

**FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION OF THE IPCC**  
**Paris, France, 13 – 16 March 2018**

IPCC-XLVII/Doc. 8  
(16.II.2018)  
Agenda Item: 12  
ENGLISH ONLY

**ALIGNING THE WORK OF THE IPCC WITH THE NEEDS OF THE GLOBAL  
STOCKTAKE UNDER THE PARIS AGREEMENT**

(Submitted by the Secretary of the IPCC)

## **ALIGNING THE WORK OF THE IPCC WITH THE NEEDS OF THE GLOBAL STOCKTAKE UNDER THE PARIS AGREEMENT**

### **Introduction**

At the 46<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPCC (Montreal, Canada, 24-27 February 2015), the Panel decided to establish a Task Group co-chaired by France and Mexico to play a leading role in facilitating further discussion on the alignment of the work of the IPCC and the global stocktake. It was further decided that the mandate and terms of reference for the Task Group would be discussed and determined at the 47<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPCC.

The Secretariat was requested to invite governments to make submissions which would inform the documentation and discussions at the 47<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPCC. On 12 October 2017, the Secretary of the IPCC invited governments to provide views on the alignment of the work of the IPCC and the global stocktake, as well as suggestions for terms of reference for the Task Group. The deadline for providing inputs was initially set to 30 November 2017 but was later deferred to 15 December 2017.

A total of 37 governments and 1 IPCC Observer Organization submitted responses at the time of preparing this document. They are listed below. The original submissions are attached to this document as Annex I (this final list as well as the submissions related will be added after agreement of and improvement by the countries).

- Argentina
- Australia
- Belgium
- Brazil
- Canada
- Chad
- China
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Denmark
- Ecuador
- Estonia
- European Union
- France
- Germany
- Hungary
- Indonesia
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Japan
- Liechtenstein
- Luxembourg
- Mauritius
- Mexico
- Netherlands
- New Zealand
- Norway
- Republic of Azerbaijan
- Republic of Korea
- Republic of Tanzania
- Singapore
- Spain
- Slovak Republic
- Swaziland
- Switzerland
- Togo
- Turkey
- United Kingdom

At the 47<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPCC, the Panel will be requested to only consider the proposed terms of reference for the Task Group. Suggestions submitted by governments on the timing and length of the assessment cycle, and related issues will be provided to the Task Group for further analysis and consultation. Further solicitation of government inputs to the process will be done as necessary.

## **1. PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE TASK GROUP**

On the basis of the submissions received, the following Terms of Reference for the Task Group on the Alignment of the work of the IPCC with the global stocktake are presented for the Panel's consideration.

### **PURPOSE**

- To prepare a comprehensive analysis report, identify viable options and make recommendations for consideration by the Panel for aligning the work of the IPCC in order to ensure the relevance of future IPCC products with the needs of the Global Stocktake under the UNFCCC.
- The Task Group will consider the budget implications of the different options.
- The Task Group will closely interact with the Task Group on the revision of the IPCC procedures.
- The Task Group will take into account the ongoing work of the UNFCCC on the GST modalities.

### **TERM**

- The Task Group should start its works immediately following the approval of its TORs by the Panel at the 47<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPCC. The Task Group should present progress reports at Panel Sessions and comply with IPCC procedures and ensure transparency and inclusiveness. The work should be concluded in 2020 at the latest.

### **MEMBERSHIP**

- Co-chaired by France and Mexico
- Be open to all governments
- All WMO regions should have at least 2 representatives
- Representatives of the IPCC Bureau
- Two 'rapporteurs' to take note of discussions and draft proposals
- About 20 membership
- Secretariat support

### **MEETINGS AND REPORTING**

- Circulate the compiled information to Governments before submitting to the Panel
- Hold meetings during plenary sessions, starting from the 49<sup>th</sup> Session
- Between plenaries: mail exchanges, cooperative work, teleconferences, call for submissions
- Present a progress report at each Panel Session

## ARGENTINA

Country: Argentina

**A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:**

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

Reducing the assessment cycle up to five years could be an option but it will require discussion. However, beyond the length of the cycles, the matter is what type of products are required.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

Ten years may result a long term in terms of governance and the need of renewing IPCC elected authorities.  
In relation to Global Stock take, it is important to say its rules and time lines are not agreed yet, so IPCC should not tie its work only to GST dynamics.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

This option seems reasonable and Global Stock Take of UNFCCC is one of the most relevant processes. However GST has not been designed yet and it may result problematic for IPCC to be tied only to GST bearing in mind that a lot of basic issues (related to GST) are to be defined in UNFCCC.  
In this sense, IPCC should also focus its work on other types of demands (in terms of science or climate policies) beyond GST.

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

**B - Terms of reference of the Task Group**

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

Due to the early stage of GST definitions, the first task should be identified certainties and unsolved issues related to GST. This will avoid unnecessary discussions in the heart of IPCC while preventing IPCC from political criticism.

In second place, the Task Force should cover the issue of IPCC cycles not only regarding GST but other global dynamics that may require IPCC products.

Third, the Task Force should identify a set of stake holders to consult and carrying out a survey as a first step.



## AUSTRALIA

### A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

Least preferred option. This is likely to increase budget pressures beyond acceptable levels. If the same format is followed for AR7 as we have for AR6, the same amount of work would need to be completed in a shorter timeframe. It would also create additional pressures on the IPCC towards the end of the Assessment cycle, when governments are focused on reviewing and approving content of the assessment reports.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

Preferred option. This is the simplest approach, with greatest flexibility to meet the global stocktake's needs, and it is possibly the least costly. The update should focus on the elements of greatest relevance to the global stocktake, rather than constitute just a mini Assessment Report; the IPCC can be guided by the UNFCCC in this regard.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

This option introduces complications in the time frames and deliverables of IPCC reports. In assessing this option, it will be important to consider the implications for each year of the Global Stocktake:

- 2023: AR6 will be completed, with the Synthesis Report to be delivered in 2022, so expect that AR6 Synthesis would be in time for the GST.
- 2028: an AR7 would be due in 2028, but would this be early enough for the GST, or would the AR7 be brought forward a year, or would a Special Report be needed?
- 2033: an AR8 would be due in 2035 therefore expect that a Special Report would be needed, would this be in 2032 or 2033?
- 2038: the AR would be 3 years old, would this be too old and therefore would a SR be needed?

As mentioned in response to Q2, it is also questionable whether the Assessment Reports are the most useable format to inform the Global Stocktake. A targeted or standardised approach, responding to known global stocktake areas of interest, would appear more appropriate.

#### 4. Any other suggestions and proposals

The best outcome is an IPCC report that responds to the needs of the Parties to the Paris Agreement, and allows flexibility for the IPCC work program in terms of time lines, products and costs. Australia is also mindful of the serious budgetary pressures faced by the IPCC at this time, and seeks to gain an understanding of the budget implications of each option.

### **B - Terms of reference of the Task Group**

#### 1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

- Prepare a budget analysis of costs for each option.
- Elaborate on what type of report would be required for each option.
- Compile a table of pros and cons for each option.
- Consider the outcomes of the COP23 discussions on this topic.
- Clarify the timing of when this decision is required.
- Circulate this information to Governments before the next Plenary Session with a clear understanding of what decisions will need to be taken and when.

## **BELGIUM**

### **Submission of Belgium in response to the request by the IPCC Secretariat concerning the alignment of cycles of the IPCC and the global stock take foreseen under the Paris Agreement?**

Belgium thanks the IPCC Secretariat for giving us the opportunity to express our views.

The IPCC's current financial difficulties highlight the need for increased efficiency, careful planning and design of relevant products. The reply of the IPCC to the UNFCCC is one of the products that the IPCC is requested to prepare. Therefore this product needs to be seen in the whole context of the IPCC, including the context of resources (human and budgetary).

For the time being, it is not yet very clear what is precisely requested from the IPCC and by when precisely. The UNFCCC's Facilitative Dialogue in 2018 will be informed by the Special Report (SR) on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5). SR1.5 could inform Parties as to whether this type of IPCC product would be appropriate for the GST and lessons can be learned for the future.

We believe that it is difficult providing answers on the proposals by the secretariat because we think that enabling a regular GST support needs to be seen in the whole context of the future of the IPCC: its core mission, its structure and management, its products, the budget etc. GST support is only one of the objectives of the IPCC.

