

SIXTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE IPCC
Sofia, Bulgaria, 27 July – 2 August 2024

IPCC-LXI/Doc. 9
(12.VII.2024)
Agenda Item: 7
ENGLISH ONLY

AD HOC GROUP ON LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE SIXTH ASSESSMENT CYCLE

(Prepared by the Co-Chairs and the Rapporteurs of the Ad Hoc Group on Lessons Learned)

(Submitted by the Secretary of the IPCC)

AD HOC GROUP ON LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE SIXTH ASSESSMENT CYCLE

1. BACKGROUND

This document presents the outcomes and considerations of an Ad-hoc Group on Lessons Learned (AGLL), that was established by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) at its 60th Session (IPCC-60) (Istanbul, Türkiye, 6 - 19 January 2024) ([Decision IPCC-LX- 7.](#)).

Work on lessons learned was initiated during the sixth assessment cycle, when the Panel, at its 57th Session (IPCC-57) (Geneva, Switzerland, 27-30 September 2022) requested the IPCC Bureau and the Task Force Bureau “to facilitate the process of collecting and synthesizing the lessons learned from the sixth assessment cycle” ([Decision IPCC-LVII-6](#)). The Bureau for the sixth assessment cycle, through an Informal Group, prepared a report on lessons learned based on submissions from Panel members, Bureau members, and TSU representatives, which was shared and presented to the Bureau for the seventh assessment cycle to inform relevant discussions at its 66th Session (BUR-66) (Geneva, 15 – 16 November 2023).

This report was then shared with IPCC Member Countries prior to the 59th Session of the IPCC (IPCC-59) (Nairobi, Kenya, 25-28 July 2023) without being discussed during the Session. Subsequently, document [IPCC-LX/INF. 9](#), containing this report in its Annex 1, was presented to IPCC-60. At this Session, the Panel decided to set up the AGLL “to advise governments on the way forward in considering the lessons learned from the sixth assessment cycle, including but not limited to those identified in Annex 1 of the document [IPCC-LX/INF. 9](#)”. The mandate of the AGLL is presented in the next section of this document.

Since its establishment at IPCC-60, the AGLL has worked intersessionally and is scheduled to report to the Panel at its 61st Session (IPCC-61) (Sofia, Bulgaria, 27 July – 2 August 2024). The Group is led by two Co-Chairs, Brittany Croll (United States of America) and Debra Roberts (South Africa), supported by two Rapporteurs, IPCC Bureau members Mark Howden and Cromwel Lukorito. It has 69 members representing 38 countries. nine Bureau members, four Secretariat representatives, and four TSU representatives serve as advisory members.

This resource document presents the outcomes and considerations of the AGLL based on the discussions during the AGLL meetings and the written feedback received through the form sent to the AGLL members via e-mail. The document was prepared under the leadership of the AGLL Co-Chairs supported by the Rapporteurs, through an interactive co-production exercise with the AGLL.

2. MANDATE OF THE AD HOC GROUP ON LESSONS LEARNED (AGLL)

The mandate of the AGLL was set up by the IPCC through [Decision IPCC-LX- 7.](#), as follows:

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change at its Sixtieth Session (IPCC-60) decides to set up an Ad-Hoc Group with the mandate to advise governments on the way forward in considering the Lessons Learned from the sixth assessment cycle, including but not limited to those identified in Annex 1 of the document IPCC-LX/INF. 9.

The Ad-Hoc Group will work intersessionally and will start its work as soon as feasible with the view to reporting back to the Panel for consideration at its 61st Session.

The Ad Hoc Group will comprise:

- USA, Co-Chair.
- South Africa, Co-Chair.
- Open to all Panel members who may wish to join the Group.
- Bureau members, Technical Support Unit and Secretariat will serve as advisors.

Mr. Mark Howden and Mr. Cromwel Lukorito were nominated to serve as the Rapporteurs. In undertaking its work, the Ad-Hoc Group will build on but not be limited to document IPCCLX/INF.9 Lessons learned from the Sixth Assessment Cycle.

3. AGLL APPROACH AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The Ad-Hoc Group held five virtual meetings to discuss the lessons learned topics. The Co-Chairs, with support from the Rapporteurs and the Secretariat, provided written notes after each discussion. The first meeting was held on 27 March 2024. The focus of the discussion was on the proposed work programme for the Group. After the first session, based on feedback from the Group, an E-Board platform was set up to enable group members to interact in between sessions and to serve as a repository for all documents shared with the Group including indicative lists, presentations, meeting notes, and the transcript of the Zoom chat for each session.¹

The Co-Chairs organized the subsequent sessions around four categories to enable a more substantive discussion on the various topics. These four sessions were ‘Science’ held on 8 April 2024, ‘Organization’ held on 24 April 2024, ‘Communication’ held on 15 May 2024 and ‘Other/Wrap up’ held on 22 May 2024. In advance of the Science, Organization, and Communications sessions, an indicative list of topics grouped into near-term/urgent and long-term were shared with the AGLL for consideration. The Group then discussed the indicative topics and any other topics they wanted to raise. After each discussion, written input was also solicited from the Group to ensure any topics not raised or in need of further elaboration could be captured.

For the fifth and final Other/Wrap up session, no materials were shared in advance. Instead, the discussion focused on the proposed outline and structure for the draft report. A draft document was shared with the Group on 14 June 2024 for review and comment. The draft document was developed based on the five virtual meetings including the notes and the written submissions provided by members via email and the E-Board. The draft document was prepared by the Co-Chairs with support and input from the Secretariat and the Legal Officer, the Chair and the Rapporteurs. AGLL members reviewed the draft document, and the comments were considered and incorporated, as applicable, into the document. The final resource document was submitted to the Secretariat on 12 July 2024. The notes from each of the five virtual meetings are provided as an Annex to the report. These notes were prepared by the rapporteurs with support from the Secretariat and Co-Chairs. They are not agreed upon as consensus documents but are intended to be a summarized account of the meeting discussions.

4. AGLL TOPICS FOR THE 61ST SESSION OF THE IPCC (IPCC-61)

A list of topics discussed by the AGLL is presented in the table below. This reflects the range of topics reflecting views discussed throughout the AGLL meetings and provided in the written submissions. The topics included are not listed in order of priority and do not indicate any AGLL consensus or endorsement. The table is an effort to reflect as comprehensively as possible the wide range of topics discussed but does not reflect all the nuanced and divergent views that were expressed during the discussions. Many topics may require further discussion to determine if they need to be taken forward, particularly those which have IPCC Principles and Procedures and/or resource implications. The AGLL report does not pre-judge any of these potential further discussions. This document is intended to serve as a resource that can inform further discussions and actions by the Panel, Bureau, Secretariat, and others.

While there are suggestions indicated in the “Responsibility” column as to who could implement the topic, it is noted that the Panel can choose to provide input on any topics listed. Many members noted that it was important to indicate where there are potential resource implications associated with a topic which could include financial, staff or time-related implications. The AGLL did not have a

¹ The E-Board tool served as a repository, but the Co-Chairs acknowledge that it did not end up facilitating additional interactions and input from the group. A couple of members posted content, but overall the platform was underutilized.

mandate to analyze the resource implications, so for purposes of this work, it is simply noted if there are possible resource implications and further consideration and analysis by the Financial Task Team, Panel, Bureau, and Secretariat will be needed. It is also important to note that there is significant variation in the level of effort required across the items included in the table and those variations are not included and would require further consideration. The information in the table on the “Status,” “Resource Implications,” and the “Principles and Procedures Implications” was provided by the Secretariat and Legal Officer as potentially helpful information for the Panel’s consideration. For purposes of this document, “Status” is denoted in the following categories:

- **Work in Progress (WIP):** This category includes tasks/ activities currently active and being worked on.
- **Urgently/Near Future (U/NF):** This category includes tasks / activities that need a determination on whether to move forward with further consideration soon, either because they are urgent or because the need for action is approaching quickly.
- **Later in the Cycle (LC):** This category includes tasks / activities that need a determination on whether to move forward with further consideration but can be started at a later stage without immediate urgency, including in the next assessment cycle.

In addition, the following denominations were used for Resource implications and Principles and Procedures implications: Yes (Y), No (N), and Potentially (P).

	Description	Status Work in Progress (WIP); Urgent/near future (U/NF); Later in the cycle (LC)	Resource Implications Yes/No/ Potentially (Y/N/P)	Responsibility	IPCC Principles and Procedures (P&P) Implications Yes/No/ Potentially (Y/N/P)
A	Better support to author teams				
1	Identify and prioritise options for supporting authors including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> financial support from external organizations (which could require guidelines/new procedures) enhancing the IPCC scholarship program providing childcare at lead author meetings and investigating options to provide support for other caring responsibilities improved travel arrangements ensure awareness of existing responsibilities for authors, including that they are sufficiently clear and well-defined, and consider if there are any updates or potentially new responsibilities that need to be clarified. 	U/NF	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Panel/Secretariat/ FiTT Panel/Secretariat/ Scholarship Programme Boards Bureau/ TSUs/Secretariat Bureau/ TSUs/Secretariat Panel/Bureau/ TSUs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial support: Y Scholarship program changes: Y Childcare at LA meetings: N Travel arrangements: N Changes in author responsibilities: Y
2	Provide professional HR support for authors about onboarding, training and dispute resolution.	U/NF	Y	Bureau/Secretariat/ TSUs/ Chair/FiTT/Panel	Training and dispute resolution: Y
3	Provide access to bibliographic resources (e.g. journals behind paywalls) for authors from developing countries.	U/NF	Y	Publications Committee/ Secretariat/Panel	N
4	Provide training in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAIR principles Diversity, equity and inclusion (also consider providing for TSUs and Bureau) IPCC processes and functions 	U/NF (FAIR) & WIP (other trainings)	Y	Bureau/Secretariat/ FiTT/TSUs/ GAT	N
5	Improve the management of author teams. This includes improved onboarding and providing sufficient time and guidance to integrate authors with different scientific backgrounds into interdisciplinary teams, a consideration of	U/NF	P	Bureau/ WGs/ TFI/ TSUs/Panel/ Secretariat	N

	workloads and a more effective way of replacing authors who become unavailable.				
6	Define clear roles and responsibilities for Chapter Scientists and clarify funding needed to ensure balanced representation.	U/NF	N: outline roles and responsibilities Y: support chapter scientists from developing countries	Bureau/Panel/Scholarship Programme Boards/Scientific and Board of Trustees/FITT	Chapter Scientists roles and responsibilities: Y
7	Provide guidance on acknowledging chapter and contributing authors (including the ethics of authorship) in official chapter citations across all IPCC reports to ensure proper scientific credit and visibility for all contributors.	U/NF	N	Bureau/Panel/Publications Committee	N
8	Support to enable CLAs to improve their meeting facilitation skills to increase the efficiency, effectiveness, and procedural consistency	U/NF	P	Bureau/TSUs	N
9	Provide improved support for early career scientists and developing country scientists, and consider increasing the number of developing country scientists	U/NF	Y	Panel, Bureau, Scholarship Programme Boards	P
10	Establish processes to address the growing amount of literature and the inclusion of emerging issues and updates in the assessment process including potential consideration of literature cutoff dates.	LC	P	Bureau/Panel/TSUs	P
11	Address the impact of language barriers in the assessment process including the challenges of developing and using literature in non-English languages and opportunities to increase the use of studies published in languages other than English	LC	P	Bureau/TSUs	N
12	Ensure awareness of existing responsibilities for Review Editors, including that they are sufficiently clear and well defined and consider if there are any updates and new responsibilities that need to be clarified.	LC	N	Panel/Bureau/TSUs	Y

