

ipcc

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON climate change

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

IPCC-LXIV/Doc. 6, Corr. 1, Add. 1
(25.III.2026)
Agenda Item: 4
ENGLISH ONLY

REVIEW OF IPCC PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

(Submitted by the Secretary of the IPCC)

IPCC Secretariat

c/o WMO • 7bis, Avenue de la Paix • C.P. 2300 • 1211 Geneva 2 • Switzerland
telephone : +41 (0) 22 730 8208 / 54 / 84 • email : IPCC-Sec@wmo.int • www.ipcc.ch



REVIEW OF IPCC PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

1. Background

This document was developed at the request of the Panel at its 64th Session (IPCC-64) to inform the discussions relevant to the agenda item 4 on the Review of Principles.

This document provides a collation of submissions made by the Panel during the 64th session regarding topics to supplement the 12 topics prioritized by the Bureau, as set forth in Doc. 6, Corr. 1.

2. Discussions at the 64th session of the IPCC

At the first day of IPCC-64, the review of principles was discussed under agenda item 4. During these discussions, the Doc. 6, Corr. 1 was presented, including on 12 topics prioritized by the Bureau and forwarded to the Panel for discussion and consideration. Ensuing discussions included questions on the reason for the review, requests for clarification on whether the document was a record of Bureau discussions of all possible topics or just those prioritized, if any amendments would only be implemented in the next assessment cycle, and the scope and timing of any review. Some delegations noted that there was limited time for the review due to the approval plenaries scheduled in the next year, while other delegations noted that there was nothing serious requiring review, that there was a need for discussions and solutions, and that timing issues did not imply immediate action. After several delegations exchanged views on topics meriting possible review, a huddle was formed, moderated by Vice Chair Ramon Pichs-Madruga, on whether there ought to be a Task Group formed on the review process.

Huddle discussions focused on past precedent actions, both with regard to review of principles and as to use of task group working during sessions and intersessionally. The outcome of the huddle was that while there was in principle no objection to the use of a Task Group, there were concerns on the timing and sequencing of any review during P64 or P65, also involving a Task Group mandated to work intersessionally. There were divergent views as to the possibility of intersessional work of any Task Group, with some delegations noting that intersessional work was already cramped and that there was no urgency to undertake such work; other delegations noting that any work on the review would need to take place between P64 and P65, meaning that intersessional work would be necessary, as there was no landing zone available for any review work following P65, given the full schedule of the plenary, including as to approval sessions. The members of the huddle agreed to meet the following day in plenary to continue discussions on topics to be prioritized, as well as timing and scheduling of any review.

Based on the discussions of the huddle, further discussions followed on the second day of plenary, both on topics to consider as well as sequence and timing of any review. Many delegations proceeded to extensively enumerate topics meriting review. Based on these discussions, the Panel agreed to:

- Establish a Contact Group with a mandate to find a way forward on the review of principles;
- Invite the delegations to submit their proposed topics for consideration under review of principles;
- Request the Secretariat to produce a document collating all the proposed topics made by the delegations;
- Request the Contact Group to report back to the Panel on 26 March, in the morning, to allow for discussions and consideration of further action on the agenda item.

Submissions were made by 19 delegations, i.e. Kenya, Burundi, Japan, Norway, Russian Federation, Switzerland, Sweden, Türkiye, Finland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, India, France, Italy, Belgium, Chile, Netherlands, Panama, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Germany. The submissions were collated and are presented under seven clusters, the first five as used for presenting the 12 Bureau prioritized topics appearing in Annex III of Doc. 6, Corr. 1, as well as two

additional clusters, for topics addressing respectively structural and procedural integrity, and enumerated references to items in IPCC-LXI/Doc. 9, Ad Hoc Group on Lessons Learned from the Sixth Assessment Cycle. These clusters are accordingly as follows: I - Selection of Experts; II - Assessment of Literature; III - Review of Drafts; IV - Governance and Finance; V - Policies and Protocols; VI - Structural & Procedural Integrity; VII – References to Lessons Learned.