In that context, the setting up of a Task Group (TG), with a clear mandate is key. It is also important for the TG to work in between IPCC sessions, since the next plenaries with approvals of reports will be very busy and probably there will be few time to discuss in depth the alignment of cycles in the context of the future of the IPCC.

In a previous plenary decision, it was aimed for a decision on the alignment in 2018. Maybe this is too soon because we expect we need considerable time to discuss, but the decision should be taken in 2020 at the latest and after stock is taken from the 2018 Facilitative Dialogue and for enabling any reorganization timely for example starting the AR7 earlier, maybe before AR6 ended formally.

#### **Terms of reference of the Task Group**

Terms of Reference could include a.o.:

- to consider the development of the GST support (the type of product and its timing) ) in the context of the other IPCC products, IPCC structure and management, and to consider the consequences in terms of resources (scientists, budget) as well as the contributions of each WG and /or TGI
- to identify the lessons learned from the Talanoa Facilitative Dialogue in 2018
- to identify options for the management of a targeted Special Report when the preparation is covering parts of 2 cycles or when the next cycle needs to be advanced in view of being ready for the stock take in 2028, for which a product should be available before the COP in 2027.

For enabling the co-chairs to play their role, it would be good to have also 2 'rapporteurs', taking note of the discussions and drafting proposals and the help of the secretariat, in particular with respect to rules and procedures of the IPCC and the budget.

The composition of the TG should be balanced: all WMO regions should be represented as well as the different IPCC WGs and the Task force on inventories.

Options for decisions by plenary should be prepared by 2019 or 2020 at the latest.

\* \* \*

**VIEWS ON THE ALIGNMENT OF THE CYCLES OF THE IPCC  
AND THE GLOBAL STOCKTAKE FORESEEN IN THE PARIS AGREEMENT  
AND ON THE TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE TASK GROUP**

**Country: BRAZIL**

The IPCC at its 43rd Session agreed to request the Secretariat to prepare proposals for aligning the work of the Panel during its Seventh Assessment Report (AR7) with the needs of the global stocktake (GST) foreseen under the Paris Agreement and to submit these proposals for consideration at a Plenary session of the IPCC no later than 2018.

***A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:***

***1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.***

Urgent climate action on mitigation and adaptation must rely on timely science-based information as a point of departure. The products of the IPCC assessment cycles constitute the principal scientific input for policy decision-making at all levels. Another input for decision-making is the GST under the Paris Agreement.

The Agreement establishes that the GST consists of an assessment of the collective progress towards the purpose of the Agreement and its long-term goals which shall be undertaken for the first time in 2023 and every five years thereafter. The main function of the GST is to inform Parties' successive Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) – i.e. the output of the GST should be an input for the nationally-determined processes which will prepare successive rounds of NDCs. The GST will therefore be a key element in informing the increase of Parties' ambition over time under the Agreement.

Brazil believes that the best option for the alignment of the IPCC and GST cycles is to reduce the assessment cycle to five years. The last product of the sixth cycle of the IPCC will be finalized in 2022, one year before the first GST in 2023. If subsequent IPCC assessment cycles take five years, they would conclude one year before GSTs.

A synchronous alignment of the IPCC and GST cycles will allow Panel products to more effectively contribute to ambition-raising by providing comprehensive, robust, science-based information on climate change to the global community, helping to: (i) increase predictability; (ii) optimize the impact of IPCC products on multilateral and national decision-making processes; (iii) provide an opportunity to review and rationalize the work of the IPCC; and (iv) most likely reduce the cost of IPCC cycles.

Besides informing the GST, the release of IPCC products up to one year before the GSTs would also influence other multilateral processes inside and outside UNFCCC framework, such as the planning of international initiatives to be announced along with GSTs. On the national level, IPCC products would be made available to stakeholders at a stage when preparations for successive updated NDCs would be ramping up, increasing the products' impacts on policy-making. This timing would also

boost the domestic and international visibility of and interest for IPCC products, thus increasing the efficiency of the Panel's outreach activities.

In order to achieve a synchronous alignment between the IPCC and the GST cycles, a review would be necessary of (a) the number of products in each cycle, (b) the characteristics of those products, and (c) the procedures for preparation and approval of IPCC products. In the current setting, an IPCC assessment cycle lasts around six to seven years and produces a full assessment report (AR), methodology guidelines, technical papers and special reports.

Although challenging, this review would provide an opportunity to rethink IPCC products, streamline procedures and optimize the use of resources (in terms of time, workload and budget). Some non-exhaustive considerations to be taken into account in this process are: the length of reports; the need to allow sufficient time for technical and government review of products; the possibility of producing methodology guidelines and special reports in alternate cycles; the possibility of producing no more than one special report per cycle.

If the number of products decreases and/or other factors mentioned above are effectively addressed, chances are the cost of each IPCC cycle will fall due to less meetings/travels.

***2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.***

Brazil believes this option is inadequate because: (a) it would reduce the exposure and policy-relevance of IPCC products for multilateral and national processes; (b) it would go against the need for more frequent availability of sound, science-based information on climate change; (c) it would increase the probability of outdated products; and (d) the definition of "relevant information" to be provided in the middle of the cycle would likely result in uncertainty and polarization in the Panel.

***3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5).***

*The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.*

This option requires almost no adaptation in IPCC's current work procedures – which can be seen either as an advantage or a disadvantage, taking into account the current workload and budget restriction faced by the Panel. Discretion over the definition of "relevant information" to be provided in the targeted special report would likely result in uncertainty and polarization in the Panel.

***B - Terms of reference of the Task Group***

***1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group***

The Task Group should, with support from the Secretariat:

- a. Provide an overview of the views of IPCC members on the subject by compiling and circulating to Focal Points submissions presented by IPCC members;
- b. Prepare an Informal Note on advantages and disadvantages of each option in relation to (i) the need to inform the GST and (ii) possible impacts on IPCC procedures, workload and budget. A draft of this note should be submitted to Focal Points for review and comments before the final version.
- c. Promote an in-session debate on the three options after the release of the above-mentioned Informal Note during the [YYth] Session of the Panel; and
- d. Based on the results of the in-session debate, the Informal Note and Members' submissions, prepare a draft recommendation note to be submitted to the Panel at its [YYth] Session.

Country: Canada

**A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:**

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

Shortening the cycle to five years would prescribe rigidity to the IPCC assessment process, increase the strain on the IPCC and the scientific community and limit opportunities for Special Reports on topics of interest.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

Extending the cycle to ten years could hamper the IPCC's ability to assess, in a timely manner, areas of science that are evolving quickly, and pose challenges for IPCC authors faced with an increased volume of literature to assess.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

Recognizing that the information needs of the global stocktake are not fully defined, and that the timing of technical work is being deliberated among Parties, this option allows the IPCC the flexibility to best meet the needs of the stocktake process on an ongoing basis. Consideration should be given to a modified version of this option, namely that the targeted report be a 'Supplemental Report' instead of a 'Special Report'. The latter implies an assessment of a specific issue, which may not accurately reflect the needs of the global stocktake. Differentiating a Supplemental Report from Special Reports and the main Assessment Reports could also help to avoid scope creep beyond the intent of the targeted report. This consideration recognizes the precedent of the Supplemental Report that the IPCC released in 1992 in order to respond to the needs of the Rio Earth Summit. Canada would welcome having direction from the UNFCCC on key questions relevant to specific needs in that given year, to make a supplementary report as relevant as possible to the information needs of the UNFCCC.

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

While Canada views that maintaining the approximately seven-year assessment cycle is the best way forward at this time, choosing this option should not preclude re-considering the length of the IPCC cycle in the future, if deemed necessary after the experience of the first global stocktake.

**B - Terms of reference of the Task Group**

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

- Synthesize the input from member countries' submissions on this issue, noting convergence/divergence of perspectives and the pros/cons associated with the various options. Present this information in a document to support decision-making on the issue.  
- Consider what mechanisms may be needed in order to ensure timely delivery and responsiveness to the UNFCCC on the global stocktake issue, e.g., a more streamlined report preparation, review and approval process.