13	Facilitate partnerships with research institutions/libraries/databases to ensure/increase access to most current literature and data.	WIP	P	Bureau/Secretariat/ FiTT/Panel	N
14	Create mentorship opportunities between senior and junior authors.	LC	P	Bureau/ Working Group /TFI/TSU	N
15	Minimize self-citation within reports by ensuring clarity and separation between authors of the report and the literature being assessed.	LC	N	Bureau/Working Group /TFI Co Chairs/Panel	Y
16	Authors selection should consider the need to prioritize authors that reside and work in their home country	U/NF	N	Bureau/Panel	Y
17	Extend the Conflict of Interest (COI) Policy and process to contributing authors.	U/NF	N	Bureau/Secretariat/ Panel/COI Committee /TSU	Y
B	Improved integration and collaboration				
18	Integrate TG Data more effectively into the assessment process to ensure appropriate information flow between DDC and author teams.	LC	Y	Bureau/Panel/TG Data/ExCom/TSUs	N
19	Early involvement of TG Data and the DDC in the writing process so that authors develop a clear understanding of data archiving needs.	LC	N	Bureau/TSUs/ TG Data/ExCom	N
20	Maximise cooperation and integration across and between WGs and TFI - especially to ensure consistent messaging (where appropriate) and consistent use of terminology, scenarios, time frames, regions, concepts, methodological approaches to analysis (e.g., using similar average periods) for all reports, including the Special Reports.	WIP	P	Bureau/TSUs	N
21	Identify cross cutting issues/products early in the cycle e.g. glossary and cross-WG boxes.	UN/F	N	Bureau	N
22	Ensure ongoing improvements in cross TSU collaboration including the possibility of joint staffing.	UN/F	N	Bureau/TSUs	N
23	Develop clear processes to enhance collaboration with and facilitate knowledge sharing through collaborations and partnerships. This could include with other UN organizations (IPBES, WMO, UNEP, UN Decades, etc.) to share best practices, avoid duplication of work, align relevant research	WIP	N	Bureau/Panel/ Secretariat	P

	outcomes, and increase awareness of relevant timelines. These types of collaborations need to be carefully evaluated to ensure they align with the IPCC work, processes and findings.				
24	Continue improving collaboration between Secretariat and TSUs.	WIP	N	TSUs/Secretariat	N
C	Improved Planning and Management				
25	Continue to engage policymakers early in the cycle to increase the awareness of the prevailing policy context and to help determine what type of information from the IPCC is needed.	WIP	N	Bureau	N
26	Ensure reliable and sustainable support for DDC.	WIP	Y	Bureau/FiTT/ Panel	N
27	Provide guidance on issues related to the co-location, organization and funding of TSUs.	LC	Y	Bureau/TSUs	N
28	Consider the resource implications, including funding, capacity and workloads of TSUs and Secretariat when considering new work/activities.	WIP	Yes	Bureau/Panel/ Secretariat/FiTT/ TSUs	N
29	Determine the number of science-related meetings to occur in the cycle.	WIP	N	Bureau/FiTT/Panel	N
30	Standardise work processes across TSUs.	LC	P	TSUs/ExCom	N
31	Identify the appropriate meeting formats for different IPCC convenings including maintaining in-person meetings and considering the use of virtual and/or hybrid arrangements where appropriate.	WIP	Y	Panel/ Bureau/Secretariat/ FiTT/ExCom/TSUs	N
32	Ensure effective and improved time management including by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • optimizing plenary time, • providing guidance to contact groups, establishing parallel contact groups, • considering additional support for smaller delegations, • making accommodations to ensure participation for the full duration of meetings, • increasing transparency about expectations of meeting length, • introducing hard stops. 	WIP	P	Chair/ Bureau/Secretariat	N

33	Continue to assess and consider the need to address the carbon footprint of IPCC activities including outreach and communications.	WIP	Y	Bureau/Secretariat/ FiTT	N
34	Develop and communicate a clear plan for IPCC events including by providing early notice of meeting dates/location and providing materials according to rules and procedures.	WIP	N	Bureau/Secretariat	N
35	Consider legal (including visa) requirements when selecting locations for meetings.	WIP	N	Bureau/Working Groups/TFI/ TSUs/ Secretariat/Panel	N
36	Develop a process to ensure a smooth and efficient transition (of process and knowledge) between assessment cycles (including the possibility of overlapping cycles).	WIP	N	Bureau/TSUs/ExCom /Secretariat	N
37	Consider approaches for capturing and following up on lessons learned including whether to collect lessons learned throughout the cycle or collect them at the end of the cycle only.	WIP	Y	Bureau/TSUs/ Secretariat/ExCom	N
38	Consider approaches to create flexibility in the cycle to deal with new and emerging circumstances (i.e., global pandemic).	WIP	P	ExCom/Bureau/ Panel	N
40	Provide updates on timeline and progress including the methodology reports.	WIP	N	Bureau/TSUs	N
41	Develop clearly defined roles for IPCC Vice-Chairs and Working Group Vice Chairs.	WIP	N	Chair/ Bureau/ Panel	P
42	Assess the need and potential opportunity for improvements in the election process including further clarification of the election rules.	LC	P	Panel/Secretariat	Y
43	Consider options to enhance the process for communicating the need for in-kind contributions so that countries may offer support in a transparent and timely manner.	WIP	N	Panel/Secretariat	N
44	Develop a process for considering emerging issues such as artificial intelligence tools, to discuss (and potentially provide guidelines) regulating their use within the IPCC assessment process and to ensure that IPCC products are used/applied correctly.	WIP/U/NF	Y	Bureau/TSUs/Panel/ Secretariat/FiTT	P
D	Ethics and Scientific Integrity				

45	Promote scientific integrity in all aspects of the IPCC's work including processes for ensuring robustness of information used and a balanced representation of diverse views.	WIP	N	Bureau/GAT/Panel	N
46	Develop recommendations for safeguarding the integrity of discussions and outputs.	WIP	N	Bureau/TSUs/ Secretariat	N
47	Clearly define the confidentiality of outputs at different process stages and determine the best approaches to preventing unauthorized access or disclosure of draft content.	WIP	N	Bureau/TSUs/ Secretariat/Panel	N
E	Better balanced and more inclusive representation of different knowledge types				
48	Ensure a balanced representation of scientific information, perspectives, and approaches e.g. regional, national, sectoral, and discipline (e.g., social sciences).	WIP	N	Bureau/Authors/ Panel	N
49	Enhance the exploration, synthesis, and use of grey literature (e.g. government literature, observational data, local research) and other knowledge sources (e.g. Indigenous Knowledge and Local Knowledge).	U/NF	Y	Bureau/ Panel	Y
50	Consider aspects of equity, differentiation, justice and fairness and regional issues and how to integrate them across the assessments.	WIP	N	Bureau/Authors/ Panel	N
51	Enhance interdisciplinarity and the ability to address the diversity of scientific fields and different viewpoints in the literature.	WIP	N	Bureau/Authors/ Panel	N
52	Increase transparency of and improve the author nomination and selection process including improved regional representation and inclusivity (e.g., authors that understand solution space and practice/implementation related knowledge).	WIP	N	Bureau/NFPs/ Secretariat/Panel	N
F	Ensure inclusiveness in all IPCC processes and convenings				
53	Encourage NFPs to focus on and ensure diverse and inclusive nominations for authors.	WIP	Y	Bureau/Secretariat/ NFPs/ GAT	N
54	Ensure ongoing improvement in regional and gender representation in all IPCC processes.	WIP	Y	Bureau/NFPs/GAT	N

55	Ensure improved mainstreaming of gender in the IPCC's work including timely implementation of the code of conduct.	WIP	Y	GAT/Bureau/Panel	N
56	Identify and prioritize options for improving travel arrangements for Trust Fund supported delegates.	U/NF	Y	Secretariat	N
G	Improved guidance on expert/co-sponsored meetings				
57	Provide guidance on meeting outputs from co-sponsored meetings.	WIP	N	Panel/ExCom	N
58	Clarify participation at expert meeting/IPCC workshops/co-sponsored meetings including potential to require nominations by NFPs. Noting that IPCC Workshops or Expert Meetings are submitted to the Panel for decision, and nominations by NFPs are only for IPCC workshops, per IPCC rules and procedures.	WIP	N	Bureau/Panel	Change in types of meetings requiring nominations: Y
59	Ensure the strategic and efficient use of expert meetings/IPCC workshops/Co-sponsored meetings - including providing schedules in advance.	U/NF	N	Bureau/Panel	N
60	Provide guidance on Bureau participation in LAMs and expert meetings, including on the provision of funding.	U/NF	Y	Bureau/Panel/FiTT	N
H	Develop strategic approach to communications				
61	Consider means of broader communication of IPCC assessments within parameters of applicable copyright policy and practices.	WIP	N	Bureau/Panel/Secretariat/COAT	P
62	Ensure a strategic approach to communications by considering how to leverage the strengths of a multimedia communications approach that assesses the suitability of a range of communications tools and technologies, including graphics, visuals representations, interactive products and infographics, fact sheets, videos, presentations, and social media, to engage a broad range of stakeholders, ensure consistency in how information is presented, maintain the quality of content, cover the full range of topics in IPCC reports, increase awareness of IPCC findings and processes, and streamline the number of communication products. This can also include consideration of the ability of those tools and technologies to be scale and applied in different regions/contexts and the ability of the tools and technologies to accommodate translation into other languages.	WIP	Y	Secretariat/ Bureau/ Panel/COAT	P

63	Increase transparency and useability of IPCC website.	WIP	Y	Secretariat/TSUs/ COAT	N
64	Continue to increase the accessibility of IPCC products including improving digital/smart phone access to all IPCC products while also recognizing that not all stakeholders have access to digital platforms.	WIP	Y	Secretariat/COAT	N
65	Determine the focus for the expert meeting on communications and review the recommendations from the 2016 IPCC Expert Meeting on Communications. The focus could be on communication with policymakers including consideration of approaches that are most useful, using plain language and fewer abbreviations in the SPMs, developing content that is actionable and solutions-oriented, and explaining more complex topics including scientific uncertainty.	WIP	N *Note one expert meeting has already been budgeted	Bureau/ COAT	P
66	Continue to increase engagement with communications experts early in the report development process in a transparent and accountable manner, including co-production of SPM figures and graphics.	WIP	Y	Bureau/Secretariat/ TSUs/COAT	N
I	Outreach and engagement strategy for AR7				
67	Develop a schedule/plan for outreach events, including consideration of the carbon footprint, to target a wide range of stakeholders.	WIP	N: developing schedule/plan Y: implementation of plan	Bureau/Secretariat/ COAT/TSUs	N
68	Enhance engagement with member countries in communication activities especially for outreach to national audiences including through proactive communication and engagement with NFPs and the newsletter from the Secretariat.	WIP	Y	Secretariat/NFP	N
69	Assess opportunities to enhance stakeholder engagement including consideration of efforts focused on specific groups such as public, youth, Indigenous groups, practitioners, research institutions, organizations and universities especially in developing countries.	WIP	P	ExCom/Bureau/ Secretariat	N

