

SIXTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE IPCC
Bangkok, Thailand, 24 to 27 March 2026

IPCC-LXIV/Doc. 6, Corr. 1¹
(16.III.2026)
Agenda Item: 4
ENGLISH ONLY

REVIEW OF IPCC PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

(Submitted by the Secretary of the IPCC)

¹ This corrigendum is issued to correct a typo in the spelling of the name of a Bureau member.

REVIEW OF IPCC PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

1. Introduction

The objective of this document is to inform discussions under agenda item 4, with reference to the IPCC Principles themselves, which specify a regular review.

2. Background

The Principles Governing IPCC Work (hereafter referred to as the principles'), comprising 19 Principles and three Appendices, contain information about the IPCC's role, organization, participation, and procedures. The Principles stipulate that they shall be reviewed at least every five years and amended as appropriate.² Previous reviews have also resulted in decisions taken with respect to governance and management, including the Terms of Reference of IPCC bodies such as the Bureau or Executive Committee.

Since the adoption of the first set of principles in 1991, the Principles themselves have been amended twice, in 1998 and 2013.³ The Appendices have been amended as necessary, most recently with an amendment to Appendix C in 2022.⁴ Additionally, the Panel recognizes an established practice of reviewing parts of the Principles, including its three Appendices, whenever needed.⁵ A chronology of Panel action related to the IPCC Principles as well as policies is set out in **Annex I**.

Following media scrutiny of errors in the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report, an independent InterAcademy Council (IAC) review was requested, leading to amendments in report preparation procedures, uncertainty evaluation, error protocols, governance, financial processes, and communications strategy.⁶

Additionally, the Panel conducted selective amendments to the Principles throughout the AR6 cycle and initiated a stipulated review in 2020 at its Fifty-second Session, mandating the Bureau to consider plenary views and present recommendations. These amendments included adoption of a [Decision Pathway](#) for consideration of requests from researchers for access to information and meetings, [replacement of Annex B of the COI policy](#) as well as a subsequent [revision of the same Annex, an amendment to Annex B of Appendix C on the size, structure and composition of the IPCC Bureau and any Task Force Bureau](#) for the seventh assessment cycle, and [adoption of the GAT policy and implementation plan](#).⁷

The Bureau Sessions were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, with virtual deliberations and written submissions. Plenary views from P-52 were compiled for Bur-58 ([BUR-LVIII/Doc. 3](#)) for consideration. The Bureau added further views which were compiled and presented to Bur-59 as [Doc. 3 - Review of Principles Gov. IPCC Work.pdf](#). A document comprising all these views was prepared for submission to the Panel, which also contained views on the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic and concerns on obstacles to in-person meetings.

Plenary sessions were impacted by circumstances related to the COVID-19 pandemic, with the result that the Panel at its 53rd(bis) Session decided to withdraw the agenda item on review of Principles Governing IPCC Work, following discussions that the outstanding review of the principles should be reserved for an in-person session.

² Principle 16 of the Principles Governing IPCC Work.

³ Fifth Session of the IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 13-15 March 1991; Fourteenth Session of the IPCC, Vienna, Austria, 1-3 October 1998; Thirty-Seventh Session of the IPCC, Batumi, Georgia, 14-18 October 2013.

⁴ Fifty-seventh Session of the IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 27-30 September 2022.

⁵ Forty-Seventh Session of the IPCC, Paris, France, 13-16 March 2018.

⁶ Thirty-Third Session of the IPCC, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 10-13 May 2011; Thirty-fourth Session of the IPCC, Kampala, Uganda, 18-19 November 2011; Thirty-fifth Session of the IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 6-9 June 2012.

⁷ Decision IPCC/XLIII-13; Decision IPCC/XLIV-3; Decision IPCC-LXI-10; Decision IPCC-LVII-5; Decision IPCC-LII-6.

3. Rationale for current review and steps taken

Noting the last review was to have taken place in 2020, and recognizing the unavoidable delay, the next scheduled review would have been in 2025.

The Chair of the IPCC in collaboration with the Secretariat has collected initial views on possible elements for consideration. These are intended to provide advice to the Panel on aspects of the principles which have proved difficult to interpret or have proved challenging to put into practice.

An initial solicitation of views at the ExCom level was initiated by the Chair at the Committee's 138th meeting. After a productive discussion, the Chair requested ExCom members to provide their perspectives on potential elements for consideration in the review of the Principles and Procedures, with the aim of obtaining a broad, unfiltered range of views. These views were submitted by ExCom members, subsequently compiled by the Secretariat, and presented to the Bureau at its Seventieth Session (Geneva, 26-27 February 2026) for input and prioritization relevant to Bureau's Terms of Reference.

4. Review: past practice context

For past practice context in the review considerations, **Annex II** provides a narrative overview of the review processes employed during the AR5 and AR6 cycles, setting out different approaches, including government-led task groups, focused contact groups, and informal consultations, that have been employed to address various aspects of Principles review. These precedents may inform decisions on the most appropriate approach for the current review.

5. Prioritization of compiled topics and recommendations

The IPCC Bureau at its Seventieth session undertook discussions around the compiled views of Executive Committee members that were organized under non-prescriptive task-related clusters, prioritizing 12 of the topics considered. The Bureau differentiated topics with clear support and/or under Bureau purview for advice and observations, from topics under Panel-level mandate or governance. Comments were taken both during the session and in writing one week later, following the request of two Bureau members for additional time for the review of the topics presented to the Bureau. Annex III documents individual views expressed divided into three groups: those prioritized by the Bureau; those that were not prioritized; and those that were subsequently submitted by individual Bureau members and were not discussed collectively. All prioritized topics along with comments raised during the Bureau Session are set out in **Annex III**. Additional comments on non-prioritized topics appear in **Annex IV**. Comments received in writing after the Session appear in **Annex V**.