Country: chad

**A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:**

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

i agree

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

they will forget IPCC if there is no recent report made available within but economically is faire but climate change is occurring at very high speed

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

yes for the developed countries and the regional impact should be based on the impacted and vulnerable countries need in term of adaptation mitigation and capacity building and need for least developed countries

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

UNFCCC should assist IPCC sessions and ARs financially and this should be negotiated on SBs sessions

**B - Terms of reference of the Task Group**

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

current task are OK



Country: China

**A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:**

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

No.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

No.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

Yes, climate change-related scientific research and assessment are governed by given rules and cycles, and the formation of IPCC reports follows a set of rigorous procedure. The current assessment cycle has ensured the quality and influence of a series of IPCC reports. We agree to maintain a seven-year assessment cycle that has lasted for 30 years. If there is a special requirement by the Convention, IPCC could respond to it by means of a special report.

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

None.

**B - Terms of reference of the Task Group**

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

To evaluate various points of views, and identify the strengths and weaknesses of options for different cycles in order to prepare a comprehensive analysis report for submission to IPCC.

Country: Croatia

**A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:**

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

It could be reasonable.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

Could be one of the option.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

The best choice.

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

**B - Terms of reference of the Task Group**

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

1. To make a study of previous experience with periods of about 7 years;
2. To analyses the first option of the 5 years;
3. To analyses 10-years option;
4. Make a table with facts pro and contra fro three options.

Country: Cyprus

**A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:**

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

The proposed reduction of the assessment cycle is too short

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

The proposed increase of assessment cycle is too long

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

The Cyprus Department of Meteorology qualifies the current seven year assessment cycle as the most appropriate for its functions

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

No other suggestion

**B - Terms of reference of the Task Group**

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

## DENMARK

Secretary of the IPCC  
Abdalah Mokssit

Office/Department  
KS

Date 08 December 2017

J nr. 2012-10

/TIC

### **Alignment of the work of the IPCC and the global stocktake of the Paris Agreement**

We welcome the opportunity to submit our views on the alignment of the work of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen in the Paris Agreement, and on the terms of reference for the Task Group on the issue, which the Panel decided to establish at P-46.

The IPCC support to processes under the UNFCCC is essential. The global stocktake of the implementation of the Paris Agreement shall assess the collective progress towards achieving the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement, in the light of the best available science. The contribution to the global stocktake from the IPCC as the leading international body for the assessment of climate change is crucial. The role of IPCC reports for the global stocktake is directly highlighted in the COP21 decision (1/CP.21, para 99).

The consideration of the IPCC contribution to the global stocktake is broader than that of alignment of the IPCC assessment cycle with future global stocktakes. The Task Group should inform the decision of the IPCC on this issue. For the first global stocktake in 2023 the IPCC is well set for providing input given the work programme of its 6<sup>th</sup> assessment cycle. Thus there is no need for immediate decisions. Rather, priority should be given to careful considerations.

The Task Group mandate should include considering

- which products should be planned for each IPCC assessment cycle in order to both support UNFCCC processes and maintain the independence and integrity of the IPCC as the authoritative body for the scientific assessment of climate change;
- how different IPCC products can inform the global stocktake in a timely manner, recognizing that the modalities of the global stocktake are to be finalised in processes under the UNFCCC;
- lessons to be learned from how the IPCC SR1.5 feeds into the UNFCCC Talanoa Dialogue;
- length and timing of future IPCC assessment cycles, including budgetary impacts and the possible need for changes in IPCC procedures following from changes in cycle length.

The Task Group should

- begin its work as soon as possible;
- conduct work between IPCC plenary sessions, since the IPCC plenary sessions in 2018 and 2019 have quite full agendas given the upcoming approval of three Special Reports and a Methodology Report;
- work in a transparent manner and could have appointed rapporteurs;
- work in an inclusive manner.

Best regards

Tina Christensen,  
PhD, Scientific adviser  
IPCC Focal Point for Denmark

## ECUADOR

ECUADOR  
ATTACHMENT IPCC-GST

LETTER A.

NUMBER 1.

The assessment cycle requires more time than five years; therefore it is not recommendable to shorten the cycle. It is special required that experts and science evolve to present the best available science to address climate change challenges.

NUMBER 2.

Since the assessment cycle already takes 7-8 years, it is important to let the science evolve in order to serve and provide the best inputs to decision makers under climate negotiations. Given the fact that 7-8 years assessment cycle imply that some global stocktakes will have the input of the whole assessment report in some cases beforehand and in other cases after, it is better to align the assessment cycle with the global stocktake but given enough time to have a good output with the best science available. For that reason, Ecuador states that each of the global stocktakes should be provided by a special report. In that regards, the special report, such as SR1.5, will serve to take decisions at least one year before each global stocktake and in line with the assessment cycle.

It is crucial not to launch a parallel process in the assessment cycle; therefore, we support this option to align the cycle with the global stocktake increasing it to ten years, but providing a special report every five years as an input for the global stocktake.

NUMBER 3.

This option will imply to have a parallel process independent of the progress of the assessment cycle, for example in 2022 the assessment cycle will fit the global stocktake in 2023 with comprehensive information, but in 2028 will not be the case due to there will be two or three years left to end the assessment cycle, and the same thing in 2033 where the assessment cycle will already be concluded in 2030, what would imply to produce special reports in parallel of the progress of the assessment cycle. Therefore, it is not recommendable to go through this option.

NUMBER 4.

As stated in number 2, it is important to have a special report every five years at least one year before each of the global stocktakes.

LETTER B.

NUMBER 1.

1. Financial implications to change the assessment cycle either to five or ten years, including special reports for each of the global stocktakes.
2. Scientific implications to change the assessment cycle either to five or ten years, including special reports for each of the global stocktakes.
3. Short term strategy for the transformation of the assessment cycle if required.

### Alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake and the terms of reference of the Task Group

Views compiled by the Ministry of the Environment of Estonia  
15.12.2017, Tallinn, Estonia

The Republic of Estonia welcomes the opportunity to submit its views on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC with those of the global stocktake (GST) and on the terms of reference for the Task Group on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake.

Estonia would like to highlight that aligning the work of the IPCC and the GST, so that IPCC can support the GST with providing the best available science inputs to the GST process, shall take priority over aligning the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake.

We are grateful to the IPCC Secretariat with providing us with the questionnaire for submission purposes. However, we feel that a free format would better suit the content our submission.

#### **Views on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC with those of the global stocktake (GST)**

The 2015 Paris Agreement initiated a global stocktake (GST) process to assess collective progress towards achieving its purpose and long-term goals<sup>1</sup>. The first of these GSTs will take place in 2023 and the second GST in 2028. Subsequent GSTs will take place every five years thereafter. To ensure that the GST is undertaken in the light of the best available science, including the latest IPCC reports<sup>2</sup> that are fit for purpose. It would be preferable for any new IPCC products to be delivered ahead of each GST session.

As the modalities of the GST are still under discussion<sup>3</sup>, the details of the scientific input required from the IPCC and the timeframe of the GST are unclear. We expect the 6<sup>th</sup> Assessment Report to be available on time to serve the first GST. Since, at present, an IPCC assessment cycle lasts approximately six/seven years to produce a full Assessment Report (AR) then this might not be the case for the second and subsequent GSTs. Therefore, the IPCC at its 47<sup>th</sup> Session should initiate a process under the Task Group on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake to identify options to provide information, in a timely manner, to Parties under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) for considering as input to the GSTs from 2023 onwards. While doing so the appropriate changes to the rules of procedures of the IPCC should also be considered.

#### **On the terms of reference for the Task Group on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake**

##### **Based the information above the Task Group shall:**

- consider how the IPCC can inform the GST in a timely manner while maintaining the IPCC's existing role and independence

---

<sup>1</sup> Paris Agreement, Article 14

<sup>2</sup> Further advice on IPCC informing the GST is given in the SBSTA 45 conclusions on Advice on how the assessments of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change can inform the global stocktake referred to in Article 14 of the Paris Agreement (Agenda sub-item 8(b)2. <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2016/sbsta/eng/04.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Agenda item 6 of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement of the UNFCCC negotiations

- exchange views with Parties to the UNFCCC and with the UNFCCC secretariat on information needs of the GST
- exchange views with the scientific community on their abilities to provide high-quality peer-reviewed inputs to the IPCC work informing the GST and to commit their time as authors or chairs and co-chairs
- consider also, how the structure of the IPCC work and the set of principles and clear procedures guiding the IPCC activities need to be changed while maintaining the high standards of the review process and independence of the IPCC
- consider budgetary implications of the above to the IPCC

**While considering the timing and work mode of the Task Group** we see that at the 47<sup>th</sup> session of the IPCC, the terms of reference of the Task Group should be adopted and its work launched. The Task Group should have sufficient time for their work during the IPCC sessions and, if needed, also work between the sessions. In addition to the two co-chairs the Task Group shall have a rapporteur appointed by the IPCC at its 47<sup>th</sup> session. Budgetary implications of the work and composition of the Task Group and its bureau should be considered.

