections to how the proposals are interpreted and represented in the materials before the AHGE. The member commented that while taking note of views is acceptable, the AHGE is not to vote on the proposals and thus would request Co-Chair guidance towards action on drafting the report for the Panel.

The Co-Chairs clarified that they wanted to ensure that the door remained open for additional proposals in case any member may not have had a chance to submit – that all members should make sure that if they have a proposal, that it is made, and correctly represented. In the event that members see that aspects of their proposals are not correctly captured, including within the Excel tables, this should be highlighted for correction, so that everything is correctly reflected, ensuring an open process. Also, in view of other proposals, that there would be the opportunity to provide an alternative or withdraw a proposal. Any new comments made during the meeting would be further captured under “Additional Considerations”. All points are to be provided as background information for the Panel for wider discussion.

The member from Hungary stated support for two Chairs and three Vice-Chairs, and noted the importance of gender balance – as there are but 8 females out of the 34 Bureau members, of geographical balance, and of progress and balance in developed/developing representation of Bureau members. Further written comments were to be submitted.

The member from South Africa expressed that some of the proposals suggest drastic changes which while difficult could be discussed; however, the member supported Saudi Arabia’s position, that the status quo was the best option, since this had worked well in past cycles especially under tough conditions. The member from South Africa also asked whether countries could propose modifications or substitute a proposal for a new proposal, when these would be presented to the Panel, and if additional proposals would be made to the Panel.

The Co-Chair response clarified that further discussion was needed between the Co-Chairs and Secretariat regarding withdrawals of proposals, but that any member was free to indicate a change to their proposal in response to other proposals. On the question on presentation to the Panel, the intention is to have the final meeting of the AHGE at the end of August, and get a mandate from the AHGE to prepare a final report to be shared with the Panel before IPCC 57, hopefully by the beginning of September. As to additional proposals at the Panel Session, it is up to the Panel to address any of these; the AHGE is not to finalize any decision-making but give an aid to the Panel to make the proposals easy to understand in support of a robust discussion at the Plenary including as to any benefits or drawbacks.

The member from Kenya clarified that their additional comments made were to introduce term limits and not to extend term limits, since for some Bureau members there is a one term limit but for others there is no limit whatsoever. Continuity of the work is important with experienced Bureau members working with newer ones with diverse expertise and perspectives. On proposals for two Chairs, Kenya prefers to keep the status quo of one Chair but is open to discuss and hear of the benefits. The response noted that the clarification would be reflected through amendment of the documents prepared.

The member from Columbia expressed concern that there were only three countries from Latin America and another should be added. The member made further comment on matters not related to the mandate of the AHGE but as related to future work programme of the IPCC. The Co-Chairs said that they would confirm the regional representation of the group per the

mandate with the Secretariat, and seek to reach out to correct this as needed, also noting that comments for AR7 are important to make work relevant for policy communities, in particular regarding products of the Working Groups, however, as outside the mandate of the AHGE, would be forwarded to the Panel.

In closing comments, the Co-Chairs recalled that a rapporteur from a developing country is still needed and asked for a volunteer, noting that the additional support would be appreciated.

### **3. NEXT MEETING DATE**

It was noted that the third and final meeting of the AHGE, to take place over Zoom, will be the final week of August, either 30 or 31 August, to be confirmed through a Doodle poll.

It was requested that any further proposals should be submitted by 17 August, to allow the Co-Chairs to review and analyse and send them out to the members for their review before the third and final meeting.