The prioritized topics under the clusters with Bureau observations are as follows:

Selection of Experts:

1. *Author selection criteria*: Existing criteria could apply to Review Editors. Additional criteria could cover intra-regional balance, early career researchers, age and career stage, or diversity of knowledge systems and socioeconomic views. These would be applied uniformly across all Working Groups.
2. *Author selection (responsibility)*: It is not clear whether author selection lies with the Working Group Bureaux (Appendix A section 4.3.2), or collectively with the IPCC Bureau (Terms of Reference paragraph 4).
3. *Chapter scientists*: Chapter scientists (CS) have no formal standing; CS offer potential for capacity building and addressing geographical imbalances, but it is not clear if CS are an extension of the TSU or represent a distinct category.

Assessment of Literature:

4. *Scope of literature/Indigenous Knowledge and local knowledge (IK&LK):* There is no guidance as to how IK/LK could be incorporated while ensuring that any expanded scope must remain within the agreed outlines of each Working Group.

Review of Drafts:

5. *Review editors – selection criteria and responsibilities:* selection criteria need to address inconsistencies in numbers, and conflicts of institutional or geographical overlap with author teams. REs could also be more actively tasked with identifying expert reviewers and organizing group reviews to manage growing comment volumes.

Governance and Finance as relevant for the Bureau:

6. *Terms of reference for Chair, Vice Chairs, WG Co-Chairs:* There are no formal TORs for they Chair or Vice-Chairs, including with respect to the formulation of the work programme.
7. *TSU Terms of Reference:* TSU TORs could include an explicit role in promoting inclusivity during workshops and lead author meetings.
8. *Developing country engagement and broader finance concerns:* Suggestions for enhancing developing country participation covered attendance at approval sessions, for example through additional delegates, extra days, more affordable travel options, and limits on delegation sizes that currently make hosting approval plenaries in developing countries logistically impossible.

Policies and Protocols:

9. *Carbon footprint and inclusivity:* IPCC could report on its own carbon footprint and develop an emissions reduction plan; an option is to make hybrid participation the default format rather than requiring consensus to enable it for individual meetings.
10. *Artificial intelligence:* Operational guidance on procedures and practices is needed; there was strong consensus at the February 2026 Methods of Assessment Meeting that some type of standing body is needed to develop and revise such guidance in the light of a rapidly evolving landscape.
11. *Copyright:* IPCC originally adopted the WMO policy which has been updated to a Creative Commons license that limits adaptation; IPCC could consider re-alignment with WMO.
12. *Conflict of Interest – timing and guidance:* The timing of the submission of forms, whether at the nomination or selection stage, may need considered, while recognising implications for developing country nominees. More clarity on the definition of conflicts of interest, who has access to forms, and actions, apart from exclusion, to resolve COI would help.

6. Discussion points and next steps

The Panel is invited to:

- Consider the summary of topics as presented in this document;
- Offer perspectives, including on further identifying topics that require attention by the Panel;
- Recommend ways of moving forward on this agenda item.

IPCC Principles and Procedures
Chronology of review actions

Year	Session	Topic and Panel action	Review/development and drafting process
1991	IPCC-5	Principles: adopted (Decision in 5th Session report)	
1996	IPCC-11	Procedures on preparation of Technical Papers: adopted (Decision in 11th Session report)	Bureau proposal to Panel
1996	IPCC-12	Financial procedures: adopted (Decision in 12th Session report)	
1998	IPCC-14	Principles: amended (to align with WMO/UN practice) (Decision in 14th Session report)	Ad-Hoc Group on Procedures, established by Bureau
1999	IPCC-15	Procedures for preparation, review, acceptance, adoption, approval and publication of IPCC Reports: adopted (Decision in 15th Session report)	Ad-Hoc Group on Procedures
2003	IPCC-20	Initiation of stipulated review per IPCC Principles	Bureau Ad-Hoc Group, to present at IPCC-21
2003	IPCC-21	Election procedures proposed	Open-ended Task Group, jointly chaired, to prepare revised proposal (of IPCC Vice Chair initial proposal) at IPCC-24
	IPCC-21	Principles: solely editorial changes as final outcome of review	Bureau Ad-Hoc Group
2005	IPCC-24	Election procedures: need for further work to resolve divergent views	In-session Contact Group based on Task Group, to present at IPCC-25
	IPCC-24	Observer organization policy: need for revised proposal	Secretariat, to revise and present at IPCC-25
2006	IPCC-25	Election procedures: adopted (Decision in Annex 2 of Session report)	
	IPCC-25	Observer organization policy: adopted (Decision in Annex 2 of Session report)	

Year	Session	Topic and Panel action	Review/development and drafting process
	IPCC-25	Terms of Reference of the IPCC (review per WMO Congress invitation)	Task Group, to present at IPCC-26
2007	IPCC-26	IPCC Terms of Reference: conclusion that no revision necessary (Approval in Annex 3 of Session report)	
2008	IPCC-28	Initiation of stipulated review per IPCC Principles: confirmation no revision necessary (Conclusion in Session report)	
2008	IPCC-29	Procedures: Appendix A Decision Framework and preparation and review of Technical Papers: revisions adopted (Decision in Annex 5 of Session report)	Member State proposal, considered by the Panel
	IPCC-29	Policy on Admitting Observer Organizations: proposal for enhanced status for the EU (Proposal in Annex 6 of Session report)	In-session Contact Group
2009	IPCC-31	Observer Organization Policy: enhanced status for the EU amendment of Observer Policy (Decision in Session report)	Task Group
2010	IPCC-32	InterAcademy Council (IAC) recommendations: decisions to implement some recommendations; to establish ToRs and workplans for Task Groups on other issues (Decisions of 32nd Session of IPCC)	Contact Groups on Procedures, Management and Governance, Conflict of Interest Policy, Communications Strategy
2011	IPCC-33	Procedures: established Executive Committee with ToRs and length of term; approved ToRs for Bureau (Decisions of 33rd Session of IPCC)	Open-ended in-session Contact Groups, for further development of Task Group recommendations