The Task Group should provide regular updates of their work at the IPCC sessions until their mandate is concluded no later than in late 2019. At the 50<sup>th</sup> session of the IPCC the Task Group shall present its conclusions to the Panel, including possible recommendations of changes to the structure and to the principles and procedures governing the IPCC, so that a decision by the Panel can be taken at that meeting.

The timeline presented above would also allow the Task Group to consider the experience gained from the 2018 Talanoa Dialogue and the role of the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C in it. The modalities of the GST and its interaction with other issues will also be sufficiently clear by the end of 2019.

## EUROPEAN UNION

Google Groups

---

### Contribution of the European Union to the discussion on the alignment of IPCC cycles with the GST

---

Andrea.Tilche@ec.europa.eu <Andrea.Tilche@ec.europa.eu>

29-Nov-2017 12:44

Posted in group: **ipcc-alignment**

The European Union (represented by the European Commission) – also for its role of Party of UNFCCC - welcomes the opportunity to submit its views on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC with those of the global stocktake (GST), as well as on the terms of reference for the Task Group to be established in order to consider this issue. With this in mind, we make in a free format the following methodological observations.

#### IPCC reports in the context of the GST

As indicated in Article 14 of the Paris Agreement, the purpose of the GST is to assess collective progress towards the Agreement's long-term goal, in a comprehensive manner, in light of the best available science. Since the IPCC provides the most authoritative assessment of the science of climate change, its reports will therefore provide a crucial input, as recognised in paragraph 99b of decision 1/CP.21.

The modalities for the GST are currently under discussion as part of the Paris Agreement Work Programme of the UNFCCC, with a view to being considered and adopted by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement at its first session (CMA1).

#### Considerations related to the Task Group Terms of Reference

##### ***Scope of the mandate:***

The Task Group should consider carefully how different IPCC products can contribute to the GST in a relevant and timely manner. This question is broader than merely weighing the pros & cons of different assessment cycle lengths and alignment possibilities. The Task Group should therefore inform the ultimate decisions of the IPCC on this matter by considering the following:

- the number and type of reports that should be produced within each cycle, in order both to inform the GST and maintain the IPCC's existing role as an independent and authoritative body for the scientific assessment of climate change (as described in the document *Principles governing IPCC work*).
- the needs of the GST process in terms of regular and timely scientific information, noting that GST modalities and inputs are ultimately the jurisdiction of the Parties to the Paris Agreement.
- the length and timing of IPCC assessment cycles that is most appropriate to meet the needs above, taking into account timing, budget and other constraints related to the completion of an IPCC assessment cycle.
- if and how IPCC procedures might need to change in order to allow for input to the GST to be made in an orderly fashion. For example, does the process of elections, selecting report topics and scoping of reports need to be changed/accelerated if the cycle length is shortened?

##### ***Timing of the Task Group's considerations:***

The Task Group should begin work as soon as possible in order to lay out the range of possibilities for orienting the work of



the IPCC towards the needs of the GST. However, the Task Group should remain open minded since there is no need to take immediate decisions (the first GST in 2023 will anyway be informed by the products of the 6<sup>th</sup> assessment cycle). Furthermore Parties to the IPCC, and the Task Group, will be better placed to consider the needs of the GST following the experience of the 2018 Talanoa Dialogue and the reception of the 1.5°C Special Report, as well as the finalisation of GST modalities by CMA1.

**Andrea TILCHE**

Head of Unit



**European Commission**

DG Research & Innovation

I4 – Climate Action and Earth Observation

CDMA 03/106 - B-1049 Brussels/Belgium

Tel.: +32 2 299 63 42

GSM: +32 498 99 63 42

<http://ec.europa.eu/research>

## FRANCE

### **France submission in response to the consultation of the IPCC Secretariat on the alignment of the IPCC work with the needs of the Global Stocktake (GST).**

France thanks the IPCC Secretariat for consulting the members of the Panel on the alignment of the IPCC work with the needs of the Global Stocktake (GST).

France considers that this is a subject of primary importance that addresses the core missions of the IPCC.

We also believe that any decision on this subject will require considerable time for reflection and consultation among the Panel members. With the adoption of 3 special reports and the refinement of 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Inventories in 2018 and 2019, the plenaries of the next 2 years will be very busy. Therefore it seems to us essential to set up terms of references that encourage continuous work of the Task Group between successive plenaries. The progress of the work should be reported during each plenary session. The final decision of the Panel should be made early enough before the end of the cycle in order to make it effective before the elections of the new Bureau. We believe that the elections of the new Bureau could take place as early as 2021, in order to save time between the end of the 6th cycle and the beginning of the 7th cycle.

The decision should therefore be taken no later than 2020. This will make it possible to build on the future modalities of the GST which are still under progress.

As one of the future co-chairs of the Task Group, France does not wish to express at this stage any preference on the options proposed by the IPCC Secretariat. We believe that Plenary 47 should focus on the mandate and terms of references that will be given to the Task Group, for which we recommend the following considerations:

#### Objectives of the Task Group:

- to identify different options for aligning the work of the IPCC with the needs of the GST;
- to identify the implications of the different options on the production of the IPCC and the organization of the cycles;
- to identify the implications of the different options on the IPCC budget;
- to identify the implications of the different options on IPCC procedures;
- to evaluate and to synthesize the pro and cons of the different options.

#### Modalities of the Task Group:

- effective start of the work on the substance just after Plenary 47
- completeness in 2020
- modalities for the work between plenaries: mail exchanges, cooperative work, teleconferences, call for submissions
- working meetings during plenary sessions, starting during Plenary 49
- progress report during each plenary
- compliance with IPCC procedures, transparency and inclusiveness

#### Composition of the Task Group:

- 2 co-chairs, 2 rapporteurs
- volunteer countries, if no more than 20, otherwise 3 representatives from each of the 6 WMO regions.
- 1 or 2 representatives of the IPCC Bureau
- secretariat support

Eric Brun  
IPCC focal point for France  
Paris, 15-12-2017



## GERMANY

Country: Germany

### A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

The Task Group should be mandated to explore options for the IPCC to deliver the information required by the GST including those outlined under bullet 1-3. The primary objectives of the Task Group's work are outlined below under bullet B.1.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

Please see bullet 1.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

Please see bullet 1.

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

IPCC 47 should take a decision on the ToR for the Task Group on the alignment of the work of the IPCC with needs of the global stocktake.

Time is needed to carefully consider options for the IPCC to deliver the information required by the GST, and these considerations would include the length of the assessment cycles, the types of products, as well as management and financial implications.

The ToRs of the Task Group should allow for such careful considerations, please see item B.1 below.

A decision regarding the options for the IPCC to deliver the information required by the GST should be informed by the Task Group's work and be taken in 2019 or early 2020.

## B - Terms of reference of the Task Group

### 1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

Primary objectives of the Task Group's work:

The Paris Agreement requires to periodically assess the collective progress towards achieving its purpose and its long-term goals (the global stocktake, GST) in the light the best available science.

As the UNFCCC's most authoritative source of scientific information, the IPCC should inform each GST with one of its flagship reports reflecting the up-to-date state of knowledge. This report would need to be delivered in sufficient time to allow for detailed consideration by Parties to the UNFCCC ahead of a GST. The Task Group should therefore be mandated to explore options to this end.

Further considerations of how to best respond to the information needs of the GST:

The mandate of the IPCC to deliver comprehensive and objective assessments must not be compromised. It is of key importance to maintain the integrity and independence of scientific process.

The IPCC's products are established by the scientific community on a voluntary basis. Any modifications to the way the IPCC works should be in agreement with the scientific community.

The IPCC procedures do not contain any specifications about the length of the assessment cycles. Instead, the frequency of publications of reports has changed over time and responded to practical issues. Flexibility to respond to the evolving needs of the UNFCCC needs to be maintained. The considerations of the Task Group should therefore not go beyond the AR7 and the second GST.