3. 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.

Submissions on topics to be considered in Review of Principles

Cluster I — Selection of Experts

Cluster I Topics

Author Selection Criteria

- Clearer criteria needed, including geographic and intra-regional balance, early career inclusion, diversity of expertise, and better representation of underrepresented regions (Kenya).
- Criteria should include geographic and intra-regional balance, early career inclusion, diversity of expertise, and be standardized across Working Groups (Kenya).
- Need to better reflect underrepresented regions, particularly Africa (Kenya).
- Scientific excellence and equitable representation must be treated as complementary (Kenya).
- Transparent and open selection process needed, ensuring gender and geographical representation (Burundi).
- Additional criteria risk over-complication; should serve as guidance rather than binding rules (Japan).
- Additional criteria should be guidance, not formal rules; avoid increased complexity (Japan).
- More clarity, transparency, and communication needed so nominees understand selection rationale (Finland).
- Selection criteria should remain broad; avoid over-targeting early-career Global South scholars (India).
- “Moral criteria” and career-stage criteria may be problematic (India — additional submission).
- “Diversity of knowledge systems” is ambiguous; risks inclusion of climate-denial content (India).
- Clearer rules needed; government nominations should receive priority (Russian Federation).
- Unconditional priority should go to government-nominated experts (Russian Federation).
- Inclusivity must be strengthened, especially through regional balance (Türkiye).
- Improvements needed based on Lessons Learned (Belgium).
- Only targeted adjustments should be considered (Switzerland, Sweden).
- Developing-country participation should be a priority (Panama).
- Inconsistencies should be clarified (Germany).
- Existing provisions already coherent; no amendment required (KSA).

- Two-tier author selection process (Appendix A + Bureau TOR) is coherent and complementary (KSA — additional submission).
- Improvements should occur through guidance, not rule changes (Italy).
- Retain Principles unchanged; possible small refinements only (Norway).
- Selection for AR7 was unbalanced; clearer rules needed (Russian Federation).
- COI and copyright also affect integrity of expert selection (Belgium).
- Oppose changes to Principles; only surgical changes to appendices should be allowed (Switzerland and Sweden).

Author Selection Responsibility

- Clarification needed on whether selection authority sits with WG Bureaux or collectively with full Bureau (Japan).
- Legal clarification needed on Appendix A 4.3.2 vs Bureau TOR paragraph 4 (Japan).
- Should not be limited to Bureau-generated lists (India).
- No inconsistency exists; the two-tier process is coherent (KSA).
- Bureau's role must remain scientific/technical, not operational (KSA — additional submission).
- No strong need for rule amendments; roles understood (Norway).

Chapter Scientists

- Role requires formal recognition and clearer definition (Kenya).
- Should support youth engagement and underrepresented expertise (Burundi).
- CLAs should retain priority in selecting CS; CS should not serve as balance-criteria mechanisms (Japan).
- Guidance needed for CS on IK/LK (Finland).
- CS are not equivalent to authors; balance criteria unnecessary (India).
- Avoid premature formalization until mandate clarified (KSA).
- Should serve capacity-building goals for developing-country experts (Kenya).
- Should allow developing-country CLAs to participate in selection (Kenya).

Cluster II — Assessment of Literature

Cluster II Topics

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

- Strong need for clear methodological guidance for IK/LK inclusion (Kenya).
- Greater inclusion of indigenous knowledge (Burundi).
- Guidance needed for authors, LAs, CS, and REs on treatment of IK/LK (Finland).