Year	Session	Topic and Panel action	Review/development and drafting process
2011	IPCC-34	Procedures: Appendix A procedures for preparation, review, acceptance, adoption, approval and publication of Reports, with annexes 1, 2, 3: revisions adopted. (Decisions of 34th Session of IPCC)	In-session Contact Group to further develop Task Group recommendations
	IPCC-34	Procedures: Appendix B to align with financial regulations of WMO: revisions adopted. (Decisions of 34th Session of IPCC)	Financial Task Team in coordination with WMO Representative
	IPCC-34	Governance and Management: Conflict-of-Interest Policy – implementation procedures and disclosure form: adopted (Decisions of 34th Session of IPCC)	In-session Contact Group, to further develop Task Group recommendations
2012	IPCC-35	Communications Strategy: adopted (Decisions of 35th Session of IPCC)	External consultant; Sub-committee of the Executive Committee; Bureau; in-session Contact Group
	IPCC-35	Governance and Management: Conflict-of-Interest Policy – Method of Working: approved (Decisions of 35th Session of IPCC)	Conflict-of-Interest Committee
	IPCC-35	Procedures: Appendix A on IPCC observer organizations invited to encourage experts to participate in government/expert review stage: revision approved (Decisions of 35th Session of IPCC)	In-session Contact Group
	IPCC-35	Procedures: Appendix C Annex B, Bureau composition, IPCC as members of WMO and UN: revisions adopted (Decisions of 35th Session of IPCC)	In-session Contact Group

Year	Session	Topic and Panel action	Review/development and drafting process
	IPCC-35	Governance and Management: Terms of Reference of Secretariat, Technical Support Units: revision approved (Decisions of 35th Session of IPCC)	Task Group on Governance and Management, WMO and UNEP representatives
2013	IPCC-37	Principles: convening Bureau Sessions through electronic means: Principle 14 amended (Decisions of 37th Session of IPCC)	Bureau, Executive Committee
	IPCC-37	Procedures: Appendix A, Annex 3 on Error Protocol on deadlines: amendment approved (Decisions of 37th Session of IPCC)	Executive Committee
2015	IPCC-41	Procedures: Appendix A, Annex B on size of the Bureau: amended (Decisions of 41st Session of IPCC)	In-session open-ended Contact Group
2016	IPCC-43	Decision pathway for consideration of requests from researcher for access to information and meetings: adopted (Decisions of 43rd Session of IPCC)	Executive Committee, Expert Meeting on Potential Studies of the IPCC Process, IPCC Secretariat
	IPCC-44	Governance and Management: Conflict-of-Interest Policy – revised Annex B to COI Policy adopted ; Implementation Procedures, Method of Working: amended (Decisions of 44th Session of IPCC)	Sub-committee of the Conflict-of-Interest Committee, Bureau
2020	IPCC-52	Gender Policy and Implementation Plan: adopted (Decision IPCC-LII-6)	Task Group
	IPCC-52	Consideration of stipulated review per IPCC Principles	Informal contact group for consultations; Bureau to consider summary of views from plenary and contact group and make recommendations to the Panel at IPCC-53

Year	Session	Topic and Panel action	Review/development and drafting process
2022	IPCC-57	Procedures : Appendix C, Annex B, Bureau composition amended (Decision IPCC-LVII-5)	Ad-Hoc Group, Secretariat
2024	IPCC-61	Governance and Management : Conflict-of-Interest Policy – revised Annex B adopted (Decision IPCC-LXI-10)	Sub-committee of the Conflict-of-Interest Committee

Review of the IPCC Principles and Procedures in AR5 and AR6

Overview

This Annex provides an overview of process modalities that have been employed in past reviews of the Principles Governing IPCC work. It outlines the different collaborative structures historically used by the Panel—including task groups, contact groups, informal consultations, and Bureau engagement—from cases from the AR5 and AR6 cycles. This information is intended to contribute to considerations during discussions on elements to be reviewed.

Process Models: Task Groups, Contact Groups, Informal Consultations, Bureau

The Panel has historically employed different collaborative structures for reviewing and amending the Principles:

Task Groups and Ad-Hoc Groups have been used for in-depth work requiring more time and detailed development of recommendations. Task groups and ad-hoc groups have often worked intersessionally.

Contact Groups have been employed for focused work on specific issues, often to develop detailed proposals based on task group recommendations or to address particular elements requiring immediate attention. Contact groups have often worked intensively during Panel sessions.

Informal Consultations have been used for preliminary discussions in session margins, allowing for flexible exchange of views before more formal deliberations.

Bureau has been mandated to provide considered input through in-session work and in ad-hoc groups to stipulated reviews of the Principles.

AR5 Cycle: The InterAcademy Council Review (2010-2012)

In 2010, following media scrutiny of errors in the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and IPCC Chair Dr. R.K. Pachauri jointly requested an independent review by the InterAcademy Council (IAC). The review was considered by the Panel at its 32nd Session.

Additional input to Panel alongside IAC outcomes by an Informal Task Group

Prior to finalization of the IAC review, the IPCC Chair convened a separate informal task group to consider a limited number of topics and provide suggestions.⁸ While considerable overlap existed between the IAC terms of reference and the task group's topics, the informal task group focused on short-term implementation steps that could be taken before Panel decisions on IAC recommendations, to avoid any prejudice to the independence of the review.⁹ The outcomes of the informal task group were presented to the Panel along with the report and recommendations by IAC.

Contact Groups and Task Groups

Following presentation of the IAC report and recommendations at the 32nd Session, the Panel formed contact groups covering the main topic areas.¹⁰ These contact groups were supported by a smaller drafting group and met over three days. Contact groups reported back to the Panel with proposed ways forward, leading to immediate implementation of several IAC recommendations.¹¹

⁸ The informal group consisted of a Co-Chair from each Working Group, two IPCC Vice-Chairs, head of WGII TSU and the IPCC Secretary; with its work taking place in light of the proposed independent review by IAC and following discussions that indicated that there might be a number of improvements that could be implemented without waiting for the outcome of the review.