The upcoming agenda items "Review of the Principles of the IPCC" and "Future Work of the IPCC" should be integrated in the Task Groups's work programme, as necessary.



## HUNGARY



### MINISTRY OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Ref. no: KPF/92038/2017-NFM

*Mr Abdalah MOKSSIT  
Secretary of the IPCC*

*IPCC Secretariat  
7 bis, Avenue de la Paix – C.P. 2300  
CH-1211 Geneva 2  
Switzerland*

15<sup>th</sup> December 2017

**Subject:** Submission of Hungary on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake

Dear Mr Secretary,

Referring to your letter of 12 October 2017 (ref. no. 5312-17/IPCC/AR6) and the e-mail of the IPCC Secretariat dated 11 November 2017, please find enclosed the Hungarian submission on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake under Article 14 of the Paris Agreement.

*Sincerely,*



*Barbara BOTOS*  
IPCC Focal Point  
Hungary

Annex: Submission of Hungary on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake

## Annex

### Submission of Hungary on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake

*Hungary welcomes the opportunity to submit its views on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake (GST) under Article 14 of the Paris Agreement, as well as on the terms of reference for the Task Group to be established in order to consider this issue. On the basis of the opportunity offered in the e-mail of the IPCC Secretariat dated 11 November 2017, Hungary wishes to submit its views in a free format and not in the questionnaire provided earlier.*

#### I. IPCC and the GST

In our opinion it is premature to discuss the alignment in detail before clear and fully elaborated options are presented for the Panel, taking into account the experience of the 2018 Talanoa Dialogue as well as the outcome of the 24<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in December 2018 with regards to the modalities of the GST. In any event, we believe that the overall objective of the IPCC should remain to provide the best available science *inter alia* for the UNFCCC including input for each GST. Any alteration in the assessment cycle of the IPCC or in the procedures guiding the work of the IPCC should serve this basic principle.

#### II. Task Group Terms of Reference

As for the terms of reference of the Task Group, dealing with the subject matter, an extensive discussion followed by a formal decision should be carried out at the next plenary session of the IPCC (IPCC47). With regards to its mandate, the Task Group should consider thoroughly and present to the Panel for discussion how different IPCC products can contribute to the GST in a relevant and timely manner *inter alia* by presenting the various options on the number and type of reports that should be produced within each cycle, in order to inform the GST; the length and timing of IPCC assessment cycles that is most appropriate to meet the needs of the GST, taking into account budgetary and procedural implications etc.

We believe that the Task Group should begin its work as soon as possible and be able to carry out its duties inter-sessionally. The outcome of the work of the Task Group should be presented in 2019 or in the beginning of 2020 at the latest.

**Country:** Indonesia

**A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:**

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

Reducing the assessment cycle IPCC to five years must be comprehensive and facilitative, and consider the global stocktake process. The IPCC review process must be in line with approach, methodology and assumptions for the global stocktake.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

Increasing the assessment cycle IPCC to ten years must be comprehensive and facilitative, and consider the global stocktake process. The IPCC review process must be in line with approach, methodology and assumptions for the global stocktake.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

To maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle IPCC must be comprehensive and facilitative, and consider the global stocktake process. The IPCC review process must be in line with approach, methodology and assumptions for the global stocktake.

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

The global stocktake is meant to be a periodic assessment of collective progress. The alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake consider that every five years each Party shall communicate a NDC and be informed by the outcomes of the global stocktake.

**B - Terms of reference of the Task Group**

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

The Task Group should be designed to support IPCC for preparation inputs for the global stocktake, with respect to: (a) preparation of working programme for assessment and methodology guidelines; (b) identification resources and possible elements for support of task group work; (c) management of task group, including workshops and expert meetings, and scoping meetings; and (d) communication of task group report outcomes

Country: Iraq

**A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:**

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

Do not agree with this choice.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

Do not agree with this choice.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

We support this choice

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

1- Increase the number of members or experts from developing countries; to participate in the task forces of preparing , editing and reviewing the IPCC reports in order to building their capacities in this regard.  
2- Taking in to account of the most vulnerable countries or countries with Special circumstances, such as armed conflicts and terrorist operations, is the preparation of report's vocabulary.

**B - Terms of reference of the Task Group**

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group



**Submission on Alignment of the work of the IPCC and the global stocktake under the Paris Agreement to the UNFCCC**

Ireland welcomes the establishment by the IPCC, at its 46<sup>th</sup> Session in Montreal during September, of a Task Group to consider the issues arising from need to align the work of the IPCC to inform the global stocktake under the Paris Agreement to the UNFCCC. The global stocktake is expected to take place every five years.

Ireland supports France and Mexico as co-chairs of this Task Group and welcomes this opportunity to outline its views on this and the process by which it may be addressed.

The range of options identified in the communication from the IPCC is also very useful for framing this discussion. A number of the options identified could address this issue; however, given the its importance for the work of the IPCC and also for the future of the IPCC itself, it is considered that further detailed consideration of these, and other, options is warranted before a final decision is taken by the Panel.

Accordingly, Ireland does not express support for a specific solution at this point but would highlight the need for the Panel to agree the terms of reference for the Task Group, as well as agreement on the modalities for its work, at its 47<sup>th</sup> Session, in March 2018.

In this context is notable that in 2018 the IPCC will celebrate thirty years since its establishment. The IPCC has proved to be remarkable successful in carrying out its work and informing policy development in a balanced and non-prescriptive manner. The award of the Noble Prize to the IPCC for its work is testimony to its achievement. However, it would also be important for the IPCC to use this milestone to initiate consideration of its future and how it can continue to play a leading role in a world that has changed significantly over the last 30 years. It would be important for the IPCC to review lessons learned over this period and to consider how its overall work and procedures can respond effectively and efficiently to current challenges and demands such as the request to provide input to the UNFCCC global stocktake, while maintaining the integrity of these that enables the IPCC to continue in being the authoritative source of information on climate change.

The mandate of the Task Group established in Montreal is specific and it would not be suitable for carrying out a broad review.

However, the work of the Task Group can contribute to a wider review of the operations of the IPCC and inform its future development. Therefore Ireland considers that the terms of reference for the task group should allow it to also inform wider consideration of the work of IPCC while addressing its core task.

In this context elements of its terms of reference could include the following elements

- To review the current Assessment report writing and review process, and options to enhance or streamline this process
- To consider other IPCC activities, including the process for production of Special Reports, the operation of the Task Force on Inventories and process for production of its reports
- To consider how the IPCC has previously communicated with the UNFCCC and how lessons for these activities might inform options to facilitate the IPCC to input to the global stocktake

The UNFCCC is also considering issues arising from the global stocktake and has not fully determined the process for undertaking the Global stocktake. Consequently, the work of the Task Group need not be completed in 2018. This should inform the work schedule for the group and a decision on when this should be completed.

In conclusion, the work of this Task Group should focus on addressing its mandate. However, its work is also important for the future of the IPCC. This should be factored into the terms of reference for the Task Group as well the modalities and timeline for its work.

Kind regards,

Colin O'Hehir  
IPCC Focal Point  
Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment  
IRELAND

Country: Japan

## A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

a) It is expected that the new IPCC products will be delivered ahead of each GST which is to be undertaken every five years under the Paris Agreement.  
b) Japan considers that the IPCC assessment cycles have been developed in a most suitable manner for an assessment of scientific knowledge in line with the cycles of scientific research. Changing the assessment cycles requires IPCC to adjust its modality in publishing the assessment reports. When doing so, it is critical to ensure the quality of these reports. At this moment, there is not sufficient information to decide whether the changing of the reporting cycle would pose any risk in maintaining the current quality of IPCC reports.  
c) Japan therefore would like to request clarification by the task group on the details of each option from various perspectives, including schedules of assessment, budget, and efficiency/feasibility of input to GST and consistency with the cycles of scientific research.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

Same as above.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

(In addition to the comments in 1.; )

a) Japan requests detailed clarification by the task group on the option 3 whether or not the option causes any confusion due to additional assessment cycle for the Special Report for GST in addition to the regular assessment cycle for the Assessment Reports in parallel.  
b) The further points to be addressed are, for example;  
(i) Will additional burden on the authors be increased?  
(ii) If we install the Special Report for GST on a regular basis, is there any negative impact on the other future Special Reports? Will the preparation of other reports be constrained by developing the Special Report for every GST?  
(iii) Is it possible to develop the Special Report in alignment with GST on regular basis in a similar manner that the SR1.5 is developed in alignment with the 2018 facilitative dialogue?