70	Increase communication with governments, the scientific community and the public throughout the cycle on both content and process including updating fact sheets and providing webinars on how IPCC works and how to engage.	WIP	Y	Bureau/Secretariat/ NFP/Panel	N
J	Author communications				
71	Develop approaches that help ensure greater inclusivity, representation and gender balance among those who are communicating on behalf of the IPCC.	WIP	N	Bureau	N
72	Assess options to support authors communication efforts including ensuring consistency with IPCC approved and accepted text.	WIP	P	Bureau/Secretariat	N
73	Continue to use webinars, expert meetings, and workshops to engage authors.	WIP	Y	Bureau/Panel/ TSUs	N
K	Government and author engagement				
74	Continue to enhance communication between authors and governments including by developing a plan for webinars during the review process, holding pre-meetings before the SPM approvals, and planning other interactive opportunities with authors to help government representatives better understand science and findings and support the policy relevance of the reports.	WIP	Y	Bureau/Secretariat/ NFPs/TSUs/ExCom/ Panel	N
75	Develop new approach/commenting system for collecting review comments on IPCC products.	LC	Y	Secretariat/ExCom	N
76	Develop a more formalized approach to revision of reports between drafts (i.e., between SOD and the final draft) so that major changes are made more transparent in addition to the existing process of submitting the corrigendum during the approval session.	LC	P	Bureau/TSUs	N
77	Ensure thorough review of all sections of the report – i.e. address the fact that currently the review comments do not always cover all report elements adequately.	LC	N	Bureau/TSUs/NFPs	N
L	IPCC logo and derivative products				
78	Ensure clarity on when the logo can be used on communications products acknowledging that the IPCC logo is intended for use for IPCC business and not just reports.	WIP	N	Secretariat/COAT	N

79	Provide clarity on the branding associated with derivative products. Derivative products can be useful but there is a need to clearly differentiate between IPCC-approved materials and materials that are developed as derivative products under the oversight of the WGs/Co-Chairs/TSUs/authors. This includes potentially developing guidelines for derivative products, being clear that IPCC scientists working on derivative products are doing so in their personal capacity and having clear disclaimers on these products. However, there was also caution that any guidelines should not set up a governmental review process for such derivative products.	WIP	N	Bureau / Secretariat/COAT	N
M	Content considerations				
80	Examine opportunities to better understand and assess societal acceptance and behavioural change.	WIP	P	Bureau/TSUs	N
81	Continue to improve the use of scenarios developed by the scientific community and referred to by the authors of the IPCC reports, including assessing issues such as: equity, justice, fairness, differentiation, and regionally specific information, delayed action, leapfrogging, lifestyle changes, and innovation.	WIP	P	Bureau/Panel/TSUs	N
82	Maximise policy relevance and emphasis on solutions/opportunities.	WIP	N	Bureau/TSUs	N
83	Continue to review and verify IPCC report findings against actual outcomes.	WIP	N	Bureau	N
84	Review assessment methodology including the use of confidence levels and levels of agreement to help better capture the full range of socio-economic perspectives.	LC	P	Bureau/TSUs	N
85	Increase the focus on actionable solutions and their effectiveness and feasibility including by engaging with practitioners.	WIP	N	Bureau	N
86	Identify and assess ways to address data gaps.	WIP	P	Bureau/TSUs	N
87	Minimize overlaps between chapters.	WIP	N	Bureau/TSUs	N
88	Review the standardized error protocol to avoid major changes to approved SPMs.	LC	P	Bureau	P

89	Increase information on the economic and socio-economic impacts of climate change and climate action in IPCC products.	WIP	N	Bureau/TSUs	N
90	Develop standardized guidelines/criteria for figures including complexity, mapping, colour schemes, etc while also ensuring that the design and presentation of material does not distort the meaning or introduce bias.	WIP	P	Bureau/Secretariat/TSUs	N
91	Continue to focus on IPCC products and reports that are concise while effectively delivering relevant information. Providing additional guidelines on the length could be helpful, but there was caution in being overly prescriptive on a specific length.	WIP	N	Bureau/TSUs/Panel	N
92	Improve communication around uncertainties in research findings and results, and the limitations and confidence levels associated with scientific data in IPCC products.	WIP	N	Bureau/TSUs/COAT	N
93	Consider options to manage and update key information between reports within a cycle (i.e., observed warming).	LC	P	Bureau/Panel	P
94	Reduce content redundancy in the reports.	LC	N	Bureau/TSUs	N
N	Report production and publication				
95	Put in place a process to ensure and provide products in the agreed UN languages as mandated in a timely manner (within the appropriate deadlines).	WIP	Y	Publications Committee/Secretariat	N
96	Expedite publication of DOIs	WIP	Y	Publications Committee/Secretariat	N
97	Ensure the contracting of the publisher is done in a timely manner.	WIP	P	Publications Committee/Secretariat	N
98	Develop a plan that avoids delays in publication of reports.	WIP	P	Publications Committee/Secretariat	N
99	Develop approaches to improve search optimization within IPCC reports.	WIP	Y	Bureau	N

100	Continue to ensure open access to IPCC data and enhance data availability.	WIP	P	Bureau/TG DATA	N
101	Continue to provide user-friendly reports that are digitally interactive.	WIP	P	Bureau/TSUs	N
102	Consider the development of new types of products to improve e.g. accessibility and communication.	LC	P	Bureau/Panel/ Publications Committee/COAT	Y

5. EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF IPCC-61/NEXT STEPS

The Panel is invited to consider this as a resource document available to inform efforts by the Panel, Bureau, Secretariat, TSUs, and other relevant IPCC bodies, as appropriate. The Panel is also invited to advise on the way forward.

Annex 1. Notes from AGLL Discussions

Note: The meeting notes contained in this Annex are not agreed upon as consensus documents but are intended to be a summarized account of the meeting discussions prepared by the Rapporteurs with support from the Co-Chairs and Secretariat.

**First Meeting of the Ad Hoc Group on Lessons Learned (AGLL) from the Sixth Assessment Cycle
27/03/2024: 13.00 – 14.30 CET (Teleconference)**

Facilitation

Co-Chairs of the AGLL: Ms Debra Roberts (South Africa); Ms Brittany Croll (United States of America)

Rapporteurs

Mr Mark Howden (Bureau Member); Mr Cromwel Lukorito (Bureau Member)

Participants

Members

Mr Hamza Merabet (Algeria); Mr Sean Harte (Australia); Mr Manfred Ogris (Austria); Mr Bart Rymen (Belgium) ; Ms Lesley Craig (Canada); Mr Lei Huang (China); Mr Radim Tolasz (Czech Republic), Ms Tina Christensen (Denmark), Ms Heta-Elena Heiskanen (Finland), Ms Carola Best, Mr Friedemann Cal (Germany); Dr T. Jayaraman, Dr Tejal Kanitkar, Mr Sharath Kumar Pallerla (India); Mr Shams Amir Naji (Iraq); Mr Sadegh Zeyaeyan, Mr Mohammad Rahimi, Ms Azar Zarrin, Mr Mostafa Jafari (Iran); Ms Anna Pirani (Italy); Ms Naoko Nakajima, Ms Kasumi Hori, Ms Aya Takatsuki, Mr Norihiro Kimura, Ms Mariko Takatani, Ms Manami Oishi, Ms Yuri Machida (Japan); Mr Andrew Ferrone (Luxembourg); Ms Kenza Khomsi (Morocco); Mr Tin Mar Htay (Myanmar); Mr Rob van Dorland (Netherlands); Mr Ole-Kristian Kvissel (Norway); Ms Yae Won OH (Republic of Korea); Mr Shugaib Magomedov (Russian Federation); Mr Abdulrahman AlGwaiz, Ms Ayael AlQarni, Ms Hussah AlHamdan (Saudi Arabia); Mr Pei Qi Puan (Singapore); Ms Camilla Andersson (Sweden); Mr Sebastian König (Switzerland); Mr Kokou Sabi (Togo); Ms Merve Güreş (Türkiye); Mr Abdelaziz Harib, Mr Ghanim Hableel (United Arab Emirates); Ms Jolene Cook, Ms Julie Maclean, Ms Rhian Rees-Owen (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland); Mr Wilbert Timiza Muroke (United Republic of Tanzania); Mr Farhan Akhtar, Mr Jean Lynch-Stieglitz (United States of America).

Advisory Members

Mr Jim Skea (IPCC Chair); Mr Bart van den Hurk (Bureau member); Mr Eduardo Calvo (Bureau member); Mr Gervais Itsoua Madzous (Bureau member).

Ms Clotilde Péan, Ms Gerrit Hansen (TSU WGI); Ms Melinda Tignor (TSU WGII); Mr Robert Sturgiss (TSU TFI).

Mr Abdalah Mokssit (IPCC Secretary), Ms Ermira Fida (IPCC Deputy Secretary), Ms Jennifer Lew Schneider (IPCC Secretariat), Ms Nina Peeva (IPCC Secretariat).

Meeting Notes

Debra Roberts (DR) opened the meeting and introduced the Co-Chairs of the AGLL - Brittany Croll (USA) and Debra Roberts (South Africa) and the Rapporteurs – Mark Howden (Working Group II Vice-Chair) and Cromwell Lukorito (Working Group II Vice-Chair).

Agenda: DR outlined the agenda of the meeting as follows:

1. Introduction of the Ad Hoc Group on Lessons Learned (AGLL) Co-Chairs and the Rapporteurs.
2. Overview of the AGLL Mandate as decided at the 60th Session of the IPCC (IPCC-60).
3. Presentation of the AGLL Co-Chairs proposed organization of work.
4. Initial feedback on the AGLL Co-Chairs plan.

Mandate: Brittany Croll (BC) recalled the mandate of the AGLL as outlined in the [decision](#) of IPCC-60 i.e. to set up the Ad-Hoc Group with the mandate of advising governments on the way forward in considering the Lessons Learned from the sixth assessment cycle, including but not limited to those identified in Annex 1 of the [document IPCC-LX/INF. 9](#). She indicated that the Ad-Hoc Group would work inter-sessionally, starting in this meeting with the view to reporting back to the Panel for consideration at its 61st Session (IPCC-61) in July 2024.

DR presented the AGLL Co-Chairs proposed organization of work, based on discussions related to four key categories: science, organization, communication, and other/wrap-up related issues. The proposal is to identify urgent/short-term needs/recommendations that require Panel discussion/approval; urgent/short-term needs/recommendations that can be undertaken by Bureau/TSUs/Secretariat; medium and long-term issues that potentially require further discussion (beyond IPCC-61).

The deliberations of the meeting based on the focal areas highlighted in the proposed work programme and the participants’ interventions are summarized in the table below.