**IPCC AD HOC GROUP ON ELECTIONS (AHGE) – SECOND MEETING**  
**Teleconference, 10 August 2022**

AHGE-II/Doc. 1  
(05.VIII.2022)  
Agenda Item: 1  
ENGLISH ONLY

**PROVISIONAL AGENDA**

- 1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**
- 2. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF PROPOSALS RECEIVED**
- 3. NEXT MEETING DATE**

## **Teleconference - Third meeting of the Ad hoc Group on Elections – AHGE – 3**

**31 August 2022 (11:00-13:00 CEST)**

### Participants

#### *Co-Chairs*

Malak Al-Nory (Saudi Arabia), Farhan Ahktar (USA)

#### *Rapporteur*

Stefanie Gastrow (Germany)

#### *Members*

Australia, Ms Maggie Bailey; Austria, Mr Manfred Ogris; Azerbaijan, Mr Fuad Humbatov; Belgium, Mr Alexandre Fernandes; Belgium, Ms Bruna Gaino; Brazil, Mr Leonardo Santos; Canada, Ms Sarah Luce; China, Mr Lu Chunhui; Denmark, Ms Tina Christensen; Gambia, Mr Lamin Mai Touray; Germany, Ms Christiane Textor; Germany, Mr Christian Müller; Hungary, Ms Eszter Galambos; India, Dr. J.R. Bhatt; Iran, Sadeq Zeyean; Ireland, Mr Frank McGovern; Japan, Mr Adachi Muneki; Kenya, Ms Patricia Nying'uro; Luxembourg, Mr Andrew Ferrone; New Zealand, Ms Helen Plume; Norway, Mr Ole-Kristian Kvissel; Republic of Korea, Ms Yaewon OH; Republic of Korea, Ms Na-Young YIM; Russian Federation, Dr. Tatyana Dmitrieva; Saudi Arabia, Nourah AlSudairy; Saudi Arabia, Aseel Alharthi; South Africa, Mr Itchell Guiney; Spain, Mr Alfonso Pino Maeso; Sweden, Mr Markku Rummukainen; Switzerland, Dr Sebastian J. König; Tanzania, Mr Ladislaus Chang'a; United Kingdom, Dr Rhian Rees-Owen; Zambia, Mr Beausic M Chongo

#### *IPCC Secretariat*

Abdalah Mokssit (Secretary), Ermira Fida (Deputy Secretary) Jennifer Lew Schneider (Legal Officer), Laura Biagioni

## **1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

Co-Chairs opened the meeting, welcoming participants.

The provisional agenda (AHGE-III/Doc.1) was adopted without any changes (see Annex I).

## **2. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF UPDATED PROPOSALS RECEIVED**

The Co-Chairs gave an overview of the documents for the AHGE discussions, including updated proposals received as set out in Excel tables, the Annex B document prepared to reflect decision blocks, a draft outline of the final report for the Panel, and the minutes from the previous meeting of the AHGE.

The updated and new proposals, received from Japan, Germany, New Zealand and Switzerland, were set out as within the Excel tables, and it was recalled that all issues outside the mandate of the AHGE would be presented to the Panel in an Annex to the final report under the heading of “Aspects to consider”, as these are deemed relevant for Panel consideration.

Comments and questions from the floor with answers from the Co-Chairs included the following:

The member from Saudi Arabia questioned the relevance of the proposal for the appointment of a Deputy IPCC Chair, as IPCC Election Rule 11 provides for an IPCC Vice-Chair to act as IPCC Chair in the event that the IPCC Chair resigns or is otherwise unable to complete the assigned term of office or perform the functions of that office. The member from India observed that the current Bureau has functioned well despite challenges over the cycle, and that there appears to be no clear rationale on the proposed changes or basis for not maintaining the status quo, adding that matters outside the mandate to the AHGE should not be in the final report to the Panel, and that the AHGE should not be making any decisions. The Co-Chairs confirmed that the status quo as a proposal would be put forth, rationales will also be included in the documentation as provided in submissions, and that other considerations would be reflected appropriately.

The member from New Zealand, in view of the request for a setting of term limits, requested clarification from the Legal Officer on the application of IPCC Election Rule 10.<sup>1</sup> The Legal Officer noted that Rule 10 allows for, in the instance of the IPCC Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs and Working Group and Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs, a case-by-case Panel decision for a second term nomination, and for the other members of the Bureau and Task Force Bureau, for a second term within the same office; that the rule only specifically excludes more than two terms for any given member in the same office.