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

Special report will not be necessary in case the timing of GST and current IPCC cycle coincides without specific arrangement.

## B - Terms of reference of the Task Group

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

a) To clarify the details of each option from various perspectives, including schedules of assessment, budget, and efficiency / feasibility of input to GST and consistency with the cycles of scientific research, including additional burden on the authors.  
b) To identify possible impact due to additional assessment cycle for the Special Report for GST in addition to the regular assessment cycle for the Assessment Reports in parallel, and the possible measures to avoid any confusion. It includes any impact on the other future Special Reports  
c) To identify and analyze the lessons learned from the SR 1.5 development in alignment with the 2018 facilitative dialogue.

## LIECHTENSTEIN

Country: Liechtenstein

### A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

Highly beneficial. New scientific knowledge will be available and the amount of publications to be considered could be reduced, which will result in less work for the IPCC.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

By the end of the assessment cycle some information is outdated. Not a preferred option.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

If it does not increase the workload of the IPCC this could be an option.

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

### B - Terms of reference of the Task Group

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

Identify the pros and cons of A1 and A2.

## LUXEMBOURG

### **Luxembourg submission in response to the consultation of the IPCC Secretariat on the alignment of the work of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement**

Luxembourg welcomes the opportunity to submit its views on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC with those of the global stocktake (GST), as well as on the terms of reference of the Task Group established in order to consider this issue.

We consider however that these considerations should be broader than an alignment of cycles, as we will explain below, and we thus would rather like to refer to an alignment of work of the IPCC and the GST. This is also the reason why we decided to make this submission in a free format.

#### **The IPCC should deliver fit for purpose reports**

As noted in the Paris Agreement, the first GST should take place in 2023 and every five years thereafter, and be based on the best available science. We consider that the IPCC reports are the most authoritative assessments of climate change and will thus be the most important input to the GST. Even though the details of the modus operandi of the GST will be decided in 2018, we expect the 6<sup>th</sup> Assessment Report to be available in due time to serve the first GST.

For subsequent GSTs this might not be the case anymore. The IPCC should thus launch at its 47<sup>th</sup> Session a process under the Task Group to identify possibilities to produce a report that includes all information relevant for the GST and is available in a timely manner for Parties under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to consider it. This is why we think that this process should also consider the structure and the principles governing the IPCC and adapt them if it is necessary to reach an alignment of work.

#### **Scope of the mandate of the Task Group**

Taking this into account, we consider that the Task Group should:

- consider the number and type of reports that should be produced within each cycle in order to inform the GST while maintaining the IPCC's existing role as an independent and authoritative body for the scientific assessment of climate change.
- exchange views with representatives of the UNFCCC in order to understand the needs of the GST in particular after COP24 when the modalities of the GST are expected to be fixed.
- consider the length of IPCC assessment cycles that best suits the needs above, taking into account the views of the scientific community and their possibility to meet the literature cut off dates associated, while maintaining the high standards of review which the IPCC has established. In addition, budgetary implications for the IPCC should be considered.
- consider also, if and how IPCC procedures might need to change to meet the changes that arise from previous consideration.

#### **Timing and way of work of the Task Group**

We consider that at the 47<sup>th</sup> session of the IPCC, the term of reference of the Task Group should be fixed and its work launched. Seeing that at all subsequent session until the 52<sup>th</sup> the IPCC will have a report to adopt, time during sessions will be limited to discuss this important topic. We thus consider that the Task Group should work in between sessions. Possibly meetings of the Task Group could be held back to back with IPCC sessions to limit budgetary implications.

The Task Group should report regularly at IPCC sessions on progress made. It should conclude its work in 2019, or possibly early 2020, and present its conclusions to the Panel, including possible recommendations of changes to the structure and principles governing the IPCC, so that a decision by the Panel can be taken in due time.

This timeline would also allow the Task group to take into account the experience of the 2018 Talanoa Dialogue and the reception of the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C, as well as the finalisation of the modalities of the GST at COP24.

Luxembourg,  
15.12.2017

Country: Mauritius

## A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

If done every 5 year, the assessment report will come out 1 year ahead of the UNFCCC "global stocktake". This will contribute enormously in making the appropriate decision by the COP to Paris Agreement. The impact of AR4 on the Paris Agreement itself can be taken as an example. It is true that the workload on the Working Groups might to be high in producing the report. However, this can be catered for. Consequently, Mauritius supports this proposal.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

The full assessment report might lose its purpose to inform decision making in climate policies at all levels. The report will lose track of the UNFCCC GST.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

This does not disturb the 6 to 7 years IPCC assessment cycle. The problem will be in coordinating the work in production of the Assessment Reports and the Special Reports. The UNFCCC global stocktake may face the problem to assess the reliability of the ARs and SRs. Additionally, the Parties will have too many documents to study prior to taking firm decisions.

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

Mauritius also supports the proposal to increase the cycle to 10 years. However, IPCC will have to consider production of comprehensive Special Reports prior to every global stocktake. However, the cost effectiveness and implications have to be carried out for every proposals and presented to forthcoming Session of the IPCC.

## B - Terms of reference of the Task Group

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

1. Take stock of all the proposals.
2. Analyse the proposals.
3. Cost effectiveness of the different proposals and the benefits thereof,
4. Timeliness of the ARs/SRs and
5. Implications of the reports to the stocktake process.

### **Mexico's views on the Terms of Reference for the Task Group on the Alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen in the Paris Agreement.**

IPCC reports cycles had change during the last 17 years, taking between 5 and 6 year in the first and second report, and between 6 and 7 years in the last three reports.

Taking into account that the climate change science is evolving in a dynamic way, producing assessment reports every 5 years seems feasible. A five year cycle could also help to reduce the frequency for Special Reports, since there will be Assessment Report available in a more timely basis.

It would be essential to maintain one to two years between the publication of IPCC reports and the global stocktake, in order to provide opportune inputs to feed it.

Acknowledging that there are concerns about the work burden it would be important to increase the number of scientist participating in the assessments. A suggestion could be made to the Parties for nominate more experts and not to duplicate, as possible, the experts proposed to work as Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead authors, and Review Editors in different chapters or special reports.

#### **Terms of Reference for the Task Force**

**Objective:** to provide inputs to the IPCC plenary on the relevant data to be taking into account to better align the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake.

#### **Proposal of the activities to be developed by the Task Force**

- **Analysis of the growth rate of scientific publications on different climate change issues since the first IPCC Assessment Report.**

**Expected Outcome:** statistic information about how the scientific publications on climate change have evolved in terms of quantity, frequency and topics addressed.

- **Conduct a thematic contents review of a representative sample of climate change scientific publications** in order to provide inputs about the topics that are more frequently addressed and the areas where the existing gaps indicates low number of research papers.

**Expected Outcome:** document to provide inputs to the UNFCCC Parties about those areas where more scientific literature is needed.

- With these information and once the global stocktake modalities are defined by the UNFCCC, the Task Force could **analyses what kind of scientific information should be take into account to contribute to the global stocktake performance.**

**Expected Outcome:** proposal of scientific information to be presented in the IPCC reports to feed the analysis of the global stocktake process.

A close coordination with IPCC working groups would be advisable in order to avoid duplication of efforts and to explore potential synergies among the tasks undertaken.



### **Submission of the Netherlands on the alignment of IPCC products with the needs of the Global Stocktake (GST)**

The Netherlands thanks the IPCC Secretariat for consulting the members of the Panel on the alignment of the IPCC work with the needs of the Global Stocktake (GST). We believe that IPCC should aim at delivering timely, robust input to the UNFCCC's global stocktakes (GST) that is based on the best available science. IPCC has a reputation as a leading science on climate change authority. The IPCC reports and in particular the ARs carry considerable weight worldwide, and are recognized as the leading assessment on climate change science, generating significant interest in the public sphere, media, enterprises and national policy, in addition to the delivery of scientific findings for the UNFCCC.

Aligning the IPCC cycles with GST will have implications for the IPCC workflow, products and budget. Whatever changes will be made, the quality and independency of the IPCC reports should be ensured. We prefer a careful process resulting in a option document in which the length of the cycle is coupled to the portfolio of IPCC reports and budgetary issues. This would require considerable time for reflection and consultation among the Panel members. Therefore, we believe that the Plenary 47 should focus on the mandate and terms of references that will be given to the Task Group, instead of collecting the preferences of the governments at this stage.