- Minimum guidance required for treating and referring to indigenous knowledge systems (Finland).
- Inclusion supported as long as scientific merit upheld (UK).
- Inclusion should be based on scientific merit; avoid ambiguous terminology like “diversity of knowledge systems” (India).
- “Diversity of knowledge systems” risks including climate-denial material; better framed as diversity of perspectives and methodologies (India).
- Strengthen cross-institutional knowledge integration (Türkiye).
- IK/LK should be included only where scientifically valid (Russian Federation).
- Inclusion should remain within WG outlines and mandates (KSA).
- IK/LK inclusion relevant with respect to COI concerns (Chile).
- India agrees inclusion should be based on scientific merit and informed by workshop discussions (India).
- UK supports appropriate and consistent treatment of IK/LK and practitioner knowledge (UK).

Broader Literature and Regional Gaps

- Structural disparities in data and scientific capacity must be addressed (Kenya).
- Principles should recognize persistent regional disparities and promote measures to reduce gaps (Kenya).
- Promote measures to address structural research and data inequities (Kenya).
- Avoid inclusion of literature that may support climate denial (India).
- Maintain priority for peer-reviewed literature (Russian Federation).
- Need for greater incorporation of Global South literature (Panama).
- Stronger inclusion of Global South perspectives is essential (KSA).
- Assessment process should explicitly require stronger inclusion of Global South literature (KSA).
- Reducing disparities in data and capacity directly improves representativeness (Kenya).
- Guidance exists on non-scientific literature and can be improved without rule changes (Germany).
- Updates to be linked to lessons-learned items (Belgium).
- Scientific merit remains central (India).

AI and Literature Assessment Processes

- Need to develop clear guidance for AI use in IPCC processes (Kenya).
- Safeguards needed to ensure scientific integrity and transparency (Kenya).
- Consider equity implications of AI access and potential biases (Kenya).
- Procedural rules needed for AI use (Finland).

- AI rules should become formal requirements (Finland).
- Development of AI guidance recommended (UK).
- UK supports monitoring AI developments (UK).
- AI requires safeguards against bias (India).
- AI risks reinforcing discriminatory biases; codified guidance needed (India).
- AI is a technical tool; must not be authoritative (Russian Federation).
- References to AI in reports are unacceptable (Russian Federation).
- AI must not serve as authoritative content; strict limits needed (KSA).
- Guidance needed without disrupting assessment cycle (Germany).
- AI is a priority unless addressed elsewhere (Netherlands).
- AI to be prioritized (Sweden).
- Supports advancing AI in lessons-learned (Belgium).

Equity, Representation, and Literature Access

- Support regions lacking scientific infrastructure to improve literature availability (Kenya).
- Recognize persistent inequities in data and research capacity (Kenya).
- Facilitate inclusion of developing-country literature—including credible non-peer-reviewed work (India, Panama, KSA).
- UK supports co-sponsored workshops for broader knowledge integration (UK).
- Support for enhanced cooperation with IPBES, UNEP, WMO, UNCCD, CBD (Türkiye).
- Global South literature inclusion stressed, while preserving scientific rigor (India).

Workshops, Technical Papers & Knowledge Integration

- Workshop outputs should be systematically brought to the Panel before influencing guidance or processes (Kenya).
- Ensure transparency, inclusivity, and oversight in handling outputs (Kenya).
- Outputs must reflect full views, including divergences (KSA).
- Recommendations only included when fully agreed; divergence must be noted (KSA).
- Workshop reports must reflect divergence (India).
- All workshop topics/agendas, including co-sponsored ones, must be Panel-approved (India).
- Stress on better time-management to ensure inclusive participation (Türkiye).
- Reference to lessons-learned items relevant to knowledge integration (Belgium).

Communication & Secretariat Transparency (Literature-Related)

- Confusion exists around communication of selections and rejections; need structured system (Finland).
- Scientists must know how selection affects assessment participation (Finland).

- Need for observer clarity in literature-related processes (UK).
- Need for structured processes before amending rules (Italy).