Focal Area	Interventions
Work Programme	<p>(i) While there was general agreement with the structure of the work Programme, Saudi Arabia sought clarification regarding the use of the phrase ‘building on’ given the ‘Lesson Learned’ document was not yet agreed upon. Would that constrain discussions?</p> <p>DR clarified that the AGLL mandate indicated that the group was not limited to the lessons summarised in IPCC-LX/INF.9 and that discussions would evolve over the course of the four meetings.</p> <p>(ii) Belgium asked if more elaborate agendas would be provided for the four meetings that had been scheduled to discuss substantive rather than process issues.</p> <p>DR clarified that more detailed agendas would be provided, and that BC would outline current thinking later in the meeting.</p> <p>(iii) Iran raised the need for a comparison between scenarios and reality over short, medium and long-term during AR7.</p> <p>DR indicated that while the point was noted for further discussion, the AGLL did not have a mandate to undertake any scientific assessment.</p>

	<p>(iv) India broadly agreed with the programme of work as proposed and asked if countries could make written submissions to support the Rapporteurs' work. India also suggested that work of the AGLL should focus on areas such as best practices and providing guidance for authors and reviewers.</p> <p>DR agreed that written input would be welcomed.</p> <p>(v) The USA observed that while updating the rules and procedures was outside the mandate of the AGLL, if general agreement emerged on the opportunity for a rule or procedure to be updated, the AGLL should be able to reflect that.</p> <p>DR indicated that the role of the AGLL was to signpost opportunities for positive change to the Panel, which would then decide on the appropriate way forward.</p> <p>BC then took the participants through the indicative issues that could be discussed at the scheduled meetings on science, organisation, and communication. BC noted that specific input on the slides was not expected on this call unless there were initial views and that there would be an opportunity to review the slides in more detail and provide written remarks after the call and in advance of the first session. BC also noted that these topics are intended to be examples and not an exhaustive list, but that they can provide useful expectations to help AGLL members to prepare for the subsequent topic-specific calls.</p>
Science	<p>(i) Iran observed that there was a need to enhance scientists' access to original papers and original data and that there should be an email address and/or contact information provided to support the needs and requirements of scientists.</p> <p>BC acknowledged these specific topic proposals.</p> <p>(ii) India noted that the indicative list is helpful but needs more specificity and suggested several particular issues that were not adequately addressed: equity/rights; differentiation; information related to socio—economic modelling; over-representation of a small group of authors and the need to increase the role of developing country inputs; and assessment methodology including the use of confidence levels and levels of agreement as insufficient. Guidelines should be provided to authors and reviewers on these matters, including how issues are framed (disciplinarity). There is a need to ensure that a diversity of opinions is reflected.</p> <p>BC acknowledged the topics and the need for specificity and clarified that the Group would not be conducting science or dictating specific science topics.</p>

	<p>(iii) Belgium noted the long list of science issues and suggested prioritising them.</p> <p>DR indicated that thinking about priorities over the short, medium and long term is a first attempt to prioritise. BC added that it was also important to capture topics that the Group members may not agree on in order to be comprehensive while also using the short time efficiently.</p>
Organization	<p>(i) Netherlands observed that there is a need to address procedures and rules regarding elections and noted that is an issue that could be addressed over the medium/long term.</p> <p>BC acknowledged the suggestion and appreciated that a timeframe was indicated.</p> <p>(ii) The USA raised three concerns: What will happen if the two-hour meetings are inadequate to finalise discussions? Will there be another process? Who should receive written feedback from participants?</p> <p>BC responded that two approaches could be explored: making use of written input and using the fourth session to pick up the extra issues. BC indicated that adding additional sessions was also a possibility, but only, if necessary, given the tight schedule and trying to be judicious with people’s time. BC also added that the IPCC Secretariat will receive the written feedback.</p> <p>(iii) The UK and Tanzania agreed with the process and materials presented in the meeting. The UK suggested the use of the Focal Point portal as a way of sharing written submissions.</p> <p>BC acknowledged the support for the process and agreed to look into potential options for transparent collaboration. The Secretariat confirmed that this would be investigated.</p> <p>(iv) Germany noted that there is a need to make the process as efficient as possible by focusing on the short-term actions.</p> <p>BC acknowledged this point and indicated that this was the shared intent of the AGLL Co-Chairs in setting forward the proposed organisation of work.</p> <p>(v) Italy liked the Focal Point Portal suggestion and also proposed the possible use of collaborative tools such as Miro Boards to enable broader engagement.</p> <p>BC acknowledged that the process is intended to be as collaborative as possible noting some potential constraints with introducing too many new tools.</p>

	(vi) WGII Co-Chair Bart van den Hurk stressed the need to collect lessons learned from AR7 from the outset of the cycle. He also noted the importance of capturing the process and lessons learned from the AGLL itself. BC acknowledged the importance of capturing the lessons learned through this AGLL process as well as the specific lessons learned from the AR7 cycle.
Communication	(i) India indicated the need to ensure outreach material matches approved material.

Other: Belgium enquired when IPCC-61 was scheduled to take place. The Secretary responded that Bulgaria was selected as the venue for IPCC-61. The meeting will be an extended session held in Sofia from Friday, 26 July 2024, to 2 August 2024.

Way Forward

1. Notes and slides from the meeting will be circulated by 29 March 2024.
2. IPCC Secretariat to provide guidance on possible use of the Focal Point Portal/dashboard.
3. Written submissions on the proposed organisation of work and potential topics to be considered for science, organisation, communications, and any other topics to be requested by 3rd April 2024.

**Second Meeting of the Ad Hoc Group on Lessons Learned (AGLL) from the Sixth Assessment Cycle
08/04/2024: 13.00 – 15.00 CET (Teleconference)**

Facilitation

Co-Chairs of the AGLL: Ms Debra Roberts (South Africa); Ms Brittany Croll (United States of America)

Rapporteurs

Mr Mark Howden (Bureau Member); Mr Cromwel Lukorito (Bureau Member)

Participants

Members

Mr Manfred Ogris (Austria); Mr Bart Rymen (Belgium); Jean-Pascal van Ypersele; Ms Lesley Craig (Canada); Mr Lei Huang (China); Mr Radim Tolasz (Czech Republic), Ms Tina Christensen (Denmark); Ms Carola Best, Ms Christiane Textor (Germany); Dr T. Jayaraman, Dr Tejal Kanitkar, Mr Sharath Kumar Pallerla (India); Mr Sadegh Zeyaeyan, Mr Mohammad Rahimi, Ms Azar Zarrin, Mr Mostafa Jafari (Iran); Ms Anna Pirani (Italy); Ms Naoko Nakajima, Ms Kasumi Hori, Ms Aya Takatsuki, Mr Norihiro Kimura, Ms Mariko Takatani, Ms Manami Oishi, Mr Koji Ohara, Mr Koki Sowa (Japan); Mr Andrew Ferrone (Luxembourg); Ms Kenza Khomsi (Morocco); Mr Rob van Dorland (Netherlands); Mr Salisu Dahiru (Nigeria); Mr Ole-Kristian Kvissel (Norway); Ms Yae Won OH (Republic of Korea); Ms Ayael AlQarni (Saudi Arabia); Ms Camilla Andersson (Sweden); Mr Sebastian König (Switzerland); Mr Kokou Sabi (Togo); Ms Merve Güreş (Türkiye); Mr Abdelaziz Harib (United Arab Emirates); Ms Julie Maclean, Ms Rhian Rees-Owen (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland); Mr Wilbert Timiza Muroke (United Republic of Tanzania); Mr Farhan Akhtar (United States of America).

Advisory Members

Mr Jim Skea (IPCC Chair); Mr Bart van den Hurk (Bureau member); Mr Eduardo Calvo (Bureau member); Mr Gervais Itsoua Madzous (Bureau member).

Ms Clotilde Péan, Ms Gerrit Hansen (TSU WGI); Ms Melinda Tignor (TSU WGII); Mr Sandro Federici (TSU TFI).

Mr Abdalah Mokssit (IPCC Secretary), Ms Ermira Fida (IPCC Deputy Secretary), Ms Nina Peeva (IPCC Secretariat).

Meeting Notes – Synthesis of Discussions

- The AGLL Co-Chairs should lead the identification of the elements within the three themes (science, organization and communication) and the next steps/recommendations to address them, but not attempt to resolve those elements since that will be decided by the IPCC Plenary.

- The decision on who would implement improvements (continuation of this group, Bureau, TSU, Secretariat) should be considered as part of the next steps, noting that many items can be dealt with by the managerial levels of the IPCC (WG Bureau, TFB, TSU, Secretariat) informing the Panel.
- Some items may best be addressed via a full discussion of the IPCC Procedures.
- The Bureau, Secretariat, and TSUs all have workload/capacity constraints which will need to be considered in determining how to pursue the AGLL recommendations. For some recommendations, there will also need to be consideration by the Panel of the budget/resource implications.

Topic	Comments/decisions
Organizational matters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● AR7 cycle should be more policy-relevant with improved diversity of knowledge (have an Expert Meeting on this) with better inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge, Traditional Knowledge and Local Knowledge (IK/TK/LK). ● There should be HR support for author teams embedded in the TSU’s as well as a broader range of support for authors in terms of tools and facilities. ● Identify opportunities to create efficiency gains via establishing common services and protocols such as the website, layout of reports, etc. ● Author selection is critical and needs attention to recruit more social scientists and practitioners to address ‘what to do’ and ‘how to do it’ and to ensure a mix of both experienced and new authors to the IPCC. There are opportunities to improve balance (including gender), increase focus on good collaborators and team-workers and also on early career scientists to build capability. Noting that early career scientists should not generally be authors, but can serve as Chapter Scientists. ● Enhance training for authors to address a range of issues including diversity training and expectations of authors (<i>see additional point under authors topic below</i>). ● Need to account for new scientific advances and new challenges by assigning people to review the literature for these and to advise the Plenary and the assessment process. ● Increase opportunities to collaborate with other like-minded scientific bodies, putting more emphasis on solution space (feasibility and effectiveness, trade-offs, etc.). ● Matters of the PhD Scholarship programme should be addressed under the Organization theme (<i>next AGLL session</i>).
Scientific input	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enhance access to established journals behind paywalls (perhaps via negotiation with publishers). This should also include consideration for enhancing access to observational data, gender-disaggregated information, local research and literature in other languages.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop separate sets of guidelines to enhance exploration, synthesis and use of grey literature, AI and local, traditional and indigenous knowledge with a view to ensuring scientific robustness. Noting that input and leadership from Indigenous Peoples in developing such guidelines on IK/TK/LK is important. These guidelines could also consider how to incorporate and reflect the diversity/range of views from various literature sources. ● Increase focus and capacity to integrate scientific inputs that reflect findings from multiple lines of evidence which is critical and is a strength of the IPCC. ● Increasing integrative analysis across disciplines (e.g. climate change, air pollution and nature/biodiversity) is important for policy development, identifying measures, implementation of action and achievement and evaluation of ambitions. ● Investigate the use of approved methodologies to facilitate easy updating. ● Early identification of cross-cutting topics, cross-Working Group boxes etc. ● Analysis of outputs from previous IPCC Reports versus what has actually occurred may help in understanding how the IPCC can better inform policy and in the development of scenarios. ● Consider options to increase the focus on societal acceptance and behavioral change, and enhance the IPCC scenarios which could include consideration of equity, justice, fairness, differentiation, regionally-specific information. ● Consider if there are additional approaches, beyond just confidence levels, that can help to capture the range of socio-economic perspectives/inputs in the scientific literature.
Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TG Data should be addressed under the Organization theme (<i>next AGLL session</i>) to ensure appropriate information flow between DDC and Author teams and timely provision of key data during the Assessments.
Documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify options to make reports more user-friendly. Noting that with more focused reports, there is the possibility of fewer nuances, so there is a need to be clear about trade-offs and under what situations different tradeoffs are desired. The focus should be on comprehensive reports. ● Enhance policy relevance by providing information in an easy-to-read and concise way for specific policy questions and reducing repetition across AR7 reports and with previous IPCC reports. ● Use digital interactive reports including online atlases. This should be considered in the current scoping process of the Special Report on Climate Change and Cities, and monitored during the writing process.

