

Guidelines for academic assessments

1. **Baseline:** Use phase 1 assessment as a starting point with the aim of critiquing and improving the original work. Teams may wish to consider: Was the initial assessment accurate? Is any information missing? Should additional references be included? What are the research needs for a given intervention? What are the areas of conflict or contention?
2. **Criteria:** Consider the 12 criteria used in the phase 1 assessment. Are they still appropriate? Should any be revised, or should additional criteria be introduced?
3. **Scope:** Teams do not need to review each intervention. For example, the sea ice team should begin with the interventions most relevant to sea ice. Each team can decide which interventions to assess based on their expertise.
4. **Team composition:** If an assessment team identifies gaps in expertise and can suggest additional team members to address them, they may request an expansion of the team.
5. **Conflicts of interest:** All assessment team members should declare any actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest at the outset of the process. Team members should not evaluate interventions where they have a close research or financial interest. These declarations will be recorded to ensure transparency.
6. **Missing information:** Teams do not need to assess a criterion if they lack sufficient information; however, this should be documented.
7. **Research needs:** Recommend research needs to address a) points of contention and b) key questions that are critical for determining the feasibility of an idea.
8. **Standards of evidence:** Assessments should be knowledge-based, incorporating the best available scientific evidence, primarily from peer-reviewed literature and data. Assessments should include a brief statement on the confidence in the evidence, reflecting the strength and consistency of available knowledge.
9. **Neutral language and balance:** Use neutral, objective language. Assessments may include links to relevant actors for each intervention, as well as perspectives from proponents and skeptics, to ensure a balanced presentation.
10. **Managing disagreements:** Assessment team members are not required to agree on the scoring of each category. However, they should identify areas of disagreement and explain the reasons for differing opinions.

11. **Reporting:** Conclude the assessment with an evaluation that enables readers to compare the pros and cons of different ideas. While there is no prescribed format, using a common structure based on the original report will make it easier to consolidate the outputs from the different teams. Each team's assessments will be published online for transparency and then integrated into a final expert assessment document by the project's daily management team.

19 September 2025