Cluster III — Review of Drafts

Cluster III Topics

Review Editors: Selection Criteria and Responsibilities

- Review stages should avoid structural constraints that hinder developing country participation (Kenya).
- Translation and accessibility needed (Burundi).
- More clarity required on RE roles (Japan).
- Confusion persists around communication processes during review (Finland).
- REs should not be tasked with identifying expert reviewers; risk of overburdening (India).
- REs should not be responsible for addressing the growing comment volume; authors require more time (India).
- Improved clarity welcome without major changes (Germany).
- Strengthened RE processes needed (KSA).
- REs may help identify expert reviewers only for low-confidence or high-disagreement topics (KSA).
- RE roles should not become over-complicated (Japan).
- Use of guidance to be emphasized, not expanded procedures (Norway).
- COI-related reviewer concerns are highlighted (Chile).
- COI reforms are essential for transparency (Belgium).
- RE-related work important as part of Bureau's priorities (Sweden).

Review Periods and Inclusivity

- Minimum 12-week separation between review periods is required (India).
- Minimum 8–10 weeks required between end of reviews and next LAM (India).
- No back-to-back review work for governments (India).
- If timing requirements conflict, deadlines must be extended rather than overridden (India).
- Review stages must remain feasible and avoid structural burdens (Kenya).
- Developing countries need full opportunity to participate effectively (Panama).
- Overlapping deadlines must be avoided (KSA).
- Türkiye notes extended sessions disadvantage smaller delegations (Türkiye).
- Türkiye also recommends:
 - concluding meetings within scheduled timeframes,

- applying reasonable time limits for interventions,
- managing repeated interventions.
- Improve communication of review timelines (Finland).
- Emphasis on feasibility and flexibility (Norway).
- Emphasis on structured process planning (Italy).

Scheduling Conflicts and Avoidance Requirements

- Prohibit overlap between IPCC review periods and COP/SB sessions (KSA).
- Avoid overlap with major UNFCCC meetings **and** major religious holidays, including Islamic holidays (KSA).
- Avoid overlap with SB sessions, COP, and religious holidays (India).
- If conflicts arise, sessions should be extended, not compressed (KSA).
- Remove concurrent deadlines that compromise accessibility or quality (KSA)
- Emphasis on feasibility and avoidance of conflicts (Kenya).

Inclusivity and Participation During Review

- Developing countries must have full opportunity to participate (Panama).
- Address financial, logistical, and structural barriers (Kenya).
- Extended sessions disproportionately affect developing countries (Türkiye).
- Hybrid participation challenges may limit review inclusivity (India, KSA).
- Norway notes many concerns can be solved through guidance (Norway).

Continuity, Consensus Requirements & Review Outcomes

- No procedural gap exists regarding lack of consensus; items should not move forward without consensus (KSA).
- If consensus is not reached, there can be **no approval and no report** (India).
- Consensus-based deliberation is essential for legitimacy (KSA, India).
- Review outputs should reflect divergences of view (KSA).
- REs must ensure substantive comments from governments and experts are fully considered (KSA).

Review Process Transparency and Oversight

- Workshop/expert meeting outputs should be brought to Panel before influencing review processes (Kenya).
- Ensure transparency and oversight in how workshop outputs shape the review process (Kenya).
- Workshop agendas, including co-sponsored meetings, must be Panel-approved (India).
- Outputs must reflect divergences and avoid recommendations without consensus (KSA).
- Panel approval required for proceedings and recommendations (KSA).

- Highlight importance of observer transparency (UK).
- Emphasis on lessons-learned improvements (Belgium).
- Support limiting scope to Bureau's items (Switzerland, Sweden).

Hybrid Participation and Impact on Review

- Hybrid participation is a fallback option only; cannot be default (India).
- Hybrid formats risk deepening inequalities (KSA).
- Connectivity and technical issues hinder participation (KSA).
- Hybrid formats may favor developed countries with greater capacity for in-person attendance (KSA).
- Hybrid formats do not allow for effective huddles essential for consensus-building (India).
- Support for hybrid flexibility without requiring consensus in emergencies (Japan).
- Equity considerations must prevail over climate-friendliness (India).