⁹ See IPCC-XXXII/INF.4.

¹⁰ IPCC Management and Governance, Conflict of Interest Policy, Communications Strategy, and IPCC Procedures.

¹¹ Decisions taken by the Panel at its 33rd Session, Abu Dhabi, 10-13 May 2011.

For other recommendations requiring more extensive work, the Panel established four task groups with specific terms of reference and workplans.¹² The task groups were mandated to prepare draft decisions with a view to completing their work by the 33rd Session.¹³

At the 33rd Session, the Panel established contact groups to further develop task group recommendations. Three task groups had their mandates extended to continue work until the 34th Session, reflecting decisions taken at the 33rd Session and finalizing pending issues. The Panel finalized revisions on procedures, governance and management, and conflict-of-interest policy at the 34th and 35th Sessions.

The IA^C review led to developments and amendments in several areas: procedures for preparation, review, acceptance, adoption, and approval of reports; guidance on evaluation and treatment of uncertainty; protocol for addressing errors in reports; governance and management of the IPCC; financial and election processes; conflict-of-interest policy; and communications strategy.

AR6 Cycle: Preparing for Elections and Stipulated Review (2013-2021)

Task Group and Contact Group on Bureau Composition

The Panel at its 37th Session mandated a Task Group to develop options and recommendations on the organization of the IPCC, among other matters. The Task Group solicited options from member governments, producing recommendations that were presented to the Panel. Based on these recommendations, the Panel at its 41st Session established an open-ended Contact Group to address composition and regional representation of the Bureau. The contact group's work led to a Panel decision to amend the Principles on Procedures for Elections, increasing regional representation and the overall size of the Bureau.¹⁴

Review followed by selective amendment

At its 47th Session, in considering the scope of work for a task group on the IPCC's future work in light of the global stocktake, the Panel agreed that it had established a practice of reviewing and amending parts of the Principles as needed, with a possible next comprehensive review scheduled for 2020.¹⁵

Informal consultation in margins of Session, with follow-up by Bureau

At its 52nd Session, in alignment with the stipulated five-year review cycle, the Panel agreed to an informal consultation in the margins of the session. The consultation addressed how to initiate the review process, the appropriate timeframe, and which elements might require review and possible amendment. The Secretariat was requested to prepare a collated summary of views expressed for consideration and input by the Bureau, to be presented to the Panel at its 53rd Session.¹⁶

The Bureau considered the collated summary of Panel views on possible elements to review and ways of conducting the review. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, deliberations took place virtually with written submissions. The Bureau identified elements for review in all aspects of the Principles as well as proposals for postponement in view of COVID-19 constraints. In preparing a report to the Panel, the Bureau recognized the past precedent of task groups mandated by the Panel and led by government representatives.

In-person session for Panel review consideration

At the electronic session IPCC-53(bis) in 2021, the Panel agreed to withdraw the agenda item on review of Principles Governing IPCC Work, following discussions that Panel consideration of a review should not occur in an electronic session but should be reserved for an in-person session.

¹² See Decisions taken by the Panel at its 32nd Session, Busan, Republic of Korea, 11-14 October 2010; evaluation of IPCC assessment processes, evaluation of evidence and treatment of uncertainty, governance and management, conflict of interest policy, communications strategy.

¹³ 1) Procedures, 2) Governance and Management, 3) Conflict of Interest Policy and 4) Communications Strategy.

¹⁴ Decision IPCC/XLI-4. FUTURE WORK OF THE IPCC, para. 12; see Annex I.

¹⁵ Forty-Seventh Session of the IPCC, note 11.

¹⁶ Decision IPCC-LII-7. Review of the Principles Governing IPCC Work.

Cluster I: Selection of experts

Cluster I Topic(s) to forward

Author selection criteria

1. Selection criteria as written apply to CLAs and LAs but should be clarified to explicitly cover Review Editors, who serve a different function representing expert review rather than authorship. (K.Saudi Arabia)(Şiir Kilkis)
2. Intra-regional balance should be considered, including the possibility of giving priority to chapter scientists from underrepresented regions to address remaining imbalances. (Şiir Kilkis)
3. Criteria should be consistently applied across all Working Groups, with intra-regional considerations clearly stipulated. (Kenya)
4. Early career researcher criteria should be applied consistently across all Working Groups, not just those that have already adopted them. (Aida Diongue) (Ladislaus Chang'a)
5. Intra-regional balance should be grouped together with age and career stage balance, given that the vast majority of report impacts will be lived by younger generations. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
6. The role of the GAT in advising on and implementing the gender strategy should be formalized, as it has been a good practice in this cycle. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
7. The full range of scientific, technical, and socioeconomic views and expertise must be included; covering only one side risks dangerous sectarianism; Bureau meetings should be more scientific than bureaucratic so members understand which views are being missed. (Eduardo Calvo)
8. The diversity of knowledge systems should be explicitly captured in the criteria, consistent with recent workshop deliberations, with much greater explicitness than at present. (Ramón Pichs Madruga)
9. The tension between regional representation and expertise can be addressed through sub-criteria to avoid repeated concerns into the cycle and beyond. (Cromwell Lukorito)

Author selection (responsibility)

10. Genuine confusion exists in the current cycle about whether responsibility for author selection lies with individual WG Bureaux or the IPCC Bureau collectively. (IPCC Chair)
11. Different interpretations have been placed on this question by different Bureau members throughout the cycle. (IPCC Chair)
12. Inconsistencies should be removed to avoid the situation that has persisted to the present and to provide clarity for future Bureau members. (Ramón Pichs Madruga)