<p>Integration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enhance integration, perhaps via a task group across and between WGs and with the TFI populated by IPCC WG and TFB Vice-Chairs, to ensure consistent use of common (or at least coherent) terminologies, definitions, scenarios, time frames, regions, concepts and approaches. Consider developing a common IPCC Glossary. ● Maintain the integrity of WG-specific content while also increasing the use of consistent approaches across WGs through greater integration.
<p>Science-related meetings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Early guidance on the use of Expert Meetings and Workshops could be helpful so as to contribute fully to AR7. ● Guidance for and consideration of co-sponsored meetings for collaboration with other UN bodies such as IPBES. ● Maximize the impact of Expert Meetings such as the one on Gender, Inclusivity and Diversity.
<p>Authors (<i>also relevant to Organization theme</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve on-boarding processes for Authors etc. both pre- and post LAM1 relating to HR, IPCC processes and goals as well as ongoing training in particular to address individual and group dynamics consistent with the IPCC Code of Conduct, diversity and inclusion requirements etc. ● Enhance support for Authors, Review Editors and Chapter Scientists regarding authorship, role clarification, behavioral expectations, tools for support etc., including based on analysis of previous attempts, how they worked and how to improve. ● Increase coherence between chapters and reports via supporting author interaction. ● The Bureau should develop guidelines and support for National Focal Points on how to ensure diverse and inclusive nominations of authors. ● The Bureau should also define author selection criteria for SPMs, and define the role of authors and section facilitators for the SYR team. ● Need to clarify ethics of authorship as well as the expectations of authors.
<p>Review process (<i>also relevant to Organization theme</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify options to improve the Expert and Government Review process through more professional IT tools to replace the current Excel-Sheets, such as using AI and other tools. ● Increase transparency on the major changes between the Second Order Draft and the final approval/acceptance. ● Develop guidance to inform the Zero-order internal review. ● Review the existing standardized error protocol involving rapid response procedure to avoid major changes in an approved SPM without further involvement of the Panel. ● Clarity is needed on how to inform users about errata to update online reports.

Publications issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increase access to diverse literature including topics such as IK/TK and social science.
Technology and digital tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop guidelines on new and emerging tools (e.g., AI) including appropriate use in relation to chapter writing and for Expert and Gov't Review in order to understand and avoid potential limitations of such tools including biased results and inaccuracies. ● Consider how to ensure that IPCC products are being appropriately and accurately used by/integrated into AI tools (e.g., using the most recent reports).
Other matters (Policy Relevance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The IPCC reports should continue to be policy-neutral, policy-informing and should objectively deal with scientific, technical and socio-economic factors relevant to the application of particular policies. ● IPCC assessments should retain their independence and objectivity.

Other issues raised to considered during organizational discussion (next session):

- Mechanisms should be put in place during approval meetings to ensure developing countries' representatives are present for the full duration of all meetings.
- More transparency is needed about the real duration of meetings, and in the event, that meetings must extend, the IPCC should accommodate representatives from developing countries, and modify their reservations and flights as required.

**Third Meeting of the Ad Hoc Group on Lessons Learned (AGLL) from the Sixth Assessment Cycle
24/04/2024: 13.00 – 15.00 CEST (Teleconference)**

Facilitation

Co-Chairs of the AGLL: Ms Debra Roberts (South Africa); Ms Brittany Croll (United States of America)

Rapporteurs

Mr Mark Howden (Bureau Member)

Participants

Members

Mr Hamza Merabet (Algeria); Mr Sean Harte (Australia); Mr Manfred Ogris (Austria); Mr Bart Rymen (Belgium); Jean-Pascal van Ypersele; Ms Lesley Craig (Canada); Mr Lei Huang (China); Mr Radim Tolasz (Czech Republic), Ms Tina Christensen (Denmark); Ms Carola Best, Mr Friedemann Call (Germany); Dr T. Jayaraman, Dr Tejal Kanitkar (India); Mr Sadegh Zeyaeyan, Mr Mohammad Rahimi, Ms Azar Zarrin, Mr Mostafa Jafari (Iran); Ms Anna Pirani (Italy); Ms Kasumi Hori, Ms Aya Takatsuki, Ms Mariko Takatani, Ms Manami Oishi, Mr Koji Ohara, Mr Koki Sowa (Japan); Mr Andrew Ferrone (Luxembourg); Ms Kenza Khomsi (Morocco); Mr Rob van Dorland (Netherlands); Mr Salisu Dahiru (Nigeria); Ms Synne Brustad, Mr Scott Randall (Norway); Ms Yae Won OH (Republic of Korea); Ms Ayael AlQarni (Saudi Arabia); Mr Pei Qi Puan (Singapore); Ms Camilla Andersson (Sweden); Mr Annkatrin Rassel (Switzerland); Mr Kokou Sabi (Togo); Ms Merve Güreş (Türkiye); Mr Abdelaziz Harib (United Arab Emirates); Ms Julie Maclean, Ms Jolene Cook (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland); Mr Wilbert Timiza Muruke (United Republic of Tanzania); Mr Farhan Akhtar, Mr Jean Lynch-Stieglitz (United States of America).

Advisory Members

Mr Jim Skea (IPCC Chair); Mr Bart van den Hurk (Bureau member); Mr Eduardo Calvo (Bureau member); Mr Oliver Geden (Bureau member); Ms Sonia Seneviratne (Bureau member).

Ms Gerrit Hansen (TSU WGI); Ms Melinda Tignor (TSU WGII)

Mr Abdalah Mokssit (IPCC Secretary), Ms Ermira Fida (IPCC Deputy Secretary), Ms Nina Peeva (IPCC Secretariat) Ms Jennifer Lew Schneider (Secretariat).

Meeting Notes – Synthesis of Discussions

- The Co-Chairs presented the indicative list of **organizational-related topics**, noting their attempt to make items action-oriented. The list was split into three categories: near-term, long-term, and topics that are already dealt with elsewhere.
- In relation to the **categorization**, it was suggested that including the differentiation of near-term and long-term in future notes of AGLL meetings would be helpful. It was also noted that the near-term can be interpreted to reflect the ‘urgency of acting’ and requires a decision at IPCC-61. In many cases, even longer-term issues require immediate, preparatory action. It was also proposed to consult the IPCC Legal Officer who could help identify which items could be resolved within the managerial level of the IPCC. It was noted that the AGLL and the Panel can discuss the items under all the categories. Questions were raised about the **final input** by the AGLL and that this required

discussions. There were queries from participants about **overlaps** between science organization-related matters dealt with in the previous meeting as well as about the scope of the AGLL.

- The Co-Chairs clarified that they will prepare the **final AGLL report in consultation with the broader Group**. They reinforced the intent to **remain within the mandate of the AGLL**. As for the **overlaps**, they noted that all inputs are being **captured and recorded**.

Near Term Issues: Organization	
Topic and prior discussion points	Comments/decisions
<p>Organizational support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and prioritise options for supporting authors and delegates, including increased human resources support, financial partnerships with external organizations, enhancing the IPCC scholarship program, providing childcare at lead author meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that there were many items under “organizational support,” and further discussions on the E-Board might be needed to better clarify these. It was noted that providing childcare was important but not sufficient. The Gender Action Taskforce (GAT) could look at other possible support needs. • Identifying and prioritizing options for supporting authors, delegates and those carrying responsibilities was raised by many participants. It was pointed out that all issues related to authors’ support discussed previously under “Science” should be moved to “Organisation”. • It was clarified that “financial partnerships” referred to support not provided by the IPCC Trust Fund or the Working Group TSUs, e.g. some philanthropic organisations might be interested in supporting Chapter Scientists via the IPCC Scholarship Fund. • Regarding the scholarship programme, it was noted that PhD-level students provide the best benefit to the IPCC process in terms of scientific research. • Authors also need support with onboarding and conflict resolution.
<p>Review process (*also included under Science)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide authors' responses to governments for the last government draft before the floor version. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals for the authors to provide responses to government comments on the Final Government Draft that were used to develop the Floor version were supported, but it was noted that this would put a further burden on the authors and would border on changing the Rules and Procedures. • In general, enhancing author-government collaboration, including through webinars, would be appreciated.
<p>Equity, diversity and gender issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure ongoing improvement in regional and gender representation in all IPCC processes • Increase the transparency of the author/expert selection process • Provide DEI training to authors, TSUs and Bureau • Ensure improved mainstreaming of gender in the IPCC’s work including by formally recognizing the IPCC Code of Conduct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity, diversity and gender issues are priorities and DEI and related training would be valuable and should be extended beyond the Bureau and include work in the Plenary. • The GAT work is appreciated. It was important to establish a functioning committee and process to deal with complaints. • The IPCC Code of Conduct should include an “incident protocol” and also consider author-related matters. • Ensuring improvement in regional and gender representation in all IPCC processes is essential. The GAT was encouraged to continue to do excellent work on gender-related issues. • It was queried how TG-Data support to authors would be handled. • Several suggestions were made on regional representation, particularly in consideration of participation from developing countries. One suggestion was that support could be provided to two representatives from each developing country to attend the Plenaries, especially for approval sessions. Further, not only the origin of the authors should be considered, but also where they are

	<p>based and work. The importance of developing and retaining institutional knowledge was also noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IPCC training processes could include information on how to enhance regional participation, including improved onboarding. It was also suggested that the training be open to all parties to ensure there is a common understanding.
<p>Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify the appropriate meeting formats for different IPCC convenings including the use of virtual and/or hybrid arrangements where appropriate. ● Ensure effective and improved time management including by optimizing plenary time, reducing the number of in-person plenaries, providing guidance to contact groups, establishing parallel contact groups ● Assess and address the carbon footprint of IPCC activities ● Ensure inclusiveness in all IPCC processes and convenings ● Develop improved foresight and planning for IPCC events including by providing early notice of meeting dates/locations and providing materials according to rules and procedures 	<p>Suggestions and perspectives as to meeting formats included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Exploration of the benefits, costs and risks of each format (hybrid, in-person, virtual) and also for new approaches (longer plenaries). ● In-person plenaries are essential for the IPCC process, especially when it comes to approvals and science-related matters. ● Hybrid and virtual options could be considered for certain types of meetings with a hybrid option being the default for invited participants who cannot join in-person. ● Concerns were expressed about limiting the number of plenaries as these are the main forum for governmental discussion of IPCC matters and that there are only two plenaries per report. A suggestion was made that the number could be reduced by combining the administrative and science items into longer plenaries. <p>Develop improved foresight and planning for IPCC events including by providing early notice of meeting dates supported with various proposals made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Respecting and adhering to a clearly defined meeting schedule is critical. Otherwise, it impacts participation, especially developing country representation. If the schedule is not respected (e.g. meeting over-runs), the IPCC could provide additional support to ensure full coverage of meetings by developing country representatives. ● Meetings should end on time; over-running should not be the default practice. Solution options include “hard stops”, taking critical decisions early in the meeting, moving some items to other sessions, or shifting discussions virtually if in-person time is not sufficient. Adhering to a clearly defined schedule could prevent overruns, while also acknowledging that the Chair(s) is responsible for coordinating and running the meetings and they should have the ability to organize the sessions as they see fit to accomplish the work. ● Parallel discussions and scheduling parallel contact groups may be burdensome for smaller delegations. Guidance for contact groups would be appreciated and could be developed by the Bureau. ● Plan sessions so that critical decisions get taken earlier and ensure all sections of a SPM receive adequate attention during approvals. The use of daily schedules (as used during virtual approvals) was suggested. <p>The assessment of the carbon footprint of IPCC activities should be comprehensive, looking at all activities and not just Plenaries. Measuring would help find how improvements could be achieved. Other comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Assessing the carbon footprint against the meeting format. ● It was proposed to have careful consideration for the meetings’ locations, (to include carbon footprints in decisions).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Organising back-to-back meetings and holding online preparatory meetings to reduce GHG emissions. ● There were diverging views regarding limiting the size of the delegations to reduce GHG footprints. One possibility explored was a limit to the number of in-person representatives with additional participants online. <p>Ensuring inclusivity in all IPCC processes was stated as being very important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All IPCC meetings, especially Plenaries, could be more inclusive. The GAT could provide further advice on this. ● Inclusivity could also be improved in developing the Assessment Reports, from the Outline to the outreach. <p>Developing improved foresight and planning for IPCC events should be a priority, and it requires the Secretariat, Bureau and Panel’s involvement. Particular arrangements are required for planning approval sessions. Governments have a key role in providing suitable options for the various IPCC meetings.</p> <p>Other suggestions included informal experience-sharing briefings/sessions for IPCC Focal Points and delegations with the IPCC Bureau members, for example, at the margins of the plenaries on topics such as the value of indigenous and traditional knowledge.</p>
Longer Term Issues: Organization	
Topic	Comments/Decisions
<p>Assessment cycles and work program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop a process to ensure a smooth and efficient transition between assessment cycles ● Collect lessons learned throughout the cycle rather than just at the end. ● Put in place a process to ensure the translation of the issued deliverables within the appropriate deadlines ● Establish clear protocols and guidelines for each aspect of the work program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There were diverging views on progressively developing a list of issues and of lessons learnt throughout the cycle rather than just at the end.
<p>Assess the opportunity for improvements in the election process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Diverging views were expressed on IPCC elections, as some participants expressed concern that this addressed IPCC Rules and Procedures and was outside the mandate of the AGLL. The Co-Chairs noted that it was not within the scope of the AGLL to modify the Rules and Procedures, but the AGLL could discuss options and indicate if there is convergence about a point that the Panel could then consider. ● Several suggestions for improving the election process were made, indicating these considerations should take place well ahead of the elections for the