The member from China requested clarification on the difference between the proposed IPCC Deputy Chair and the IPCC Vice-Chairs, and noted preference for the status quo. The member from Germany responded, firstly as to the relevance of Rule 11, indicating that the selection process could be done amongst the IPCC Vice-Chairs, and that the wording “assignment” or “appointment” could be withdrawn, but that this was a structural proposal and not to be removed from consideration. The member from Germany also requested clarity within the Annex B document on the need for gender balance throughout all roles of the Bureau in the section specifying what was to be ensured in filling elective positions. The Co-Chairs requested further clarification from the member whether the Deputy was to only fill in for the IPCC Chair or if there were other aspects; Germany clarified that the Deputy Chair was a support role but that this would need greater clarification in Panel discussions.

The member from Brazil questioned the basis for changing the status quo, and suggested that the pros and cons of current configurations could be included, observed the importance of regional representation balance, and further noted that it was important for the Panel to have the views of the AHGE on the “Aspects to consider” and that it would be helpful to reduce the number of proposals to make it easier for the Panel to analyse these. The Co-Chairs responded that combining proposals was welcome, and encouraged members to reach out to their Bureau members, also in view of what has worked and not worked with regards to the Bureau.

---

<sup>1</sup> Election Rule 10 states “The term of office of the IPCC Chair, the IPCC Vice-Chairs and the Working Group and Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs will be limited to one term in a particular office, with the provision of a possible nomination for election for one further term in the same office for individual cases if the Panel so decides. The other members of the IPCC Bureau and of any Task Force Bureau shall be eligible for nomination for re-election for a second consecutive term in the same office. Only those members that have served in an office under the provisions of Rules 11 and 12 for less than 2 years shall be eligible for nomination for re-election for a further term (IPCC Chair, Vice-Chairs and Working Group and Task Force Bureau Co-Chairs) or a further two consecutive terms (other positions on the IPCC Bureau or any Task Force Bureau) in the same office.”



The member from the UK emphasized that the “Aspects to consider” are critical to present to the Panel, and also sought clarification on the proposal for TG-Data Co-Chairs to join the Bureau, as these co-chairs are not elected in the same way, and whether it is appropriate to include these in the process of the IPCC. The Co-Chairs agreed that this point should be reflected in the documents to the Panel.

The member from Switzerland highlighted that the status quo could be improved, that there were several issues during the AR6 cycle, such as governance needing improvement; further noting the importance of presenting the “Aspects to consider” to the Panel, especially as a rationale for certain elements to be changed. It was requested to check the reference to the proposal on the establishment of WG Vice-Chair liaisons as between the Working Groups, to be selected amongst themselves, to ensure that this appeared.

The member from Japan expressed satisfaction with the status quo, but also noted the importance of strengthening the role of the IPCC Vice-Chairs, and requested clarification on the current roles of the IPCC Vice-Chairs. The Co-Chairs recalled that the AHGE was not taking any decisions on any proposals, but that this was for the Panel to discuss.

### **3. PREPARATION OF REPORT FOR PANEL**

The Co-Chairs presented the Annex B document with tables reflecting the possible decision points for the Panel to address. It was recalled that the AHGE was compiling proposals and not taking any decisions, and that all materials would be shared with the Panel, including all proposals as received, the tables setting out the consolidated proposals, the Annex B document and the PPT.