Chapter Scientists

13. Formal recognition of chapter scientists is needed, including their potential role in capacity building and in addressing intra-regional imbalances through geographical representation. (Şiir Kilkis)
14. The role must be well stipulated and articulated in the principles. (Kenya)
15. Formalizing chapter scientists is important because it simultaneously addresses funding, capacity building, youth engagement, and inclusivity, and is most likely to address concerns raised across expert meetings. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
16. A fundamental question must be resolved: are chapter scientists an extension of TSU as originally implemented in AR5, or a new category to be selected like authors? They carry no word “author” anywhere, and if they are purely TSU extensions no further elaboration is needed; if they are something beyond that, the Panel needs to reflect on it. (Eduardo Calvo)
17. Chapter scientists currently have no standing whatsoever in the principles and procedures. (IPCC Chair)
18. End-to-end institutionalization of every actor in report production, including chapter scientists, is needed to enhance credibility and avoid endless appeals; the Bureau should take control of the process rather than leaving it entirely to CLAs and LAs. (Cromwell Lukorito)

Cluster II: Assessment of literature

Cluster II Topic(s) to forward

Scope of literature/Indigenous and Local Knowledge (IK&LK)

19. Support for inclusion of IK&LK, consistent with workshop discussions and with scientific merit. (Şiir Kilkis)
20. The workshop reached consensus on this matter, making it worth bringing forward to the Panel. (Şiir Kilkis)
21. Inclusion must remain within the agreed outlines of each Working Group; an open-ended umbrella approach without limits is a concern. (K. Saudi Arabia)

Cluster III: Review of drafts

Cluster III Topic(s) to forward

Review editors: selection criteria and responsibilities

22. Inconsistency exists in the number of review editors, and selection criteria must be discussed alongside numbers, given the chapter count in AR7 exceeds what WG members can cover. (Şiir Kilkis)
23. Criteria should address cases where review editors come from the same countries or institutions as CLAs or lead authors; geographical balance and same-institution avoidance are more important than numbers alone. (Şiir Kilkis)
24. The current description refers only to “government review” when in practice it is “government and expert review”; the table presented to the Panel should reflect both, and experts should be able to continue reviewing drafts even during meetings. (Şiir Kilkis)
25. Review editors could usefully be tasked with identifying expert reviewers to ensure full expertise coverage, especially for topics with low confidence or lower levels of agreement. (Şiir Kilkis)
26. Review editors could organize group reviews on targeted topics to manage the volume of comments while maintaining quality. (Şiir Kilkis)

Cluster IV: Governance and Finance (as relevant for Bureau)

Cluster IV Topic(s) to forward

Terms of Reference for Chair, Vice-Chairs, WG Co-Chairs

27. ToR for Chair, Vice Chairs, and WG Co-Chairs should be clarified; Vice Chairs currently have virtually no defined role beyond communication. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
28. Vice Chairs should be added to the work programme formulation process. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)

TSU Terms of Reference

29. TSU Terms of Reference should include the role of TSUs in upholding inclusivity during workshops and lead author meetings. (Şiir Kilkis)
30. Clarity is needed on the balance between the IPCC Bureau's scientific and operational roles. (Şiir Kilkis)
31. The Panel should consider contingency planning for cases where approval plenary consensus is not reached, as this is currently a void in the principles and procedures. (Şiir Kilkis)

Developing Country engagement and broader finance concerns

32. Developing country participation in approval sessions needs to be increased, including allowing one additional participant and additional days given contact group demands and session overruns. (Noureddine Yassaa) (Malak Nory)
33. Travel mechanism modalities need to be addressed; the cheapest and most direct routes are often unavailable, directly affecting participation. (Ladislaus Chang'a)
34. Increasing representation of developing countries in final approval sessions is a major concern that must be included. (Malak Nory) (Ladislaus Chang'a)
35. Approval plenaries require consideration of delegation sizes; very large delegations make it logistically impossible to host approval plenaries in developing countries, which is a matter of fairness. (Eduardo Calvo)
36. An emergency reserve day for approval plenaries should be built in to ensure developing country participation. (Eduardo Calvo)

Cluster V: Policies and Protocols; COI, Error Protocol

Cluster V Topics to forward

Climate Friendliness and Inclusivity

37. Win-win strategies should optimize both climate-friendly operations and inclusivity; remote participation and joint LAM meetings demonstrate reduced emissions alongside increased participation. (Şiir Kilkis)
38. Light-touch joint activities during lead author meetings of different Working Groups could replicate the positive experience of the joint LAM meeting. (Şiir Kilkis)
39. IPCC should report on its own CO2 budget and work to reduce its footprint, given its own AR6 conclusions. (Sonia Seneviratne) (Robert Vautard) (Oliver Geden)
40. Hybrid should become the default format with opt-out rather than requiring consensus to go hybrid; this serves both inclusivity and climate goals. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
41. Some authors are unwilling to fly and this must be accommodated, for inclusivity reasons. (Robert Vautard)
42. Inclusivity is the real keyword alongside climate friendliness; both should be treated together. (Eduardo Calvo)
43. IPCC should have a climate plan; it cannot call for action from others without having one. (Sonia Seneviratne) (Robert Vautard) (Oliver Geden)
44. Not all climate friendliness and inclusivity decisions require Panel action; some are within Bureau scope. (IPCC Chair)

Artificial Intelligence

45. AI is extremely important: the expert meeting raised many important issues and guidance is urgently needed. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz) (Eduardo Calvo) (Ladislaus Chang'a)
46. Any use of AI for IPCC should first be specifically agreed upon as a safeguard; UN-endorsed principles provide a useful starting framework. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
47. AI needs to be tackled at Panel level. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz) (Oliver Geden) (Edvin Aldrian)
48. The NEMA meeting distinguished between UN principles for appropriate AI use, where there was some consensus, and operational implementation, where agreement was harder; the Panel should give at least directional guidance toward elaborating operations. (Bart van den Hurk)
49. Caution is needed given how rapidly the field is moving and how much remains unresolved. (Edvin Aldrian)
50. Recommended to await the report of the Methods of Assessment meeting before operationalizing. (IPCC Chair)

Copyright

51. IPCC's copyright notice was adopted from WMO but WMO has since updated its policy to include a specific Creative Commons license; IPCC should consider to align. (IPCC Chair)