Cluster IV — Governance and Finance

Cluster IV Topics

Terms of Reference (Chair, Vice-Chairs, Co-Chairs)

- Clarification needed regarding meaning of “work programme” (Japan).
- Further clarification needed on whether “work programme” in Topic 6 equals Bureau TOR para 4; Secretariat guidance requested (Japan)
- Secretariat–scientist communication requires improvement (Finland).
- Clarify status of government observers accompanying Bureau members (UK).
- Need for clearer rules that government representatives accompanying Bureau members are observers only (UK).
- Too early for procedural changes; process premature (India).
- Scientific priorities should drive Bureau functioning (Germany).
- Limited refinements supported (France, Italy).
- Formal and clearer TORs required, ensuring boundaries of operational authority (KSA).
- Establish formal TORs for Chair to define and limit operational autonomy (KSA).
- Terms of Reference needed for Chair, Vice-Chairs, WG Co-Chairs to ensure accountability, transparency, and predictability (KSA — additional submission).
- Maintain distinction between Bureau's scientific/technical role and Panel's operational authority (KSA — additional submission).
- Merit in providing descriptions of Chair/Vice-Chair roles but prefers no changes to Principles (Norway).
- Clarification through guidance rather than amendments (Italy).

- Explore governance issues but within a limited scope (France).
- Supports small “surgical” adjustments only for principle review (Switzerland).
- No changes to Principles (Sweden).
- Emphasis that governance updates must not interfere with the assessment cycle (Germany).
- Preference for focused scope; avoid broadening governance issues (Netherlands).
- Stress on expanding cooperation with UN bodies (IPBES, UNEP, WMO, UNCCD, CBD) to strengthen coherence (Türkiye).

TSU Terms of Reference

- Strengthen TSU support to foster inclusivity (Kenya).
- Improve communication processes (Finland).
- TSU mandates should not be expanded into inclusivity enforcement (India).
- TSUs must not take on governance functions beyond technical support (KSA).
- TSUs perform support functions only and must not assume Panel/Bureau roles (KSA).
- Avoid implying TSUs enforce inclusivity in LAMs/workshops (KSA).
- TSU roles should not be expanded vaguely or beyond technical competence (India).
- Refine TSU roles through guidance rather than rule changes (Norway).
- Guidance—not amendments—should clarify TSU-related issues (Italy).

Developing Country Participation & Finance

- Financial, logistical, and structural barriers must be addressed (Kenya).
- Provide more support for low-income country delegations (Burundi).
- Equitable nomination processes and removal of participation barriers (Burundi).
- Clarification needed on links between support mechanisms and host capacity (Japan).
- Japan requests explanation of interactions between additional delegates, extra days, affordable travel, and hosting burden (Japan).
- Greater inclusivity and representativeness required (Panama).
- Improved support needed at all approval stages (Germany).
- Developing-country quorum required for decisions; full attendance must be ensured (KSA).
- Majority of developing countries must be present for *all* decisions, not only major ones (KSA).
- Delegation size should not be limited; enhance support instead (India).
- Limiting delegation size is unacceptable; equity should come from increased support (India).
- Review work should remain focused and targeted (Netherlands).
- Approval plenaries should ensure equitable participation (Kenya, India, Panama).

- Time and format adjustments may support effective participation (Kenya).
- Extended sessions disadvantage small delegations; improved time-management needed (Türkiye).

Governance Structure, Transparency & Decision Practices

- Formalize voting to resolve procedural issues when consensus cannot be reached (UK).
- Amend Rule 1 to reference Paris Agreement goals (UK).
- Bureau should maintain and update a list of organizations eligible for co-sponsored workshops (UK).
- India emphasizes:
 - No timeline for RoP review should be imposed prematurely;
 - No intersessional work at this stage;
 - Issues must not be restricted to Bureau's list;
 - All views must be taken up;
 - Disagreements must be recorded.
- Forming a Task Group now is premature (India).
- Define process before entering detailed rule amendments (Italy).
- Highlight of numerous lessons-learned items related to governance (Belgium referencing IPCC-LXI-3).
- Support restricting scope to Bureau's priorities (Switzerland, Sweden).
- Many governance issues can be resolved through guidance rather than rule changes (Germany).