After deciding the terms of references, the progress of the work of the Task Group should be reported during each plenary session. The final decision of the Panel should be made early enough before the end of the cycle in order to make it effective before the elections of the new Bureau. We believe that the elections of the new Bureau could take place as early as 2021, in order to save time between the end of the 6th cycle and the beginning of the 7th cycle. The decision should therefore be taken no later than 2020. This will make it possible to build on the future modalities of the GST which are still under progress. A first glimpse is to be expected when the outcome of the Talanoa Dialogue becomes available at the end of 2018.

We recommend the following considerations for the Task Group:

Objectives of the Task Group:

- to identify different options for aligning the work of the IPCC with the needs of the GST;
- to identify the implications of the different options on the production of the IPCC and the organization of the cycles;
- to identify the implications of the different options on the IPCC budget;
- to identify the implications of the different options on IPCC procedures;
- to evaluate and to synthesize the pro and cons of the different options.

Modalities of the Task Group:

- effective start of the work on the substance just after Plenary 47
- completeness in 2020
- modalities for the work between plenaries: mail exchanges, cooperative work and teleconferences
- working meetings during plenary sessions, starting during Plenary 49
- progress report during each plenary
- compliance with IPCC procedures, transparency and inclusiveness

Composition of the Task Group:

- 2 co-chairs, 2 rapporteurs
- volunteer countries, if no more than 20, otherwise 3 representatives from each of the 6 WMO regions.
- secretariat support

Rob van Dorland  
IPCC acting Focal Point for the Netherlands

**Country:** New Zealand

**A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:**

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

- parallel work in the final part of the assessment cycle would likely require more financial resources  
- need to address perception that IPCC reports are only for the GST process.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

- likely hard to get commitments for Bureau positions and TSU support for such a long cycle

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

- requires the least change to current practices

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

- should aim for a decision by the plenary in 2020, after the current work on Special Reports is complete  
- our comments on the three options are preliminary, until the associated implications become clear.

**B - Terms of reference of the Task Group**

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

- to convene open meetings of member countries in association with IPCC plenaries  
- to solicit and summarise submissions from countries on the emerging questions  
- to examine how the different proposals might require changes to IPCC rules, product types, and electoral procedure

### Submission about alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the Global Stocktake by Norway, 15 December 2017

Norway appreciates the opportunity to submit, in a free format, our views on the upcoming process relevant for aligning future IPCC cycles towards the Global Stocktake (GST) under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). We have not filled in the detailed questionnaire since the nature of some of the questions in our view is prejudging the discussions we believe should take place in the context of the Task Group (TG).

Norway acknowledge the decision at the last plenary about a TG, and in our view the Terms of Reference (ToR) and the mandate for this TG is the most pressing theme to discuss and decide in the upcoming IPCCs 47<sup>th</sup> plenary. The TG should report to the IPCC-plenary during its work as long as it is operational. Norway considers this theme as of high importance, and intends to contribute actively to its work and are willing to volunteer to be a member of the TG.

Norway also recommend that one or two rapporteurs be appointed in addition to the two co-chairs.

We also feel that valuable experiences regarding both establishment and work modalities of TGs could be drawn from the four TGs IPCC established in 2010 related to the implementation of the InterAcademy Councils recommendations (procedures, governance and management, conflict of interest policy and communication strategy). The Terms of reference for these groups were given at the 32<sup>nd</sup> IPCC session, see agenda item 5 and Annex 3 of the [report from the meeting](#).

Norway also note that possible revision of IPCCs Principles and Procedures are planned to be discussed in 2018 (at least every five years according to article 16 of the Principles) and that the procedures are related to the alignment issue. In case it is a need for another task group e.g. on procedures we feel that it may be preferable to establish such a group (including its mandate) at the same time as the TG for alignment since this may influence the mandate for the TG on alignment. According to our decisions, the secretariat will prepare a draft mandate. This, and if needed the mandate for any other relevant task group, may be further elaborated in a contact group during the Paris session, to facilitate the final decision. As for the election of rapporteurs and/or co-chairs e.g. in case of an additional group we are not aware of specific IPCC procedures for this, but we believe it could be done in plenary after consultations with the member countries or as it was done in 2010 when they were elected by the task group itself.

In general, Norway views the potential alignment of the IPCC cycle towards the GST as a much broader discussion than only deciding if a 5, 7-8 or 10-year IPCC-cycle is appropriate. We also note that in the existing procedures the number of years for the Term of an IPCC cycle is undefined. IPCC started with 5 year for the first and second cycle, for the third and fourth cycle it was 6 years and in the last round 7 years. Normally it has been a decision about when a new term and assessment report is to be finished for each cycle. It could be an alternative approach to make a principle decision about the length of the cycle, but still have the possibility to define each cycle in more detail during the presiding cycle.

Anyhow, it is important for us that the IPCC, in 2018, sends a clear message to the UNFCCC that IPCC is prepared to provide relevant information to GST that will be delivered from the IPCC in an appropriate and timely manner.

A major related point for Norway is that currently we believe that the downtime between each cycle, and thus between published IPCC products, is too long (ref: AR5 SYR approved November 2014 and the coming approval for IPCC Special Report on global warming of 1.5 °C in October 2018). The result

of this is that results gets outdated e.g. related to adaptation and mitigation. Therefore, we feel that Working Group Co-Chairs and the IPCC Chair should be elected one year earlier than the rest of the bureau when transitioning from one cycle to another. The rationale is that such an arrangement would allow Co-Chairs to start their preparations earlier, including establishing Technical Support Units, and then be ready at the time when they take office to start production of IPCC reports. This will also make it possible to approve Special Reports earlier in a cycle. To our knowledge, this has been done previously for the IPCC Chair (in the transition from SAR to TAR) when Robert Watson acted as chair-elect for the last year of Bert Bolin's last chairperson period.

Norway also believe that there might be implications of the decisions about the length of future IPCC-cycles that might affect several aspects of IPCC work, e.g. IPCC procedures and rules for election of the IPCC bureau, possible new IPCC products, length of the reports, more efficient transition from one cycle to another and budgetary implications. At the same time this illustrates that it may be a need for changes related to IPCCs work also for other reasons than those related to the alignment issue.

Norway believes that the TG should be given a clear mandate so that discussions and further work linked to alignment aspects can evolve and mature further, including developing proposals that can be dealt with appropriately by the IPCC-plenary. In our view, a final decision should preferably be made in 2019 or, at the latest, early in 2020. Therefore, and given IPCCs extensive time schedule and work programme in 2018 and 2019, the TG should start its work as soon as possible. The need for physical meetings for the TG should be considered, and the TG will need to work between the plenary sessions. However, some TG-meetings could be held back-to-back with other IPCC-meetings (e.g. IPCC plenary or bureau meetings). In order to include the views of countries that are not members of the task group it could be given opportunities to send submissions and to comment on a draft. The mandate may as well define to what extent the TG should seek advice from the IPCC Chair, the IPCC Vice-Chairs, Working Group and TFI Co-Chairs and the Secretary.

Norway also believes that there will be relevant lessons-to-learn from the Talanoa dialogue in late 2018 and from how the IPCC Special Report on global warming of 1.5 °C will be received after its approval and publication. Information from these processes should feed in to the work of the TG. Another important milestone, that will be relevant for the coming work of the TG, is the upcoming decision about input and modalities for the GST in the UNFCCC process.

## REPUBLIC OF AZERBAIJAN

Country: The Republic of Azerbaijan

### A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

Five years time period is acceptable for the assessment cycle. It will enable to save time for conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

Ten years time period is quite a long time for the assessment cycle. The coincidence of NDC assessment period of UNFCCC and the IPCC assessment period will be appropriate.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

It is important that the IPCC Special Reports coincidence with UNFCCC global stocktake.

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

### B - Terms of reference of the Task Group

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

We believe that the established Task Group should take into account the relevance of its activities with UNFCCC global stocktake and this should be reflected in the Terms of reference of the Task Group.

## REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Country: The Republic of Korea

### A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

It would be useful for the IPCC report to be used as input to the global stocktake. But, we concerned that it is unlikely to be able to adjust the IPCC work cycle to five years, considering the length of time to produce a new climate change scenario, Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phase (CMIP). If IPCC conduct the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle for reducing the assessment cycle to five years, it may be an excessive burden on the IPCC Bureau, member governments and experts.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

We doubt IPCC assessment report do a role as a report including new scientific findings in this option.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

We support this option to keep the IPCC cycle at its current frequency.