The Annex B document with the possible six decision points was presented, noting that Option 1 is always represents the status quo. The possible decision points for the Panel to consider within the document were informed to the AHGE as follows:

- Decision Point 1 - Number of IPCC Chairs and IPCC Vice-Chairs
- Decision Point 2 - TG-Data Co-Chairs to join the IPCC Bureau
- Decision Point 3 - Regional balance of Working Groups Co-Chairs
- Decision Point 4 - Overall regional balance
- Decision Point 5 - Number of WG Vice-Chairs distribution
- Decision Point 6 - Overall size of IPCC Bureau

Comments and questions from the floor with answers from the Co-Chairs included the following:

The member from South Africa observed that there should be a matrix for an outline of the pros and cons, that there needed to be some rationale on why some proposed changes were submitted, and that time was needed to go through the document; the member further noted that the issues not under the mandate should be separate from the Final Report but that there was a clear need to articulate the roles of the IPCC Vice-Chairs. The member further expressed as the status quo has been shown to be very efficient in the demanding AR6 cycle, a valid question was whether a change in the status quo would lead to more efficiency, and that in the introduction to the report to the Panel it should be pointed out that many proposals held to the status quo.

The member from Belgium stated support for the status quo and that it was very late to make changes to the structure; the member also added support to the requests for clarity on the

roles of the IPCC Vice-Chairs and that the issues outside the mandate of the AHGE should somehow be presented to the Panel. Finally, the member expressed a preference for a neutral UN location for the election plenary, such as Geneva.

The member from Saudi Arabia noted that the decision with the option of 2 IPCC Chairs should specify one each from a developed and developing country, and repeated the concern that the proposal on the Deputy IPCC Chair was outside the mandate of the AHGE in view of IPCC Election Rule 11, and that it was more fitting to discuss under the Terms of Reference, and thus should be removed from the structural proposals. The member further noted the importance of not reducing regional representation, as seen in parts of Decision four.

The member from Tanzania expressed support for the point made by the member from South Africa that time was needed to digest the information and that there needed to be a clear articulation of the responsibilities of the Bureau. The member from Hungary pointed out that the proposal on the importance of intraregional balance within the Bureau needed to be specified within the Annex B text on what was to be ensured in filling elective positions, and shared text accordingly.

The member from the UK added support for the request for more information on the rationale for the options, as expressed by the member from South Africa, and questioned if some options would be ruled out if the Panel chose an option from a specific decision, suggesting that a decision-tree or flow chart would be helpful.

The member from Germany reiterated the importance of gender balance throughout all Bureau positions and the avoidance of using the term “assigned” to the Deputy IPCC Chair proposed position, but that this was an important alternative to the 2 IPCC Chairs. The member also remarked that there were implications on any increase in the number of Bureau positions, such as a commensurate increase in Trust Fund expenditures through more travel costs. Accordingly, the Secretariat was requested to provide the estimates for the budgetary implications of a Bureau member to the Panel. The Co-Chairs confirmed the reflection of the first two points and stated that the final point was to be included in the budget discussion at P57.

The member from Kenya reiterated the proposal regarding term limits overall to ensure adequate continuity of the IPCC work, ensuring incorporation of newer members with increasingly diverse expertise and perspectives, and questioned if this would appear in the decision points or appear elsewhere. The Co-Chairs noted that this would be reflected in the Final Report but would not appear in the Annex B document as it was not on size, structure and composition of the Bureau.

The member from Saudi Arabia reiterated the view that the proposal on the Deputy IPCC Chair was outside of the mandate in view of the provisions of Election Rule 11. The Co-Chairs stated that this would be discussed further as how it is reflected in the Final Report.

The Co-Chairs then presented the outline for the Final Report to the Panel, specifying the supporting documents that would be presented to the Panel, and noted that a draft would be shared with the AHGE members for comments and then posted on PaperSmart in advance of the P57. It was recalled that collection and clarification of the proposals was the mandate of the group, and that with a view to equity and fairness that the AHGE was not to make a decision on any given proposal or to put forward a specific proposal to the Panel. The AHGE

undertook a process of collecting and clarifying the proposals, and that all proposals would be made available to the Panel.

The member from Norway supported the structure of the outline, and at the same time requested the addition of three decision points to the agenda item for the AHGE at P57, to include a decision on the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau, a decision on the timing of the election, and a decision on the term of the Seventh IPCC Bureau. The member from Belgium expressed support for seeking specific decisions on the term of the IPCC Bureau and timing of elections. The Co-Chairs clarified that the AHGE mandate does not include setting the agenda for P57 and that these comments would be forwarded to the Secretariat.