Operational Roles (Chair, Bureau, Secretariat, TSUs)

- Secretariat communication gaps cause confusion, especially in author selection and review processes (Finland).
- Secretariat must clearly communicate selection *and* rejection, with predictable timelines (Finland).
- Do not expand Bureau operational authority beyond scientific/technical roles (KSA).
- Governance decisions must remain within the Panel's authority (KSA).
- Flexibility for Chair/Vice-Chairs/TSUs to operate under constraints (Japan).
- Maintain flexible operating structures without rule amendments (Norway).
- Governance decisions must remain consensus-based; fallback mechanisms are unacceptable (India).
- Some implementation decisions can remain at Bureau/Secretariat level (France).
- Guidance is the best mechanism for clarifying operational responsibilities (Italy).

Co-Sponsorship, Observers & External Coordination

- Strengthen cooperation with IPBES, UNEP, WMO, UNCCD, and CBD (Türkiye).
- Ensure Panel discussion for observer organizations with potential conflicts (UK).
- Avoid private co-organizers of workshops, since agendas may diverge from IPCC principles (India).
- Stricter observer admission and review of EU's differentiated rights (KSA).
- Explicitly exclude military institutions from observer eligibility (India, KSA)

Cluster V — Policies and Protocols (COI, Error Protocol, AI, Climate Friendliness)

Cluster V Topics

Artificial Intelligence

- AI use requires caution, transparency, and equity considerations (Kenya).
- Development of clear guidance on the use of AI in IPCC processes required (Kenya).
- Safeguards needed to ensure scientific integrity and transparency (Kenya).
- Consider implications for equity, including differential access and risks of amplifying knowledge imbalances (Kenya).
- Hybrid participation flexibility should be possible without requiring full consensus (Japan).
- Procedural rules needed for AI use (Finland).
- Formal procedural requirements needed for AI use (Finland).
- Development of AI guidance recommended (UK).
- UK supports action to monitor ongoing AI developments relevant to IPCC work (UK).
- AI use requires safeguards against bias (India).
- AI risks reinforcing discriminatory biases; codified guidance needed (India)
- AI is only a technical tool; must not be cited or treated as authoritative (Russian Federation).
- References to AI in reports are unacceptable (Russian Federation).
- AI must not be treated as an authoritative source; strict limits must be applied (KSA).
- Guidance needed but should not disrupt the assessment cycle (Germany).
- AI is a priority unless addressed elsewhere (Netherlands).
- AI is a priority topic within Bureau list (Sweden).
- Advance AI discussions linked to lessons-learned (Belgium).

Conflict of Interest (COI)

- COI timing must not disadvantage developing country experts (Kenya).
- Clear and equitable COI policy required (Burundi).
- Legal clarification needed on alleged inconsistencies (Japan).

- Transparency needed regarding observer applicants (UK).
- Early COI forms create barriers; oppose early requirement (India).
- COI information should be obtained without burdening developing-country authors or focal points (India).
- Detailed COI forms at nomination stage are unacceptable ().
- Flexible COI resolution mechanisms needed beyond exclusion (Russian Federation).
- Oppose early submission and warns against over-centralization (KSA).
- A uniform, one-size-fits-all COI process risks inappropriate centralization (KSA).
- COI is a priority topic (Chile).
- Strengthened COI policy essential (Belgium).
- Uniform and transparent process needed (Germany).
- COI is a priority for several delegations (Sweden, Switzerland).
- Reject homogenization of COI procedures; preserve WG diversity (KSA).

