Acting Knowledge Committee Statutory Note

Note: The purpose of this document is to set the Acting Knowledge Committee structure, functions and processes during the IPOS ramp up phase (2025 - 2027). Responsibilities and certain substantive components which will apply only after the ramp up phase, are included in the Appendix.

The Acting Knowledge Committee shall operate in accordance with the IPOS Values Charter, which prevails in matters of values, principles and standards across all IPOS governance bodies and activities.

1. MANDATE AND SCOPE

1.1 Mandate. The Acting Knowledge Committee (AKC) is the governance body responsible for the scientific and technical integrity, inclusiveness, and contextual relevance of IPOS outputs. It safeguards credibility, impartiality, and methodological rigour across all knowledge activities.

1.2 Scope of remit. The AKC governs methods, quality assurance, peer review, and approval of IPOS knowledge products prior to publication. It does not set organisational strategy or budgets, does not manage the operational delivery of services.

2. ROLE

2.1 Request selection. The AKC conducts the prioritization and selection of received Action Requests, Rapid Responses, and Catalyst inputs prior to a final review by the Interim Steering Committee.

2.2 Approval authority. The AKC formally approves final knowledge outputs before release. It ensures that IPOS activities and outputs are aligned with the Values Charter, that uncertainty and confidence are expressed appropriately, and that minority views are transparently recorded where consensus is not possible.

2.3 Quality-assurance functions. The AKC ensures scientific and technical rigour; that methodology is transparent and reproducible.

2.4 Methodological governance. The AKC adopts and periodically updates IPOS methodological standards (evidence appraisal, synthesis protocols, co-production methodologies, scenario use, peer-review guidelines, and post-publication corrections/errata).

2.5 Plural knowledge integration. The AKC sets standards for the equitable inclusion and validation of diverse knowledge systems alongside peer-reviewed science, with appropriate safeguards and attribution. To ensure this, the AKC should

annually refine and update the IPOS Inclusivity and Equity Guidelines and coproduction principles and processes.

2.6 Peer-review governance. The AKC develops and periodically updates the guidelines for independent external review; endorses reviewer selection to ensure expertise, independence, and diversity; and oversees response-to-review procedures.

2.7 Expert selection guidance. The AKC defines transparent criteria for nominating and approving experts to contribute to drafting or review, taking into account competence, diversity, independence, and absence of unmanaged conflicts of interest (COI). In collaboration with the Secretariat (and in due course in collaboration with the Regional Nodes), the AKC approves working group composition.

2.8 Conflicts of interest and ethics. The AKC adopts and enforces COI policies for members, authors, and reviewers; requires timely declarations; mandates recusals where appropriate; and publishes COI statements for approved outputs where needed.

2.9 Data, AI and transparency standards. The AKC, supports the Secretariat, sets principles for data sourcing, accessibility, reproducibility, adherence to FAIR and CARE principles and responsible use of algorithmic tools (including precautionary measures against bias and requirements for explainability and auditability).

2.10 Monitoring and learning. The AKC provides advice on the regular monitoring and evaluation processes conducted by the Secretariat after each request cycle. These evaluations will include post-delivery quality reviews and syntheses of the lessons learned to improve methods, reviewer guidance, and approval practices.

2.11 Risk management. Where risks to scientific integrity are identified (e.g., uncorrected errors, evidence of bias, method deviations), the AKC can require corrective action up to and including revision, addendum, or retraction.

2.12 Dispute resolution. The AKC arbitrates methodological or evidentiary disputes among contributing experts, seeking consensus and, failing that, ensuring fair representation of reasoned dissent in the approved text.

2.13 Interfaces with governance bodies. The AKC collaborates with the Secretariat on process coordination and documentation and provides the Interim Steering Committee with methodological advice and quality-assurance reports. Recommendations and findings shall be transmitted through written reports and periodic joint sessions with the Interim Steering Committee, ensuring structured dialogue, traceability of follow-up actions, and coherence across governance levels.

.**2.15 Interfaces with the knowledge community.** The AKC, in close collaboration with the Secretariat, curates and maintains the roster and guidance for the emerging IPOS Knowledge Network, including competency matrices and orientation guidelines on methods, ethics, and uncertainty communication.

3. GOVERNANCE

3.1 Composition. The AKC comprises experts spanning natural and social sciences, policy analysis, civil society/practice, private sector, and Indigenous and local knowledge holders, with balanced representation across regions, genders, and career stages. The maximum number of members for the AKC is 22 experts or knowledge or rights-holders.

3.2 Leadership. Following the term of the first cohort of Co-Chairs selected for commencement, the AKC elects two Co-Chairs by majority vote, taking into account gender, generational, geographic and sectoral diversity). Co-Chairs convene meetings, steward procedures, and sign approvals on behalf of the Committee.

3.3 Appointment and terms. During the ramp up phase, the members of the AKC shall serve for a one-year term, renewable once. All members will have the opportunity to serve for a second term during the second year of the ramp up phase (unless they resign or are removed for breach of ethics or failure to participate in AKC processes). New members will be proposed by the Secretariat, with the support of AKC and the CSI and submitted for approval to the AKC (see appendix for post-ramp-up phase procedure).

3.4 Quorum and meetings. The AKC meets regularly and ad hoc as needed for approvals. A quorum of 75% of the KC members is required for a valid deliberation. Meetings may be in person or virtual with secure record-keeping.

3.5 Decision-making. The AKC seeks consensus for approvals and methodological decisions. Where consensus cannot be reached after reasonable efforts, a two thirds majority vote may be used, with dissenting minority opinions recorded in the decision log and, where relevant, reflected in the output.

4. PROCESS

4.1 Conflict of interest. AKC Members with a declared conflict related to a specific request must recuse themselves from related deliberations and votes; recusals are recorded in the minutes.

4.2 Records and transparency. The AKC maintains complete records of output versions, as well as records of methodologies, and minutes of decisions consistent with confidentiality obligations.

4.3 Confidentiality. Drafts, reviewer identities (unless open review is explicitly used), and deliberations are treated as confidential until approval. The AKC sets rules for pre-publication communications to protect process integrity.

4.4 Amendment of these statutes. The AKC may propose amendments to its statutory note to reflect improved practice; amendments enter into force upon endorsement with approval from the Interim Steering Committee.

Appendix: Post Ramp up Phase

Once IPOS is fully implemented, the AKC will revise this Statutory Note as necessary taking into account lessons during the initial demonstration period and will include at least the following:

1. **Formalising the Knowledge Committee.** The AKC will transition to the Knowledge Committee under a transition plan to be developed jointly with the Interim Steering Committee by mid-2027.
2. **Interfaces with operational structures.** The KC will work with Regional Nodes to ensure contextual appropriateness of methods, support identification of qualified regional reviewers and service contributors, and promote consistent application of standards across regions.
3. **Appointment of new members.** New members will be elicited through an open call (shared with the CSI and Strategic Partners as well as UN Agencies), and will be selected by an *ad hoc* selection committee of four people appointed by the Interim Steering Committee, on proposition of the Chair.