

REPORT OF THE TWELFTH MEETING OF THE IPCC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1 August 2012, 03:00-04:30PM CET - Teleconference

CONCLUSIONS AND DECISIONS

Participants:

Members:

R. K. Pachauri (Chair); I. Elgizouli; H. Lee; J.-P. van Ypersele; T. Stocker; R. Pichs Madruga; Y. Sokona; T. Hiraishi. T. Krug.

Advisory Members:

R. Christ; J. Minx; L. Meyer.

Others:

J. Lynn (minutes); Zhou B. (silent observer as agreed by the Chair upon request of Qin D.)

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Executive Committee (ExCom) adopted the provisional agenda (EXCOM-XII/Doc.1).

2. FOLLOW-UP TO IPCC-35 DECISIONS OF RELEVANCE TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(i) Report on the effectiveness of the ExCom

The ExCom considered a draft note by the IPCC Chair on the effectiveness of the ExCom, which lists *inter alia* the topics that the ExCom has dealt with. It agreed that this was a useful summary and that it would be premature to make any assessment of performance. R. Pichs Madruga, Co-Chair of WGIII, said the report should also refer to the improved electronic communications that have made such virtual meetings more effective. It was agreed that members of the ExCom would send their comments on the draft to the Chair, so that the report could be finalized by the Chair.

(ii) Electronic version of IPCC reports as the document of record

It was decided to postpone discussion of this topic until the next meeting so that C. Field, Co-Chair of WGII, could contribute. T. Stocker, Co-Chair of WGI, reported that the TSU of WGII had already started to work on setting up a chapter of SREX as a demonstration, but this work was not yet complete.

(iii) Procedures: further issues pertaining to the role of the observer organizations in the AR5 review

The ExCom considered a note prepared by the Co-Chair of WGI and agreed with the conclusion that no further action or clarification was required given the guidance from IPCC-35 on this subject. The Chair suggested that the note should spell out explicitly that experts recommended to take part in IPCC activities do not represent their nominating organizations and it was agreed to amend the note to add this clarification.

	Action Item	Responsibility	Deadline
1.	(i) Report on the effectiveness of the ExCom: To prepare a note for comments by the members of the ExCom.	Chair	31 August 2012

2.	(iii) Procedures: further issues pertaining to the role of the observer organizations in the AR5 review: To amend the note. ¹	Co-Chair WGI	15 August 2012
----	--	--------------	----------------

3. IPCC RELEVANT MATTERS ADDRESSED BY UK INFORMATION TRIBUNAL

The IPCC has been contacted to provide comments for a case before the UK First-Tier Tribunal (Information Rights). The ExCom agreed that it was not appropriate for the IPCC to entertain questions directly raised by individuals or organisations who are party in an ongoing tribunal case. It was agreed that the Secretary would respond to the requests before 7 August along these lines. The ExCom agreed to seek further legal advice and opinion on the underlying questions raised.

	<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
3.	To reply to requests for information from parties to a dispute at the UK Information Tribunal.	Secretary, Co-Chair WGI	6 August 2012
4.	To take legal advice to clarify the questions raised by these requests and report to ExCom.	Secretary	2 October 2012

4. MATTERS RELATED TO THE FIFTH ASSESSMENT REPORT (AR5)

(i) Consistency of publications

The Secretary underlined the importance of planning the covers and general layout of the AR5 Working Group contributions well in advance to ensure an evocative and consistent appearance that signals that the publications form a single report. She noted that the WGI TSU is already working on AR5 layout. The ExCom agreed that sharing ideas among TSUs and the Secretariat on topics such as the use of colour, layout, graphics and cover page design and image at an early stage in the process is important. The ExCom asked the Secretariat and TSUs to follow up on this, and the Co-Chair of WGI agreed to shortly circulate a schedule for these discussions.

The Secretary has circulated a draft call for tenders for publication of the AR5 for comments. One question is whether the publisher selected should produce an e-book or whether that should be undertaken by the IPCC. The Head of the SYR TSU suggested that the Synthesis Report could also be included in the call for tenders.

	<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
5.	To plan consistent visual identity for AR5 contributions.	All TSUs, Secretariat	From October 2012
6.	To provide feedback on draft Call for Tender to the Secretariat.	TSU Heads	22 August 2012

(ii) Planning of Working Groups and Panel Sessions in 2014

The Secretary noted the importance of scheduling a brief Plenary following one of the WG approval plenaries in the first half of 2014, to discuss matters such as the 2015 budget, communications issues around AR5, and other matters arising at the end of the assessment cycle. Given the need for a sign-off by the auditors on the 2013 statement of expenditures, March would be too early to discuss the budget. The ExCom agreed that the most suitable date for a one-day IPCC Plenary to address these matters would be immediately following the WG III approval Plenary and asked the Secretary and WGIII to discuss the possibility of an extra day with the German government.

¹ The final version of the note entitled "IPCC Procedures: Further issues pertaining to the role of the observer organizations in the AR5 review" is attached to this report as **Annex 2**.

	<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
7.	To plan extra day of Panel Session following WGIII approval plenary.	Secretary, Head WGIII TSU	22 August 2012
8.	To inform WGII and Japanese hosts that there will not be a two-day IPCC Session following the WG II Session.	Secretary, WGII Co-Chairs	22 August 2012

J.-P. van Ypersele, Vice-Chair, said it was regrettable that none of the approval plenaries for AR5 were being held in a developing country. The Chair urged WGs and the Synthesis Report TSU to consider holding Lead Author/Core Writing Team meetings in developing countries to the extent still possible.