Copyright

- Clarify role of observer organizations (UK).
- Align IPCC copyright policy with UNEP/WMO updates (Belgium).
- Copyright reform is a priority (Sweden, Netherlands).
- Need realistic, practical copyright compliance (Germany).
- Caution against misuse of IPCC logo (KSA).
- Strengthen safeguards against logo misuse; ensure accurate attribution (KSA).
- Need for modernized copyright approach facilitating translation and dissemination while preserving integrity (Belgium).

Climate Friendliness & Inclusivity

- Participation of developing countries is more important than carbon footprint considerations (Kenya).
- Hybrid formats should not replace in-person participation (India).
- Remote participation is a fallback option and cannot be default (India).
- Hybrid default risks deepening inequalities (KSA).
- Hybrid participation introduces risks of connectivity and technical challenges affecting developing countries (KSA).
- Hybrid formats may unintentionally favor developed countries with greater resources for in-person attendance (KSA).
- Climate actions should be reasonable and evidence-based (Germany).

- Hybrid participation risks reinforcing inequalities; ensure in-person engagement remains primary (KSA).
- Unwillingness (not inability) to travel should not justify accommodations (India).
- Climate-friendliness cannot override equity for those with minimal emissions contributions (India).

Error Protocol, Scientific Integrity & Comment Management

- RE roles and time allocation must allow adequate response to comments (Finland, India).
- REs cannot be responsible for addressing growing comment volume; more author time needed (India).
- Multiple concurrent deadlines undermine error management and comment quality (KSA).
- Improved meeting time-management to reduce procedural errors (Türkiye).
- See lessons-learned items on improving error-correction processes (Belgium).

Transparency, Oversight & Approval of Outputs

- Workshop/expert meeting outputs should be systematically returned to Panel before influencing processes (Kenya).
- Ensure transparency, inclusivity, and oversight in use of workshop outputs (Kenya).
- Workshop reports must reflect divergence and avoid recommendations without consensus (KSA).
- Proceedings and recommendations must receive Panel approval (KSA).
- Panel approval for all workshop topics/agendas, including co-sponsored meetings (India).
- IPCC communications must strictly follow the SPM; selective emphasis prohibited (India).
- Sweden, Switzerland, Belgium highlight lessons-learned items as relevant inputs under this cluster.
- Ensure Panel discussion of observer applicants with possible COI risks (UK).
- Maintain a focused scope for review (Netherlands).

Cluster VI — Structural and Procedural Integrity

Cluster VI Topics

Consensus and Decision-Making

- Preserve consensus-based decision making as core to IPCC legitimacy (KSA).
- No decision should be adopted if consensus is not achieved (KSA).
- Avoid creating alternative pathways that bypass consensus (KSA).
- Amendment process should reaffirm consensus-based decision making (KSA).
- Consensus is central to credibility of an intergovernmental scientific body (KSA).
- If consensus is not reached during approval, there can be no approval and no report (India).

- Consensus must be explicitly affirmed as the rule: “all decisions shall be taken only with consensus” (India).
- When consensus is absent, discussions should continue or be deferred (KSA).
- Rejection of any fallback or alternative decision-making mechanisms (India).
- Task group deliberations should explore ways to improve efficiency while preserving consensus (Kenya).
- Any alternative approach must consider equity impacts and voice balance (Kenya).
- Formalize use of voting for procedural issues when consensus fails (UK).
- Belgium, Switzerland, Sweden highlight consensus-related lessons-learned items (IPCC-LXI-3).

Assessment Cycle Structure

- Timing should be based on scientific needs, not external policy calendars (KSA).
- IPCC cycles must not be aligned with UNFCCC cycles to preserve independence (Russian Federation).
- Introduce a fixed seven-year assessment cycle (KSA).
- India supports a 7-year cycle from election to last plenary (India).
- Establish formal rule-based cycle timelines (KSA).
- Bureau terms should align with fixed cycle (KSA).
- Cycle duration must allow full scoping, drafting, review, revision, and approval (KSA).
- If timing conflicts occur, deadlines must be extended rather than compromised (India).
- Duration must follow scientific—not political—needs (Russian Federation).