- 52. Translation into another language does not constitute adaptation. (IPCC Chair)
- 53. Any modification to an IPCC figure takes it out of context; “adapted from IPCC” is acceptable wording but calling a modified figure an IPCC figure is problematic; any copyright message must be carefully crafted to avoid triggering unnecessary plenary debate. (Eduardo Calvo)
- 54. Any policy must be practicable in the real world; current compliance with IPCC figure usage worldwide is very low. (Robert Vautard)
- 55. Language barriers make compliance particularly difficult for non-European language users. (Edvin Aldrian)
- 56. Guidance should be realistic and aim for practicable implementation. (Germany)

Conflict of Interest: Timing and Guidance

On timing

- 57. Requiring COI forms at nomination stage is supported by several Bureau members; discovering a COI after author team selection is extremely disruptive given the complex interdependencies of team composition. (Sonia Seneviratne) (Robert Vautard)
- 58. Bureau members themselves submitted COI forms at nomination stage, establishing a precedent that should apply consistently. (Sonia Seneviratne) (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
- 59. Early submission is particularly important for Panel members applying to be lead authors, so they can clarify in advance what they would relinquish. (Kenya) (Robert Vautard)
- 60. Early submission allows management letters to be written before selection and avoids placing pressure on Bureau members when a delegate applies for authorship. (Robert Vautard)
- 61. Early submission is opposed by others on grounds of impracticality given thousands of nominees; risk of early disqualification based on sector rather than merit; particular disadvantage to developing country nominees. (K. Saudi Arabia) (Malak Nory) (Ladislaus Chang’a) (Nourredine Yassaa)
- 62. Including clear COI guidance statements in nomination calls, rather than requiring full forms at nomination stage, would provide the information benefit without the barrier. (Cromwell Lukorito) (Ladislaus Chang’a) (Nourredine Yassaa)
- 63. Early forms may create barriers for developing country experts for whom participation is already challenging; COI statements in nomination calls are preferred by several Bureau members. (Ladislaus Chang’a) (Nourredine Yassaa) (Malak Nory)
- 64. There is divergence of opinion on timing; this divergence should be reported honestly to the Panel. (IPCC Chair)
- 65. Timing and guidance are related: early submission implies exclusion as the only resolution while later submission enables other resolution mechanisms. (IPCC Chair)

Guidance

- 66. Clarity is urgently needed about what happens once something is identified on a COI form; current process is opaque. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz) (Oliver Geden)

67. Panel guidance is needed on a transparent, coordinated, equitable process across Working Groups and bodies; current practices differ significantly producing inequitable treatment. (Sonia Seneviratne) (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
68. Homogenization across IPCC is needed; the COI Committee could be extended to cross-WG cases to ensure consistent treatment. (Sonia Seneviratne)
69. More guidance and clarity are needed to make the process work effectively; this was the point of clear consensus in the Bureau. (IPCC Chair)

Non-prioritized topics by cluster

Cluster I: Selection of experts -Topics not to forward to Panel

Mid-Cycle Additions to LA and CLA Pools

- Could be implemented through practice by retaining flexibility at the formal selection stage for a secondary additional step, without requiring rule changes. (Bart van den Hurk)
- Happens in practice already and does not need a change to the actual principles. (IPCC Chair)

Withdrawn

- Withdrawn by the Chair as originator since they referred to undertakings to conduct reviews that were never actually undertaken. (IPCC Chair)
- Left to one side as the Panel chose not to undertake them. (IPCC Chair)

Contributing Authors: no change proposed

- Question raised about how the Bureau can ensure regional and intra-regional representation among contributing authors. (Noureddine Yassaa)
- Existing principles state that contributing authors are enlisted by author teams without any reference to overall balance; no change proposed. (IPCC Chair)

Other (literature/grey literature)

- Gaps in quality assurance and quality control procedures, capacity disparities across countries, and inconsistent application of uncertainty guidelines across chapters were raised but fell outside the scope of the cluster topics and were not proposed for forwarding. (Edvin Aldrian)

Cluster II: Assessment of literature - Topics not to forward to Panel

IK/LK materials

- Included in #7 (IPCC Chair)

Technical papers

- Deleting the technical papers as defined would reduce IPCC's flexibility for cases where an objective international scientific perspective is essential. (Şiir Kilkış) (Eduardo Calvo)
- Possible future uses may not yet be recognized; deletion would be premature. Şiir Kilkış) (Eduardo Calvo)
- The absence of technical papers in recent cycles does not mean they are unnecessary; the potential for their use remains, particularly in current circumstances. (Şiir Kilkış) (Eduardo Calvo)
- Could usefully synthesize information across different Working Groups and cycles. (Sonia Seneviratne)

- General message is to retain existing flexibilities; no specific Panel action proposed. (IPCC Chair)

Cluster III: Review of drafts - Topics not to forward to Panel

Review Periods, COPs and SBs

- Overlap between government review periods and COPs/SBs requires discussion and agreement. (IPCC Chair) (Kenya)
- This is genuinely a Panel matter rather than a Bureau matter and should be left for the Panel to decide without a Bureau recommendation. (Kenya)

Review Meetings

- Review meetings have happened in the past for non-budgetary reasons and should not be removed as a mechanism. (Şiir Kilkış) (Eduardo Calvo)
- Could be a useful future mechanism for managing the growing volume of reviewer comments. (Şiir Kilkış) (Eduardo Calvo)
- No need to bring this forward given current practice falls within existing procedures. (IPCC Chair)

Review Editors Identifying Expert Reviewers

- Review editors should be tasked with identifying expert reviewers to ensure full expertise and suggest group reviews. (Şiir Kilkış)
- As currently written, proceeds by non-objection from the Bureau. (IPCC Chair)
- Substance folded into topic 15 rather than forwarded separately. (IPCC Chair)

Expert reviewer – selection by Bureaux

- No support

Cluster IV: Governance and Finance (as relevant for Bureau) - Topics not to forward to Panel