#### **4. CLOSING OF THE MEETING**

The Co-Chairs closed the meeting after stating that the draft Final Report would be shared with the AHGE members for comment.

**IPCC AD HOC GROUP ON ELECTIONS (AHGE) – THIRD MEETING**  
**Teleconference, 31 August 2022**

AHGE-III/Doc. 1  
(26.VIII.2022)  
Agenda Item: 1  
ENGLISH ONLY

**PROVISIONAL AGENDA**

- 1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**
- 2. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF UPDATED PROPOSALS RECEIVED**
- 3. PREPARATION OF REPORT FOR PANEL**
- 4. CLOSING OF MEETING**

## **Ad-hoc Group on the Size, Structure and Composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau for the Seventh Assessment cycle**

### **Terms of Reference<sup>1</sup>**

#### **Background**

The Principles Governing IPCC Work, Appendix C, Rule 7 provides for Panel review and amendment of the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau at least one Session prior to the Session at which the IPCC Bureau and/or any Task Force Bureau are elected.

The IPCC agreed at its 53rd (bis) Session (March 2021) to set up an Ad-hoc Group on the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau for the Seventh Assessment cycle.

#### **Objectives**

The Ad-hoc Group will identify proposals to present to the Panel regarding the size, structure, and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau for the Seventh Assessment cycle.

In undertaking its work, the Ad-hoc Group will seek to ensure transparency, inclusiveness and equal opportunity for participation of all its members, noting the importance of the inclusion of the perspectives of developing countries.

#### **Term**

The Ad-hoc Group will undertake its work following closure of IPCC-53 (bis), preparing progress reports and presenting these to the Panel at its future sessions, with the final outcome to be presented to the Panel at IPCC-57 (bis) for its decision, during the week following Synthesis Report (SYR) approval at IPCC-57, avoiding any overlap between the work of the Ad-hoc group and SYR approval Plenary.

#### **Composition and operation of the Ad-hoc Group**

The Ad-hoc Group should consist of:

- Two Co-Chairs, with balanced representation from developed and developing countries and taking into account gender balance;
- Two Rapporteurs, with balanced representation from developed and developing countries and taking into account gender balance;
- A minimum of two representatives from each WMO Region; and
- Open-ended membership as to participation of all Members of the IPCC.

The Ad-hoc Group will conduct its work both in conjunction with plenary sessions and intersessionally, including by electronic, remote communication and virtual means.

Administrative support will be provided by the Secretariat.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Decision IPCC-LIII\(bis\)-2.1, Annex 1.](#)

## **Terms of Reference of the IPCC Bureau<sup>2</sup>**

1. The purpose of the Bureau is to provide guidance to the Panel on the scientific and technical aspects of its work, to advise on related management and strategic issues, and to take decisions on specific issues within its mandate, in accordance with the Principles governing IPCC Work.
2. The IPCC Bureau consists of the IPCC Chair, three IPCC Vice Chairs, Co-Chairs of the three Working Groups and the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories and the members of the Working Group Bureaus. The composition of, rules governing election to and membership of the Bureau and Working Group Bureaus are defined in Appendix C to the Principles Governing IPCC Work. The Bureau is chaired by the IPCC Chair. Its work is supported by the IPCC Secretariat.
3. The Bureau will advise the Panel and the Chair of the IPCC, including with respect to:
  - a. scientific and technical aspects of the IPCC's Programme of Work;
  - b. the conduct of the Sessions of the Panel;
  - c. progress in and coordination of the work of the IPCC;
  - d. the application of the Principles and Procedures of the IPCC;
  - e. technical or scientific communications matters.
4. With respect to IPCC Assessment Reports and other IPCC Products the Bureau and the individual Working Group and Task Force Bureaus will:
  - a. advise the Panel on the Work Programme of the IPCC and the coordination of work between the Working Groups;
  - b. develop and agree on the list of authors, review editors and expert reviewers, taking into account the balance of expertise, geographical coverage and gender;
  - c. engage with the wider scientific community, both globally and regionally;
  - d. oversee scientific quality; and
  - e. participate in the response to possible errors, as described in the "IPCC Protocol for Addressing Possible Errors in IPCC Assessment Reports, Synthesis Reports, Special Reports or Methodology Reports.
5. The Bureau will also:
  - a. function in the role of an Editorial Board in finalizing Technical Papers as defined in Section 5 of Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC Work;
  - b. oversee the work of any technical task groups (e.g. TGICA);
  - c. provide guidance on cross-cutting scientific issues related to the drafting of reports;
  - d. oversee implementation of the communication strategy in respect of the activities of IPCC Bureau members;
  - e. review requests for admission as observer organizations; and
  - f. perform other duties as may be assigned to it by the Panel.
6. The Working Group and Task Force Bureaus will assist and advise the Working Group and Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI) Co-Chairs with respect to:
  - a. preparation of working group and TFI assessment reports and methodology guidelines;