Workshops and Expert Meetings

- Outputs must reflect full range of views, including divergences (KSA).
- Recommendations included only when fully agreed; divergences must be explicitly stated (KSA).
- Proceedings and recommendations must be approved by the Panel before use (KSA).
- Workshop outputs should be systematically submitted to Panel before influencing procedures (Kenya).
- Ensure transparency, inclusivity, and Member oversight (Kenya).
- All workshop topics and agendas—including co-sponsored meetings—must be approved by the Panel (India).
- Workshop reports must reflect divergence (India).
- Bureau should maintain updated lists of eligible co-sponsoring organizations (UK).
- Effective time-management is essential to avoid disadvantaging small delegations (Türkiye).

Observer Admission Criteria

- Exclude military institutions explicitly from observer eligibility (KSA, India).
- Review differentiated rights of the EU (KSA).
- Tighten criteria for pending observer applications; remove those lacking competence (KSA).
- Ensure Panel discussion for observer applicants with possible conflicts (UK).

Scheduling Avoidance Rules

- Prohibit overlap between IPCC review periods and UNFCCC meetings (KSA).
- Avoid overlap with SB sessions, COP, and major religious holidays—including Islamic holidays (KSA, India).
- When conflicts arise, deadlines should be extended, not shortened (India).
- Eliminate multiple concurrent deadlines that undermine participation (KSA).
- Emphasize feasibility and avoiding conflicts (Kenya).

Developing-Country Quorum and Representation

- Developing-country quorum required for decisions (KSA).
- Majority of developing countries must be present for **all** decisions (KSA).
- Presence must be ensured from opening to adjournment (KSA).
- Delegation size should not be restricted; equity must come from increased support (India).
- Long sessions force small delegations to leave early; must be avoided (Türkiye).

Climate-Related Mandate Protection

- IPCC must remain strictly scientific; it is not to call for climate action (India).
- Climate-friendly operational measures must not override participation equity (India).
- IPCC mandate should not be diverted into carbon-budgeting or policymaking (KSA).
- Operational improvements must avoid mission creep (Germany).

**[Cluster VII — References to IPCC-LXI/Doc. 9,
Ad Hoc Group on Lessons Learned from the sixth assessment cycle](#)**

Cluster VII (topics referenced by delegations within IPCC-LXI/Doc. 9)

Switzerland:

We prefer to work on the list of 12 items as proposed by the Bureau. We also are completely opposed to change any of the Principles. We might consider minor surgical changes to the appendices.

They refer to Decision IPCC-LXI- 3. Ad Hoc Group on Lessons Learned from the sixth assessment cycle and are contained in Document:

IPCC-LXI/Doc. 9.

No.: 5, 10, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 31, 33, 34, 37, 48, 51, 53, 62, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 74, 82, 85, 86, 89, 93, 98, 100, 101, 102

.....

Sweden:

We are completely opposed to change any of the Principles. We might consider minor surgical changes to the appendices.

We support and submit the condensed list of additional amendments as detailed by Switzerland in plenary, based on the lessons learned, Decision IPCC-LXI-3 document: IPCC-LXI-doc.9, namely the following:

5, 10, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 31, 33, 34, 37, 48, 51, 53, 62, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 74, 82, 85, 86, 89, 93, 98, 100, 101, 102

.....

Belgium

We support Switzerland’s proposal to advance work on the relevant items linked to Decision IPCC-LXI-3: Ad Hoc Group on Lessons Learned from the Sixth Assessment Cycle, as presented in document IPCC-LXI/Doc. 9. The following items, we consider particularly relevant:

5, 10, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 31, 33, 34, 37, 48, 51, 53, 62, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 74, 82, 85, 86, 89, 93, 98, 100, 101, 102