	<p>eighth IPCC cycle. These included putting in place a clear process for voting procedures, setting out how the Panel will move through voting rounds, helping Focal Points understand the election process and the role and expectations of the Bureau in advance of nominating candidates, and including the need to more proactively address gender balance.</p>
<p>IPCC Science Integrity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide clear guidelines for the use of IPCC logo ● Clearly define the confidentiality of outputs at different process stages ● Review the copyright policy to enable broader communication of IPCC assessments ● Determine the best approaches to preventing unauthorized access or disclosure of draft content ● Develop recommendations for safeguarding the integrity of discussions and outputs 	<p>Several comments were made regarding the logo and the copyright policy, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Issues of branding and logo should be dealt with promptly in the near term and not in the long term timeframe. ● Logo and copyright policy need revision, UNEP’s emission gaps report copyright could be used as an example in the process. ● Diverging views were expressed on whether the logo usage is reserved solely for IPCC's officially negotiated documents/reports, with concerns that if this were the case, the IPCC would lose corporate identity and visibility. ● Concerns about the use of the logo on derivative/communications products, with the suggestion that this would need a discussion on how to address it as such products (developed with the oversight of Co-chairs and Authors) reach a broader audience. ● The IPCC Legal Officer noted that the IPCC logo is used for IPCC “business” which extends beyond IPCC Reports.
<p>Synergies and collaboration with other organizations / bodies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop clear processes to enhance collaboration with sister organizations (IPBES, WMO, UN Decades, etc.) to share best practices, avoid duplication of work and align relevant research outcomes 	<p>Regarding the synergies and collaboration with other organizations/bodies, the development of a clear process was highlighted noting that there are many different relationships, and across these, it will be critical to protect the integrity of the IPCC. Other comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clarification was sought about the use of the term “sister organizations” and following an explanation from the Co-Chairs the term will not be used further by the AGLL as it was considered to be confusing. ● The importance of enhancing collaboration, especially regarding alignments and approaches to new issues and common challenges like AI, etc., and how each deals with Indigenous, Traditional and Local Knowledge. ● The need for structural links with institutes of higher learning was highlighted, including through a liaison function within the organization. ● Collaboration with various sectors relevant to the reports’ expertise was encouraged. ● That collaboration with other organisations should be discussed in Plenary, not in AGLL. ● A recommendation for the Bureau and, subsequently, the Panel to discuss ways to enhance working arrangements with other agencies and entities producing reports, including revising working arrangements for the organization of joint events.

List of Topics Addressed Elsewhere: ORGANIZATION	
Topic	Comment/Decisions
<p>Issues noted but addressed through other agenda items</p> <p><u>Assessment cycles and work program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Determine the number of reports to be undertaken in this assessment cycle <p><u>Timeline</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop options for the AR7 cycle to provide timely input for the GST ● Provide updates on timeline and progress including the methodology reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Discussions on the timeline are not in the scope of the AGLL. ● It was suggested to avoid items regarding alignment with the GST as there was no agreement. Co-Chairs clarified that this was not a topic on which AGLL could make decisions.
<p>Issues noted but to be addressed in Scoping</p> <p><u>Assessment cycles and work program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide guidance on the length and format of reports and SPMs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Add an item on “Improving the agility and frequency of IPCC Updates”, including via new types of products (for the next cycle).
<p>Issues noted but to be addressed by Bureau, Secretariat, TSU (without needed Panel decision)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Work towards continuous improvement in the Secretariat and TSU collaboration ● Roles and cooperation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Defined clear roles for IPCC Vice-Chairs and Working Group Vice Chairs - Define clear roles and responsibilities for Chapter Scientists - Provide guidance on Bureau participation in LAMs and expert meetings, including on the provision of funding - Increase the clarity of roles and cooperation of the Secretariat and identify opportunities for improvement 	<p>The IPCC Chair provided an overview of the items that are currently in progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● On science-related issues, Governments already have the capacity to make nominations for Expert Meetings as the Procedures cover this if the meeting is elevated to an IPCC Workshop. ● The Secretariat has taken up the IG-Publications recommendations, including DOI implementation and timetables for publication. The ToR of a Publications and Translations Committee (PTC) are under development, taking care of the procurement processes. Offline Discussions of the scope of the PTC could be extended to cover access to literature (an issue raised by many participants). ● On organizational issues, the Expert Meeting on Gender is in preparation and the GAT work is progressing. ● The Chair provided clarification on the usage of external partnerships to support Chapter Scientists through the IPCC Scholarship Fund. ● The IPCC Vice-Chairs have defined roles, each shadowing a WG and serving as focal points for interaction with other groups (youth, Indigenous People and IPBES). ● Meeting formats and the WGs Vice-Chairs's roles and participation in expert meetings etc, will be discussed in BUR-67. <p>Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Appreciation of the progress made on publications and the GAT, as well as the steps taken by the IPCC Chair and VCs in enhancing collaborations. ● Caution about targeting certain stakeholders and observer organizations. When consulting observer organizations all have to be consulted; if there is such stakeholder identification, it would need a discussion outside AGLL.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It is crucial to support the item on enhanced TSU-Secretariat cooperation, especially around the transition from one cycle to another. ● Suggestion that the Chair provides a “response paper” on progress to the Panel on the actions already taken on Lessons Learned.
--	---

Other issues raised identified as missing items under the organization-related list:

- Funding of the **Trust Fund**. The Secretariat's efforts to increase contributions need to be continued. This could also include exploring options for additional partnerships.
- **Appropriate capacity** and **human resourcing** are urgently needed to address the Secretariat's increasing workload through a comprehensive approach, not an incremental one.
- **Resources** for the TSUs should be considered with the request to have much more cross-Working Group interaction; some resources, such as speciality training, could be shared.
- **Financial and capacity support needed** for developing tools and infrastructures for improving the review processes, etc. has to be considered.
- **Limitations beyond financial resources**, including human capacity and time (TSU, Secretariat, voluntary contributions by Bureau members, etc.) also have to be considered.
- It was suggested that the review process of the Rules and Procedures should be re-initiated.

Other issues raised to be considered during communications discussion (next session, the fourth AGLL Meeting):

- **Usage of logo** on derivative/communications products and concerns regarding communications and usage of the logo.
- Taking **advantage of the growing communication technologies**, using social media to engage a broad range of stakeholders with IPCC work.
- Outreach and **content** used, as well as **inclusivity** in the process, with some authors tending to dominate throughout the report development and communication process.
- Concerns were also expressed that communication by authors following an approval may not always be faithful to the approved text.

**Fourth Meeting of the Ad Hoc Group on Lessons Learned (AGLL) from the Sixth Assessment Cycle
15/05/2024: 13.00 – 15.00 CEST (Teleconference)**

Facilitation

Co-Chairs of the AGLL: Ms Debra Roberts (South Africa); Ms Brittany Croll (United States of America)

Rapporteurs

Mr Mark Howden (Bureau Member); Mr Cromwel Lukorito (Bureau Member)

Participants

Members

Mr Hamza Merabet (Algeria); Mr Sean Harte (Australia); Mr Manfred Ogris (Austria); Mr Bart Rymen; Jean-Pascal van Ypersele (Belgium); Ms Lesley Craig (Canada); Mr Lei Huang (China); Mr Radim Tolasz (Czech Republic), Ms Tina Christensen (Denmark); Ms Heta-Elena Heiskanen (Finland); Ms Carola Best, Mr Friedemann Call (Germany); Dr T. Jayaraman, Dr Tejal Kanitkar (India); Mr Sadegh Zeyaeyan, Mr Mohammad Rahimi, Ms Azar Zarrin, Mr Mostafa Jafari (Iran); Mr Ghaith Mahdi Hamdi (Iraq); Ms Anna Pirani (Italy); Ms Kasumi Hori, Ms Aya Takatsuki, Ms Manami Oishi, Mr Koji Ohara, Mr Koki Sowa (Japan); Ms Dana Lang (Luxembourg); Ms Kenza Khomsi (Morocco); Mr Rob van Dorland (Netherlands); Mr Ole-Kristian Kvissel, Mr Scott Randall (Norway); Ms Yae Won OH (Republic of Korea); Mr Abdulrahman AlGwaiz (Saudi Arabia); Ms Camilla Andersson (Sweden); Mr Sebastian Konig (Switzerland); Mr Kokou Sabi (Togo); Ms Julie Maclean, Ms Jolene Cook (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland); Mr Farhan Akhtar, Mr Jean Lynch-Stieglitz (United States of America).

Advisory Members

Mr Jim Skea (IPCC Chair); Mr Bart van den Hurk (Bureau member); Mr Eduardo Calvo (Bureau member); Mr Oliver Geden (Bureau member).

Ms Gerrit Hansen (TSU WGI); Ms Clotilde Pean (TSU WGI)

Mr Abdalah Mokssit (IPCC Secretary); Ms Ermira Fida (IPCC Deputy Secretary); Ms Nina Peeva (IPCC Secretariat); Ms Jennifer Lew Schneider (Secretariat); Mr Andrej Mahecic (Secretariat).