Timelines

- There is currently no decision mechanism for report timelines, creating significant uncertainty for authors, meetings, and scientific programmes; either timeline decisions should be delegated to WG Bureaux or a different mechanism introduced. (Robert Vautard) (France)
- AR7 was the first cycle where timeline decisions were postponed from one plenary to another, demonstrating the operational problem. (France)
- Note: divergent views were expressed on this topic — some Bureau members and government representatives argued it falls outside the Bureau's mandate; the Chair committed to reporting this divergence honestly and discursively to the Panel rather than as a Bureau recommendation. (IPCC Chair)
- Consensus is a red line and advising the Panel on this from the Bureau is outside the Bureau's mandate. (K. Saudi Arabia) (Malak Nory)
- Governance is not scientific advice and including topics outside Bureau scope risks the Panel rejecting the entire document. (Malak Nory)

- The Bureau should be silent on governance given the perceived conflict of interest; governance is a matter for the Panel. (Eduardo Calvo)
- The list is not conclusive enough to form a basis for Panel discussion; multiple financial dimensions are missing including GHG emissions, data, fundraising, the \$75 million income target, and trust fund status. (Switzerland)
- Not only government representatives but also Bureau members stated that some discussions exceeded the Bureau's mandate. (K. Saudi Arabia)
- Some governance and finance issues directly influence scientific outcomes but should be flagged only with a strong disclaimer that the list is not comprehensive. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)

Vice Chair Authorship in Reports (no number — raised informally)

- Vice Chair authorship in reports has been applied inconsistently across Working Groups with no clear procedural basis. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
- A more consistent and transparent decision-making approach is needed. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
- Raised by Vice Chairs but not formally proposed for Panel action. (IPCC Chair)

Working Reserve Interest Fund (related to finance items)

- The working reserve interest fund is already implemented in practice under a different name and should be redefined accordingly rather than described as not implemented. (Eduardo Calvo)
- Raised but not formally proposed for Panel action. (IPCC Chair)

Informal Scientific Exchanges Among Bureau Members (no number — raised informally)

- Proposal for informal Bureau meetings of scientific members only to create structured space for scientific discussion. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz) Sonia Seneviratne)
- Bureau meetings could be extended by one day, with the prior day dedicated to informal scientific exchange among scientific members only. (Sonia Seneviratne)
- Existing procedures do not prevent informal cross-WG scientific meetings; no rule change is needed. (Noureddine Yassaa)
- A simpler solution would be to add a standing agenda item on scientific matters to existing Bureau meeting agendas. (Şiir Kilkiş)
- Informal Bureau meetings without government representatives have already occurred without issue; formal Bureau meetings must always include government representatives. (Malak Nory)
- The formal Bureau composition must remain intact; any cross-WG scientific exchange should be framed as an informal meeting of Bureau members rather than a formal Bureau meeting. (Cromwell Lukorito)
- IPCC is both intergovernmental and scientific and government delegates contribute usefully through their experience; the original purpose of government presence in Bureau meetings should be respected. (Germany) (Malak Nory)
- The balance of interventions in the current meeting had shifted noticeably toward Bureau members compared to previous cycles, suggesting progress is already being made. (IPCC Chair)

- No change to principles and procedures required; to be reported discursively to the Panel. (IPCC Chair)

Cluster V: Policies and Protocols; COI, Error Protocol - Topics not to forward to Panel

Co-sponsoring of Workshops/Expert Meetings

- The IPCC logo should be limited to Panel-approved materials only; caution is needed over its use in co-sponsored contexts. (Malak Nory)

Synthesis Report Adoption

- The process is complex but was followed correctly in AR6; additional training and guidance are needed rather than rule changes. (Kate Calvin)
- The process has worked across six assessment reports and many special reports; better explanation rather than change is appropriate. (Germany)
- Not proposed for Panel action; training and clarification sufficient. (IPCC Chair)

Co-sponsoring/Branding

- The IPCC logo should be limited to Panel-approved materials only. (Malak Nory)
- Pre-pleenary briefing sessions for developing countries ahead of approval sessions are important to enable inclusive engagement. (Malak Nory)
- No rule changes proposed. (IPCC Chair)

UNFCCC Technical Dialogues

- Clarity is needed on how IPCC expertise is deployed in UNFCCC technical dialogues; inconsistent use of overflow pathways has created ambiguity. (Şiir Kilkış)
- Guidance is needed on when and how IPCC experts can share findings in UNFCCC contexts. (Şiir Kilkış)

Error Protocol

- Publication of errors is not coherent across reports and should be made consistent. (Germany)
- The rapid response process lacks transparency; when a submitted correction is changed, the submitting government should be informed. (Germany)

Bureau comments received in writing following the 70th Session

Cluster I: Selection of experts

- (Author Selection): should not go to the Panel as there is no genuine inconsistency requiring Panel intervention. The two provisions describe a coherent division of labor that is fully consistent with the Bureau's own Terms of Reference. The two provisions describe a sequential, two-tier process: the WG Bureau selects, the full Bureau reviews and agrees. This is not an inconsistency but a check and balance that is entirely within the Bureau's existing mandate to operate and clarify internally. No amendment to the Principles or Appendix A is required, and this topic does not warrant Panel 64's attention. (Malak Nory)
- (Author Selection): implementation of Gender Action Plan and GDEI principles in author selection. An addition should be made to Appendix A.4.3.2 "The relevant gender GDEI related statistics will be submitted to the Gender Action Team before the finalization of the selections, and the GAT may make recommendations for adjustment if deemed necessary to implement the relevant GDEI related IPCC policies". This will be for implementation of the Gender Action Plan, and potentially the GDEI related policies that may come after the expert meeting. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
- (Participation of IPCC Vice-Chairs in author/expert selections): the Bureau TOR and the procedures are in conflict with regards to whether IPCC Vice Chairs should participate in author/expert selections. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
- (Authorship by WG Vice-Chairs): the procedures do not extend to whether Working Group Vice-Chairs can be authors of IPCC reports. Practices to include Vice Chairs as authors have been very inconsistent among reports and WGs, the decision on these untransparent. The circumstances should be well defined when a Vice Chair can be author, and how this should be determined in a transparent and inclusive process. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)