5. UPDATE ON ERROR PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION

The Chair informed the ExCom on progress on the analysis of an alleged error in AR4 WGIII chapter 4. The Co-Chair of WGI informed that WGI had posted an erratum on 15 June 2012 involving a figure in a FAQ, following the protocol for addressing possible errors. The Head of the WGIII TSU said it was investigating a potential error involving nitrous oxide and had entered it in the protocol.

6. UPDATE ON COMMUNICATIONS ACTIVITIES AND PLANS

The ExCom noted the good progress by the ExCom sub-committee on the Communications Strategy (ExCom-CS) in preparing the Note on Implementation, including current considerations of accountability and traceability of the decision-making process. The Chair said he would send a message to the sub-committee in the next few days urging it to keep the Note on Implementation as brief and focused as possible. J.-P. van Ypersele, Vice-Chair in charge of the ExCom-CS, said the note would be ready by the end of August for discussion in the ExCom, before circulating it to members of the Panel by 1 October 2012. The Chair further noted that communications activities had been going well since the launch of SREX and this was having an impact, which he hoped the IPCC could build on.

The Secretary informed that requests to hold a side event at COP18 must be submitted between 7 and 10 August 2012. She said she had also consulted with the UNFCCC about the possibility of presentations by IPCC within the formal discussions. The ExCom agreed to register one and if possible two side events to present SREX and SRREN and asked the Secretariat to follow up accordingly.

	<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
9.	To develop IPCC activities at COP18.	Secretary	10 August 2012

7. ANY OTHER MATTERS

The Secretary presented options for dates for the Forty-Sixth Session of the Bureau that did not conflict with Working Group activities and other major events. After a discussion it was agreed to look at a date early in 2013.

	<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
10.	To identify dates in early 2013 for the Forty-Sixth Session of the Bureau.	Secretary	3 September 2012

**IPCC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – TWELFTH MEETING
Teleconference, 1 August 2012**

EXCOM-XII/Doc. 1
(30.VII.2012)
Agenda Item: 1
ENGLISH ONLY

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

(Submitted by the IPCC Secretariat)

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

2. FOLLOW-UP TO IPCC-35 DECISIONS OF RELEVANCE TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

- (i) Report on the effectiveness of the ExCom
- (ii) Electronic version of IPCC reports as the document of record
- (iii) Procedures: further issues pertaining to the role of the observer organizations in the AR5 review

3. IPCC RELEVANT MATTERS ADDRESSED BY UK INFORMATION TRIBUNAL

4. MATTERS RELATED TO THE FIFTH ASSESSMENT REPORT (AR5)

- (i) Consistency of publications
- (ii) Planning of Working Groups and Panel Sessions in 2014

5. UPDATE ON ERROR PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION

6. UPDATE ON COMMUNICATIONS ACTIVITIES AND PLANS

7. ANY OTHER MATTERS

IPCC Procedures: further issues pertaining to the role of the observer organizations in the AR5 review

2 August 2012

In response to a request for clarification of the role of IPCC observer organizations in the government/expert review of draft reports and recognising that there had been some inconsistencies in past practices, this topic was discussed at ExCom-7 and the IPCC Secretariat presented a number of options for discussion at P-35 (see IPCC-35/Doc.10).

The Contact Group on Procedures carefully reviewed these options and the related text proposals for the IPCC Procedures (Appendix A to the Principles) in several sessions at P-35. The delegates clearly supported the option of inviting observer organizations to identify experts to review IPCC reports, which is expressed in the P-35 decision: *The Panel decided to invite IPCC observer organizations to encourage experts to participate in the government/expert review stage*. Such experts do not represent these IPCC observer organizations.

This approach is consistent with past practice in all WGs and TFI and will be put into effect immediately for the government/expert review of the WGI AR5 Second Order Draft (SOD), with a letter being sent to IPCC observer organizations inviting them to encourage experts to participate in the expert review of the WGI AR5 SOD.

As part of its decision at P-35, the Panel *requested the Executive Committee to consider whether there is a need to clarify any further issues pertaining to the role of the observer organizations in the AR5 review*. The request for clarification of the Procedures originally came from an observer organization but it was not a request for change, and neither governments nor the WGs/TFI have suggested that any change is needed.

The Contact Group also considered the status of the various categories of Observer Organizations, Participating Organizations and Organizations with Enhanced/Special Observer Status. There was no government consensus in either the Contact Group or in the subsequent discussion in Plenary for any of the options presented in IPCC-35/Doc.10. These included: observer organizations to provide comments on the Second Order Drafts during the government/expert review, inviting them to provide written comments on the revised draft of the Summary for Policymakers before the approval session, or for those drafts to be sent to observer organizations for information.

Delegates stressed that the governments provide reviews and comments as part of an intergovernmental process and that the observer organizations have the opportunity of involving their experts in the expert review stages. Such experts provide reviews under their name; they do not represent these observer organizations. The need for a consistent approach for AR5 was also mentioned and hence it was left for the ExCom to consider whether there is a need for any further clarification.

The decision of the Panel at P-35 gives the necessary clarity to the WGs and TFI in respect of the role of observer organizations in the AR5 review. There are no further issues pertaining to the role of observer organizations in the AR5 review that require clarification or action at this time.