Meeting Notes

- The Co-Chairs presented the **indicative list** of topics for the session dedicated to **communications**, noting that the **modus operandi** was the **same** as in the prior discussion. Issues in the indicative list were separated into **near-term/urgent and longer-term** matters to facilitate the discussion. They acknowledged that there were **overlaps** between topics/ sections and noted that **re-sorting of all issues** will be done to address these overlaps when structuring the **final report**. The Co-Chairs will engage with the AGLL on the structure and development of the final AGLL report for IPCC-61. They encouraged the AGLL members to use the E-board as a means of communication.
- Mr Andrej Mahecic, Programme Manager, Communications and Media Relations, highlighted that the Secretariat's communications work is based on the **Communications Strategy and Implementation Plan**. He noted that most of the **recommendations** from the **Sixth Assessment Cycle Expert Meeting on Communications** have been implemented. Work in the

Seventh Cycle will continue to be guided by these, while some of the recommendations/documentation may need to be reviewed to reflect current progress and priorities. Regarding the indicative list, he highlighted the following:

- It may be useful to consider having two **Expert Meetings** in this cycle, respectively, one on communications for key stakeholders (policymakers) and another one for the authors on communicating science, once they have been selected.
 - There is already a **Copyright Policy**; changes to this would require broader consultation.
 - **Digital platforms** are well underway. **Multimedia communications** have been used extensively in the cycle. **Social media** has been emphasized.
 - On **outreach**, there is a broad main plan, which is primarily based on the overall schedule of the IPCC commitments and meetings. Virtual options should be explored further.
 - On **broader audiences**, 5000 journalists receive communications from the IPCC, and further engagement with other groups, including indigenous groups and youth, is important.
 - The communications team regularly supports initiatives in **member countries**, especially around the releases of major reports. However, engagement with governments is a cross-cutting issue, and it is not only about communications. There is a regular Secretariat **newsletter** and the **website** is the other major information tool for dissemination.
 - The **communications products** produced by the Secretariat are based on the SPMs drafted by the scientists. Careful consideration is given to the **accessibility of language**. As for the **guidelines criteria for figures**, this would require broader consultations with the WGs and the TSUs, given the guiding hand that they have in producing figures.
 - **Partnerships and derivative products** initiatives are strategically assessed as although, these are not IPCC products, the communications facilitate the contacts with authors.
 - As a **priority** for the decisions, he highlighted the expert meetings on communication.
- Some **general process concerns** raised by members of the AGLL included:
 - Some members observed that summary notes and indicative lists were not posted on the **E-board** and noted that the E-board was not serving the intended purpose. The Co-Chairs and the Secretariat noted that all materials were posted and referred members who experienced difficulties in accessing this material to the Secretariat for assistance.
 - There was a proposal to avoid calling the **meeting notes** a “Synthesis of Discussions” since they do not synthesize the discussion and do not capture all individual views shared. The Co-Chairs clarified that the notes were not a final and approved document by the AGLL but a memory prompt rather than a detailed record and aimed at helping participants keep track of the discussions.
 - There were divergent views on whether **all items discussed** should be included in the notes, with a specific reference to the matters related to the “election process”, with a disagreement about whether this falls under the mandate of the AGLL and whether it should be included in the agenda of the AGLL meetings. The Co-Chairs emphasized that their role is to serve as **neutral and objective facilitators** of the discussion. Therefore, **all the views of the AGLL members** should be captured and reflected even where there was no agreement.

- In general, **other** points from the fourth AGLL meeting included:
 - The **importance of communication** of the IPCC work and findings.
 - The **progress** made in AR6 and the need to continue to build on that progress in AR7.
 - Emphasis on the need to focus on the **core work and priorities** of the IPCC taking into account both the IPCC mandate and available time, financial and human resources.
 - The need for communication to not simply have an objective to bring more visibility to the IPCC itself, but also aim to always lead to an **increased policy relevance** of the process, ensuring that more people understand the contents and can make informed policy decisions.
 - The need for communication that is **fit for the purpose** for the end users.
 - A strong message for the need for **balance and accuracy** (i.e. reflecting approved text) in communications.
 - Request for an **Implementation Plan** which would make the discussions more concrete.
 - A proposal for the topics in the indicative list to be captured within a discussion on the **Communication Strategy**, which has not been reviewed in a long time.

Near Term/Urgent Issues	
Topic	Comments/decisions
<p>Communication products</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Assess the suitability of the range of communication tools and technologies in order to effectively deliver IPCC findings/messages including: graphics, visual representations, interactive products and infographics, fact sheets, videos, presentations and derivative products. ● Develop a strategy for the use of social media to engage a broad range of stakeholders. ● Include chapter and contributing authors in official chapter citations across all IPCC reports to ensure proper scientific credit and visibility for all contributors. ● Ensure digital/smartphone access to all IPCC products. ● Develop standardized guidelines/criteria for figures including complexity, mapping, color schemes, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Many members supported the need to assess the suitability of the range of communication tools and technologies, including the specific proposals in the indicative list. However, careful consideration of the resources and expertise is needed to avoid overloading the IPCC staff and authors and distracting from the IPCC’s primary objective. ● Importance of conducting a communications assessment from the start of the cycle in line with the recommendations of the 2016 expert meeting and the joint lessons learned document on communications produced by the TSU’s in the sixth cycle. ● The role and value of Interactive products including positive feedback on the IPCC videos. ● Need to elaborate on ‘innovative communication approaches’ and that the Communications Action Team (CAT) could look at this. ● Need for more diversity in how IPCC develops communications products, noting that the scientific basis of climate communications is centered in Anglophone countries, making it difficult to tap into expertise from different regions. ● Consultations with stakeholders about how they use all the available products should be considered. ● Efforts to improve the quality and user-friendliness of the figures through the involvement of graphic designers and engagement with governments at plenaries were highlighted and recommended to be developed further in this cycle.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Focus on fewer communication products that are standard and capture the nuances and balance of the approved reports. ● Communication matters should be part of guidance to authors, policy makers and the wider audiences. ● Need for more diversity including in developing tailored communications products that speak to different audiences. ● Digital formats for communications that yielded a number of views: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consideration of dedicating resources, especially for TSUs. ○ Consideration should be made on how IPCC reports are used by search and artificial intelligence tools to ensure that the information generated is accessible and accurately reflected. This may require some partnerships with the leading companies. ○ There was a suggestion that the IPCC develops basic materials in digital formats for mobile devices. Asking for the entire report may, however, be challenging.
<p>Communications content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prioritise focus on communications approaches that are most useful to policymakers including using fewer abbreviations in the SPM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Focus should be placed on content that is useful to policymakers. For instance, communication of the cost of inaction as well as that of action and solution-oriented and actionable messaging. ● Short infographics, as done in the past, is very helpful. ● There is a need to keep working on developing tailored communications products and speaking to different audiences. ● The language used in the reports should be accessible and clear for the policymakers and understandable by the general public. ● Training for authors and communications officers in the TSUs on how to communicate, especially on the application for policy and actionability, is essential. ● High priority should be given to content for communication. Need to safeguard the integrity of the messages in the approved report communication and address the mismatch between communication and content. ● Consideration of developing clear messaging about gaps and confidence levels, as well as about the cost and trade-offs of the response measures as well as of the impacts. ● The IPCC should consider how it talks about scientific uncertainty publicly, since the term uncertainty is generally understood differently among the wider public, and it's often associated with not being sure about something.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While it is acknowledged that sometimes authors do need to elaborate on the science contained in the underlying reports, communications by authors should be consistent with approved text.
<p>Strategic communications planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the recommendations from the 2016 IPCC Expert Meeting on Communication and assess the need for an expert meeting on communications in AR7 and the need to engage specific communications experts. • Develop a strategy to leverage the strengths of a multimedia communications approach. • Assure the Copyright policy allows broad communication of IPCC findings (*also included under ORGANIZATION). • Develop a schedule/plan for outreach events. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many members highlighted the importance of ensuring the implementation of the recommendations of the 2016 IPCC Expert Meeting on Communication. • Need to consider updating the Copyright Policy since it limits the use of the figures and captions particularly in languages other than English. • Communication should not be an end in itself, not just for more visibility of the IPCC itself, but should also enable the various stakeholders to understand the contents and lead to increased policy relevance to facilitate informed policy decisions. • Need for strategic outreach plans with a focus on events that have clear objectives and measurable impact.
Longer Term Issues	
Topic	Comments/Decisions
<p>External communication and outreach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess opportunities to enhance stakeholder engagement including developing a targeted communication and outreach plan for specific groups including the public, youth, Indigenous groups, practitioners, research institutions, organizations and universities especially in developing countries. • Use multiple media approaches to tailor and communicate messages including developing short messages and video clips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TSU’s should produce an information note outlining how the IPCC process works and expectations from authors. • The start of the cycle provides an opportunity to build climate literacy. • Communication is important and should address different audiences and specific requirements. However, while doing so, it should be noted that customizing the communication to specific audiences is not in the IPCC mandate. Therefore, consider the potential other partners to support these types of efforts. This could also include consideration of how the IPCC can collaborate with other stakeholders to disseminate information to various audiences. Noting that this needs to be discussed in the context of the resources and budgets associated with the communications activities. • Consideration of how to leverage the National Focal Points to support engagement, communications and outreach to national audiences including the potential for developing a resource for new NFPs to understand and on-board into the role.

<p>that can be used on social media.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increase communication with governments, the scientific community and the public throughout the cycle on both content and process including updating fact sheets and providing webinars on how IPCC works and how to engage. ● Develop a plan and process to share products efficiently. ● Facilitate knowledge sharing through collaborations and partnerships to develop products. ● Enhance engagement with member countries in communication activities especially for outreach to national audiences. ● Develop approaches that help ensure greater inclusivity, representation and gender balance among those who are communicating on behalf of the IPCC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Need to clearly distinguish between external communication, including outreach and social media and internal communication regarding the direct products of the IPCC, such as abstracts, abbreviations, figures in IPCC reports. ● Consider the development of factsheets for Ministers, etc., as a readily accessible product.
<p>Communications content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increase information on the economic impacts of climate change in IPCC products. ● Improve communication around uncertainties in research findings and results and the limitations and confidence levels associated with scientific data in IPCC products. ● Increase emphasis in IPCC products on the solutions space. ● Make the SPM shorter (e.g. 10 pages) and more targeted to policymakers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There was general support for many of the bullet points of the proposed communication content, noting that the scoping will be shaping the content and that there was no need to do this also at the AGLL meetings. ● Increasing information on the economic impacts of climate change in IPCC products was pointed out as a crucial area, including the cost and trade-offs of the response measures. ● The focus should be on what is more useful, including the communication of the cost of inaction as well as that of action. There should continue to be solution-oriented and actionable messaging. ● There were different views on keeping the SPMs to 10 pages or focusing on ensuring that the SPMs are robust and well-rounded. It was also noted that SPMs should focus on solutions.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Assess options to manage and update information between reports (i.e., observed warming). ● Assess options to ensure that communication by authors is consistent with the approved text. ● Provide products in multiple languages in a timely manner. 	
Topics Addressed Elsewhere	
Topic	Comment/Decisions
<p>Issues noted but addressed through other agenda items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clarify usage of the logo on derivative/communication products and concerns regarding communications and usage of the logo (*also included under ORGANIZATION). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Views were expressed that the use of the IPCC logo should be restricted for Plenary-approved material. [Note: input of Legal Officer in previous Organisation meeting indicated that the logo was intended for use for IPCC business not just reports] ● While derivative products were found useful, concerns were raised regarding their communication, branding and disclaimers, especially as some of these materials were also available on the IPCC website. ● It is important to clearly differentiate between IPCC-approved material and material that's developed as derivative products under the oversight of the WGs/Co-Chairs/TSUs/authors. ● It should be clear that IPCC scientists working on derivative products do so in their personal capacity to avoid confusion with the IPCC products. ● There was an agreement on the need to discuss derivative products, including developing guidance. However, any guidelines on this should not set up another governmental review process for such derivative products.
<p>Issues noted but to be addressed by Bureau, Secretariat, TSU (without needed Panel decision)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Internal communication between authors and governments. ● Develop a plan for webinars during the review process including continuing to hold pre-meetings before the SPM approvals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Internal communications and engagement, especially with National Focal Points and Governments were recognized as highly important. Proactive and unified communication efforts for the WGs and especially for the TFI activities were encouraged. ● Posting documents and reports of IPCC meetings should be timely as per the IPCC Principles. ● The factsheets were appreciated, especially those on the work of the IPCC and these should be further developed and improved. ● There was support for interactive opportunities between governments and authors throughout the cycle that should not only aim to allow government

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan for interactive opportunities with authors throughout the cycle to help government representatives better understand the science and findings 	<p>representatives to understand the science better, but also to help make the reports more policy-relevant.</p>
--	--

Remarks and clarifications by the IPCC Chair and the IPCC Secretary

The IPCC Chair raised three main points:

- There is a **budget provision** for an expert meeting on communications. He called for the compilation of the results of these conversations to give guidance to the Bureau as to what kind of proposal for an expert meeting on communication could be brought forward. His personal preference is to have a meeting oriented towards communication with policymakers.
- It is possible to produce a more **focused SPM** and reduce the **length**, bearing in mind that the aspiration for a ten-page SPM would not be feasible. While making reference to the AR6, he noted that SYR SPM contained eight and a half pages of figures and footnotes. For instance, if the SPMs were ten pages, it would have left very little space for words. He advised that the issue of how to focus and structure the SPM could be a **topic to be tackled at an expert meeting** to seek convergence between National Focal Points and authors.
- Having **induction** for those who are new to the IPCC process, including Focal Points, Bureau members and TSUs is important.