---

<sup>2</sup> [Thirty-third Session of the IPCC, Abu Dhabi, UAE, 2011, Decisions taken with respect to the review of IPCC Processes and Procedures, Governance and Management, Annex A.](#)

- b. identification and selection of authors, review editors and expert reviewers;
- c. management of working group and TFI activities, including workshops and expert meetings, and scoping meetings;
- d. selection of participants for workshops, expert meetings, and scoping meetings; and
- e. communication of working group and TFI report outcomes.

## **Roles, responsibilities and qualifications of IPCC Bureau Members**

### **7. Roles**

Members of the Bureau provide scientific and technical support to the Chair of the IPCC and the Co-Chairs of the Working Groups and TFI in accordance with the Terms of Reference of the Bureau.

### **8. Responsibilities**

Members of the Bureau have responsibility to:

- a. uphold and implement the principles and procedures of the IPCC;
- b. advise the Panel and its Chair on scientific and technical matters;
- c. maintain the reputation of the IPCC and promote its products;
- d. maintain the highest standards of scientific and technical excellence;
- e. advise IPCC Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors and Review Editors;
- f. act in accordance with communications guidelines and oversee the implementation of the Communications Strategy in respect of the activities of IPCC Bureau members;
- g. declare interests in accordance with the IPCC policy on Conflict of Interest; and
- h. encourage nominations and participation of scientists from their regions in IPCC activities.

### **9. Qualifications**

Members of the Bureau should have appropriate scientific and technical qualifications and experience relevant to the work of the Bureau, as defined by the Panel.

### Members of the Ad-hoc Group on Elections

|                    |                          |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Australia          | Kenya                    |
| Austria            | Luxembourg               |
| Algeria            | Maldives                 |
| Azerbaijan         | Montenegro               |
| Belgium            | New Zealand              |
| Brazil             | Norway                   |
| Canada             | Oman                     |
| China              | Philippines              |
| Columbia           | Republic of Korea        |
| Denmark            | Russian Federation       |
| Dominican Republic | Saudi Arabia             |
| France             | Senegal                  |
| Gambia             | South Africa             |
| Germany            | Spain                    |
| Guatemala          | Sweden                   |
| Guinea             | Switzerland              |
| Hungary            | Tanzania                 |
| India              | Ukraine                  |
| Indonesia          | United Kingdom           |
| Iran               | United States of America |
| Ireland            | Venezuela                |
| Japan              | Zambia                   |

|            |   |                    |
|------------|---|--------------------|
| Region I   | Africa  | 11 representatives |
| Region II  | Asia  | 14 representatives |
| Region III | South America                                       | 8 representatives  |
| Region IV  | North America, Central<br>America and the Caribbean | 4 representatives  |
| Region V   | South-West Pacific                                  | 4 representatives  |
| Region VI  | Europe  | 24 representatives |



## 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.

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.