Cluster II: Assessment of literature

- (Scoping): for meeting preparation, the leadership of scoping processes should have a consistent and transparent structure and approach. Amend Appendix A. 4.1., by adding "The development of the Scoping Meeting Program and Participant Selection is conducted by a scientific steering committee, to be chaired by the Co-Chairs or IPCC Vice Chairs for cross-working group reports, and consists of a diverse group of Bureau members representing geographic and disciplinary diversity." (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
- (Scientific steering of reports): The scientific leadership of IPCC reports needs to be inclusive, transparent, and consistent across reports. Amend Appendix A. 4.2. by adding "The scientific oversight of the report should be performed by a scientific steering committee. The SSC is to be chaired by the relevant WG Co-Chairs and consists of a diverse group of Bureau members from the relevant working groups, including at least one IPCC Vice Chair. The SSC should be balanced with regards to geographic origin and disciplinary backgrounds." (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)

Cluster III: Review of drafts

- (Preparation of the Reports): should go to Panel as the length and integrity of government review periods are fundamental to the rights of all IPCC member countries to participate effectively. (Malak Nory)
- (Review Editors – number of): should not go to Panel as the number of Review Editors needed is an operational decision, not a matter of high-level principle. (Malak Nory)

Cluster IV: Governance and Finance (as relevant for Bureau)

- (Consensus as basis of Panel decisions): is entirely outside the Bureau's mandate. It should not go to Panel because the Bureau has no mandate to propose amendments to the Panel's own decision-making procedures under Annex 2.A. This is a matter for member governments to raise directly, not for the Bureau to initiate. (Malak Nory)
- (ToRs IPCC Vice Chairs): IPCC Vice Chairs should be mandated to assist the Chair in representing the IPCC, liaising with governments and international bodies, overseeing the implementation of IPCC rules and procedures, as well as cross-working group cooperation (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)

Cluster V: Policies and Protocols

- (Climate friendliness and inclusivity): The Bureau's Terms of Reference assign it a scientific and technical advisory role; it has no mandate to propose new institutional values or operational policies to be embedded in the Principles. Such a proposal, if it is to be considered at all, must come from member governments, not from a Working Group Bureau. Furthermore, the proposal is insufficiently developed as it references external guidance (UN "Greening the Blue") without a concrete implementation plan. It is not ready for Panel consideration and thus should not be forwarded to the P64. (Malak Nory)
- (Copyright requirements): This is not a provision in the Principles, Appendix A, or any formal procedural document. It is therefore not a matter that requires a Panel decision at all. The copyright (<https://www.ipcc.ch/copyright/>) is an administrative communication managed by the Secretariat. (Malak Nory)
- (Error Protocol): Step 4A in Sections 1, 2 and 3 of the Error Protocol distinguish between typographical and other types of error. An error that is not typographical may still be minor and editorial in character (e.g. mis-description of lines in graphs). This means that the much more demanding Step 5A is invoked. It is suggested that the word "typographical" could be substituted by "editorial". (IPCC Chair)

Non-cluster specific comments

- The current rules do not specify a minimum representation for the approval of reports, consistently creating a risk that a small number of members (mostly from developed countries) would approve key segments of the reports without the broad consensus of the Panel. Establishing a clear guidance with a minimum of 50% of members presence in every approval/decision of the Panel is a fundamental governance safeguard that ensures the legitimacy and credibility of IPCC reports. This is a matter of principle that requires a Panel decision. (Malak Nory)

- Written comments that are submitted separately after any Bureau Meeting – without providing the possibility for these comments to be also discussed collectively by fellow Bureau members before communication by the Chair to the Panel as possible points for consideration, similar to discussions that took place during the agenda item of the recently invited meeting of B-70 – can undermine principles of transparency and inclusivity in the process that everyone deems vital to upholding. (Şiir KILKIŞ)
- Moreover, in future cases of providing the choice of submitting written comments, the possibility for fellow Bureau members to continue to discuss and elaborate on them will be important for processes that can better maintain a common and shared understanding among Bureau members respectfully. (Şiir KILKIŞ)
- Otherwise, comments can be summarised to the Panel without ensuring transparency in what will be summarised in representations of the Bureau. Greater clarity on these processes can be promising in supporting the Bureau in continuing to uphold responsibilities in inclusive and collective processes. (Şiir KILKIŞ)
- Expert meeting/Workshop proposals: IPCC Vice Chairs oversee crucial cross-working group aspects of the IPCC work programme and should also be able to propose expert meetings/workshops enabling the implementation of the IPCC's mandate. Appendix A.7.1 to be amended: "IPCC Vice Chairs" to those who can submit Expert Meeting or Workshop proposals (end of sentence 1 in paragraph 4)". (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
- Interpretation: Amendment to Principle 14 (interpretation for Bureau meetings). This should not be necessary. Bureau meetings have typically been conducted recently without interpretation. Important cost savings, and not necessary. No Bureau member should be elected if English command is insufficient for work in the Working Groups, and with authors. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
- Trust Fund (TF) eligibility needs clarification and updating:
 - 1) The eligibility for TF support should be clarified in terms of whether citizenship or residence is taken into account, especially for multiple citizenships and differing residence situations. If TF support is received by eligible citizens residing and working for longer term in well-resourced countries, the TF support effectively goes back to the donor countries rather than benefiting less developed economies and strengthening their scientific capacities for IPCC. The issue is complex and a survey or process should be initiated to understand the most desirable eligibility definition in order to best implement the IPCC's mandate and principles (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)
 - 2) Updating is needed, since the categories (e.g. economies in transition) and countries have been categorized, major changes have taken place in relative financial capacities of IPCC members. (Diana Urge-Vorsatz)