The IPCC Secretary raised the following points:

- The framework of communications was **improved** in the sixth cycle, based also on the 2016 expert meetings recommendations. He emphasized the need to operate within the **framework of communications** as certain topics go beyond.
- The Secretariat is paying a lot of attention to the **induction, and there was a brochure being prepared and a pre-plenary briefing session for IPCC-61** that could be helpful, especially for new FPs, delegates, Bureau and TSU's members.
- The Secretariat issues a regular **newsletter** with the aim of improving internal communications.
- When discussing deliverables, it is important to associate all these **recommendations with the concrete capacity** that can be installed in terms of human resources, financial resources and the procedural aspects related to financial resources.

Next Steps

The Co-Chairs indicated that:

- The next AGLL session is scheduled for 22 May 2024 and will provide an **opportunity to raise any other issues** that the AGLL members consider not to have been substantially covered in the discussions about science, organization and communications.
- AGLL members are invited to provide written feedback, not only on communications but also on the list of the **top five priority issues** across all three topics already discussed by the AGLL. This feedback will help the Co-Chairs to organize the discussions at the next and final AGLL session and develop the **outline and structure** for the product for consideration by IPCC-61.

- The top five priorities are not bound to any sort of preference, but to help begin laying a clear **roadmap**.
- The Co-Chairs emphasized that their role was to ensure that a **fair and open conversation** is conducted and that there is **broad-scale and accurate reporting** back to the broader group through a **co-production exercise**.
- The Co-Chairs are to offer thoughts on **outlining and structuring the product** for presentation to IPCC-61.

**Fifth Meeting of the Ad Hoc Group on Lessons Learned (AGLL) from the Sixth Assessment Cycle
22/05/2024: 13.00 – 15.00 CEST (Teleconference)**

Facilitation

Co-Chairs of the AGLL: Ms Debra Roberts (South Africa); Ms Brittany Croll (United States of America)

Rapporteurs

Mr Mark Howden (Bureau Member); Mr Cromwel Lukorito (Bureau Member)

Participants

Members

Mr Manfred Ogris (Austria); Mr Bart Rymen; Jean-Pascal van Ypersele (Belgium); Ms Lesley Craig (Canada); Mr Lei Huang (China); Ms Echeverry Prieto Ghislaine (Colombia); Mr Radim Tolasz (Czech Republic), Ms Tina Christensen (Denmark); Mr Friedemann Call (Germany); Dr T. Jayaraman, Dr Tejal Kanitkar (India); Ms Azar Zarrin, Mr Mohammad Rahimi, Mr Mostafa Jafari (Iran); Ms Anna Pirani (Italy); Ms Aya Takatsuki, Ms Kasumi Hori, Ms Manami Oishi, Mr Koji Ohara, Mr Koki Sowa (Japan); Mr Andrew Ferrone, Ms Dana Lang (Luxembourg); Mr Rob van Dorland (Netherlands); Mr Ole-Kristian Kvissel, Mr Scott Randall, Ms Synne Brustad (Norway); Ms Yae Won OH (Republic of Korea); Mr Ayael AlQarni (Saudi Arabia); Ms Camilla Andersson (Sweden); Mr Sebastian Konig (Switzerland); Ms Jolene Cook, Ms Julie Maclean (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland); Mr Wilbert Timiza Muroke (United Republic of Tanzania); Mr Farhan Akhtar (United States of America).

Advisory Members

Mr Jim Skea (IPCC Chair); Mr Bart van den Hurk (Bureau member); Mr Eduardo Calvo (Bureau member), Ms Sonia Seneviratne (Bureau member).

Ms Gerrit Hansen (TSU WGI); Ms Melinda Tignor (TSU WGII).

Mr Abdalah Mokssit (IPCC Secretary); Ms Ermira Fida (IPCC Deputy Secretary); Ms Nina Peeva (IPCC Secretariat); Ms Jennifer Lew Schneider (IPCC Secretariat).

Meeting Notes

- The Co-Chair, Brittany Croll (BC) called the meeting to order.
- She acknowledged the written input received from members for the 4th session and apologized for the notes not being ready due to technical challenges.
- BC indicated that the intention of the 5th meeting is to cover items not previously addressed and to discuss the way forward in terms of a proposed outline for the AGLL Report to P61 and a tabular format for the views that had been expressed by members from the AGLL meetings and written input.
- The Co-Chairs observed that due to the limited written responses received on the initial request for “top 5” priorities, it was not possible to structure the discussion around that input.
- The Co-Chair Debra Roberts (DR) thanked the Rapporteurs and the Secretariat for the hard work done to date. She highlighted the need to focus on the identification of how best to take this AGLL process forward into the Plenary discussions in a balanced way.

- BC took members through the proposed outline of the report to the 61st Session of the IPCC IPCC- (IPCC-61) including the Background; Mandate of the AGLL; Approach and organisation of work; AGLL issues discussed (presented in tabular format); Expected outcomes of IPCC-P61/next steps; and Annex of the AGLL Discussion Notes.
- Some **general points** raised by members of the AGLL included:
 - The importance of getting the language right based on the mandate of the AGLL.
 - All views and discussions need to be captured.
 - Given the wide range of topics discussed there is the need to identify a manageable way forward that helps the plenary focus on issues that need a decision.
 - Highlight where resources (staff and financial) are needed now and by the end of the cycle.
 - Need to consult with Secretariat and Legal Officer when identifying responsibility for a particular action.

Proposed Outline for AGLL Report	
Proposed Outline	Comments/decisions
<p>Background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Summary of the lessons learned process up through the formation of the AGLL at P-60 <p>Mandate of AGLL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reminder of the mandate to the AGLL from P-60 <p>Ad Hoc Group on Lessons Learned Approach and Organization of Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Description of the AGLL process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How we split the topics for discussion ○ How many discussions were held ○ How information was captured 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There was general agreement that the proposed outline was a good basis for drafting with some wording edits as noted below. ● There was also general agreement that the AGLL discussions have been useful in increasing understanding across a range of issues among the group (while also noting that the group was not fully representative). ● A clarifying question was raised on the “expected outcome” section in order to understand what would be included in the section. ● The Co-Chairs clarified that the section would provide a high-level statement about the next steps for consideration at IPCC-61. ● There were also comments on the need to make sure the presentation of the AGLL input is manageable for the Plenary to consider especially given the wide-ranging discussions. ● It was also noted that there was a need for more issue-specific discussions (after IPCC-61) and some indicating the need for a standing agenda item. ● There were also comments on the need to retain flexibility in the IPCC process to enable decision making

<p>AGLL Recommendations for P-61</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tabular list of topics discussed during AGLL (proposed structure next slide) <p>Expected outcome of IPCC-61/Next steps</p> <p>Annex 1 Notes from AGLL Discussions</p>	<p>and the ability to respond to emerging topics and to avoid over complicating.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were also comments about avoiding having duplicative processes for considering issues.
<p>Proposed Tabular Format</p>	
<p>Topic</p>	<p>Comments/Decisions</p>
<p>Tabular Format</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note this list below includes the full range of views expressed. It was made clear that the table format suggested is indicative and that a distinction will be made between items that are already being acted upon and those where action is still required. • Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Recommendations” is not the appropriate term to use in the proposed AGLL report - should rather be seen as ‘Issues that the Panel needs to reflect on’ or “views expressed” and framed in relation to the mandate of AGLL. ○ Input should not be limited to IPCC-61 to ensure continuous improvement since the lessons learned are a “living” process. ○ Need a summary of inputs under the description of each item outlined in the table. ○ The written submissions should be the primary source of information used in the development of the AGLL report to IPCC-61. ○ There should be a note about whether the issue needs a change to the rules and procedures.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Timing:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ There were multiple views expressed on the need to include and how to frame “timing” for the Panel.○ Some noted that the issue of timing of action should not be discussed by AGLL as that is determined by the detailed planning/processes of the AR7 cycle.○ Others indicated that timing should embrace three categories (Underway, Near term/Urgent and Beyond IPCC-61). Most important is to identify urgent issues. ● Implementing body:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ There was concern about who was responsible for the implementation and that it is necessary to indicate where other bodies are needed to deliver the task.○ Guidance on implementation should come from the IPCC-61 since other members not represented in the AGLL may have their own views.○ Implementation could also indicate which agenda item the topic could be further discussed under instead of focusing on an organizational body.○ Care should be taken to avoid micro-management of IPCC by the Plenary vs what can be dealt with at the managerial level.○ “Implementing body” should be explicitly mentioned as whether it is the Panel, Bureau, TSU or IPCC Secretariat. NFPs should also be considered in terms of implementation. ● Budget:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Acknowledge that budget implications are key, and that there is need to indicate which items trigger/signal the need for budget discussions.○ Budget issues should be handled as a process discussion.○ AGLL is not mandated to do a detailed review of budget.○ Budget implications need to be considered by FITT.○ It was also noted that there were requirements beyond financial resources such as human resources and potential process changes that could be indicated.
--	--

<p>Questions for consideration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are “science”, “organization”, and “communications” useful to retain in the report? • Does this format enable effective consideration by the Panel? • Are there any other columns needed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science, organization and communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There were multiple views from members on the value of retaining the categories for the report. The emphasis was to make the content easy to navigate, which the categories help with. The use of icons or abbreviations was also suggested as a way of ordering information. ○ Clarity was sought on what needs to be addressed by the Plenary or that can be dealt with by other mechanisms (Bureau, Secretariat, TSUs etc.) on an ongoing basis. ○ The Co-Chairs indicated that they would be happy to receive any further submissions as they relate to members’ top- five priorities and based on the input the Co-Chairs would consider how to best use the information.
<p>Timeline for Document Development</p>	
<p>Topic</p>	<p>Comment/Decisions</p>
<p>Key considerations guiding the timeline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide sufficient time for review and input from AGLL • Responsive to document deadline for IPCC-61 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline for the report should reflect the additional workload for the Secretariat in preparing for the 67th Session of the IPCC Bureau (30-31 May 2024) and SBS60(3-13 June 2024).
<p>Proposed timeline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 7- Co-Chairs first draft shared with AGLL • June 17- comments due from AGLL • June 20- Co-Chairs incorporate comments • June 21- Co-Chairs submit document to Secretariat <p><i>NOTE: Potential to convene final AGLL meeting to discuss draft/comments (likely week of June 17)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written input by members of the AGLL to be received May 29. • The Co-Chairs supported by the Secretariat and Rapporteurs to prepare a first draft and share it with AGLL. • Some asked for an extension to the timeline given other overlapping meetings. The slides were revised to extend the review time for members from 14th to 17th June 2024.

Remarks by the IPCC Chair

- Agreed that the first column in the proposed table referring to “Recommendations” should be changed to either topics or lessons to indicate how the issues will be taken forward.
- Emphasized that the consideration of lessons learned is not starting from a blank slate- many actions to improve the process are already being implemented and/or fall under existing mandates.
- Indicated that there will be a new agenda item on progress reports by the Chair, IPCC Vice-Chairs, and the Secretariat to enhance visibility and accountability. This could be a place where issues identified by the AGLL can be reported on.