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

### B - Terms of reference of the Task Group

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

We recommend the Task Group suggest supplementary information such as the proper schedule and methods including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the 7th assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the 6th assessment cycle to reduce the assessment cycle to five years.



Country: The United Republic of Tanzania

**A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:**

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

Not recommended

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

Not Recommended

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

Highly Recommended:

We Think it will be appropriate to maintain the existing seven year cycle basing on a number of factors including the fact that this was deliberated during discussion on the future of the IPCC and we reached the conclusion to maintain the seven year Cycle.

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

Contact an inventory of the key scientific requirements that can be provided by IPCC to facilitate effective implementation of the global stocktake

**B - Terms of reference of the Task Group**

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

1. The Task Group should come up with recommendations on how best the needs of the Global stocktake can be mainstreamed into the Seven year Cycle of the IPCC Reports
2. Deliberate on key scientific requirements for the Global stocktake that IPCC can provide



**Country:** Singapore

## A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

We are open to the alignment of the assessment cycles with the five yearly global stocktake (GST). IPCC findings will be the authoritative source of input to inform the GST, and conversely there could be outcomes from the GST process that could inform the IPCC products. The optimal signature of producing an Assessment Report every five years would also be very high. However, the panel should also take into account practical considerations of how trimming the cycle to five years might impact the rigour in the assessment of scientific literature and the development of IPCC products. The actual implementation timeline for experts could be a lot tighter, depending on the modalities of the GST (which is still being negotiated), and how - and when - IPCC products will feed into the process. We note that the Secretariat and WG experts are already stretched under the current cycle. It is important that IPCC remains driven by the science, and deliver products that are policy relevant but not policy prescriptive.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

A ten year cycle, with five yearly interim updates that will feed into the GST could be a feasible option. Given the close linkages with the GST, this could be an option to address the pressures of timely delivery of IPCC products whilst retaining the space for scientific rigour in IPCC's assessments of scientific literature. It would require more flexibility in IPCC's processes, to avoid locking in decisions on the products for each cycle, given that there might be developments at the UNFCCC front on a 5-yearly basis, e.g. requests for technical or special reports as outcomes from the GST. Consideration would also need to be given to the tenure of the IPCC positions, whether 10 years would be an optimal period for the various WG Chairs and Bureau members to serve.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

A ten year cycle, with 5 year interim updates in line with the GST cycles, would be cleaner, and would address the concerns of addressing the most recent findings. It will be very challenging to synchronise the processes with the current seven year cycle.

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

In making a decision, IPCC Secretariat and the Panel may wish to wait for the discussions on the GST to be concluded, as the modalities would have a bearing on the timing of delivery of IPCC's products. IPCC Secretariat should also work closely with the UNFCCC Secretariat team dealing with the GST workstream, to understand the dynamics and status of the negotiations, and to get more visibility with the negotiators. Negotiators following the GST issue under the UNFCCC may not necessarily be the same officials attending the IPCC discussions.

## B - Terms of reference of the Task Group

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

1. Map out the pros and the cons of each cycle option.
2. Lay out the practical implications of each option, e.g. 5 year cycle could entail shorter preparation time for the different WGs, shorter timeframe for national governments to review the products, 10 year cycle could imply locking in decisions early in the cycle.
3. To propose counter measures to address the potential barriers that might be faced under each option.

Country: SPAIN

**A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:**

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

Preferable option. More frequent/shorter report cycles. They would consider more recent information, and more frequently.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

Not an option in our view. Too much time, and the reports would include out-of-date information.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

Not an option either. This would require working in parallel, with an additional burden of work that could be better used to deliver the assessment reports every 5 years...

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

The IPCC should shorten the cycles. This could be done managing better every step of the assessment cycle, starting from the adoption of the outline: is there really a need to change the outline for every assessment report? as far as we see it, it gives enough flexibility to use the same outline in each cycle. All other steps of the cycle should also be streamlined. Limiting the amount of Special Reports to 2 per 5 years cycle would help optimizing the work of the IPCC.

**B - Terms of reference of the Task Group**

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

their main task would be to undertake consultations with focal points, authors, and reviewers, and submit a proposal in October 2018 (48th session).

## SLOVAK REPUBLIC

Country: Slovak Republic

### A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

No. 3 is the preferable option for the Slovak Republic, since we would like to maintain the current cycle.

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

### B - Terms of reference of the Task Group

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

## SWAZILAND

Country: Swaziland

### A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

5 years might be too short for the assessment process, unless the cycles are allowed to overlap, starting the next cycle while governments are giving feedback on the previous cycle. This, however, might be hectic for the authors.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

Most preferred option. However, it is note worthy that the UNFCCC processes are themselves not properly aligned, with the global stocktake every 5 years while the reporting cycles is every 2 years for the biennial updates and 4 years for the national communications. Proposal is to have at least as year's lag to allow for the assessment cycle to geetöinput from the global stocktake and vice versa.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

7 years might make it difficult to respond to the UNFCCC global stocktake as the IPCC cycle would only start midway through the UNFCCC cycle. However, this is the familiar cycle (second preferred option).

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

### B - Terms of reference of the Task Group

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

Take into consideration the report of the UNFCCC global stocktake and COP/CMA decisions to guide the work for each cycle.

## SWITZERLAND

### **“Alignment” of the cycles of the IPCC and the Global Stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement**

December 2017

#### **Background on the Global Stocktake**

- Article 14 of the Paris Agreement provides for a Global Stocktake (GST) that shall periodically take stock of the implementation of the Agreement to assess the collective progress towards achieving the purpose of the Agreement and its long-term goals (referred to as the “global stocktake”). It shall do so in a comprehensive and facilitative manner, considering mitigation, adaptation and the means of implementation and support, and in the light of equity and the best available science.
- The GST will be undertaken every five years starting in 2023. Already before the implementation of the Paris Agreement, an initial stocktaking exercise under the UNFCCC, in relation to the long-term goal referred to in Article 4.1 of the Paris Agreement will take place in 2018: the Talanoa (facilitative) Dialogue.
- The sources of information for the GST will be multiple; among them, the work of the IPCC.

#### **The Questionnaire**

- The Questionnaire submitted by the IPCC to Governments contains three options<sup>1</sup> mainly related to the duration of the IPCC cycle.
- In our view, the goal is responding to the needs of the Paris Agreement in conducting the GST.
- IPCC 47 should agree on the way forward for reaching this goal.

#### **Responding to the needs of the GST**

- In our view, responding to the needs of the GST does not need forcefully an alignment of the IPCC and GST cycles. The idea of an alignment of cycles implies that the GST would need an IPCC Assessment Report, which may not be the case.
- The focus of the IPCC should be on providing best available science for the GST rather than on aligning the cycles.
- Therefore, we should not disrupt the IPCC process, which may put in peril the quality of its work and its credibility.
- It is too early to take a decision on the length of the assessment cycle because it will only be a problem for GST 3 in 2033, so we can take a decision later, based on the experiences gained until then.
- We note that for GST 1 in 2023, AR6 and the three Special Reports (1.5 degrees; oceans and cryosphere; land) will be of greatest usefulness.

<sup>1</sup> **Option 1:** Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

**Option 2:** Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

**Option 3:** The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

- As for GST 2 in 2028, there is a need to start the 7<sup>th</sup> cycle in 2020 (or even in 2019) and complete the adoption of all parts of the AR7 before May 2028 for consideration by GST 2. If GST 2 intends to use AR7, GST 2 has to extract itself the needed information, while if GST 2 requests from IPCC a specific Special Report, then the IPCC will do the work (as it has been the case with the 1.5 degrees Special Report).
- As for GST 3 in 2033, the cycles will not match and a solution has to be found.
- IPCC should adopt a pragmatic approach in order to take into account: evolving elements, requests from the UNFCCC and lessons learned.
- Therefore, IPCC 47 should aim at adopting a firm decision only on the 7<sup>th</sup> cycle and let the Panel decide afterwards on the duration of the 8<sup>th</sup> cycle.
- Below, we propose steps for the 7<sup>th</sup> cycle.

### The 7<sup>th</sup> cycle

Possible steps for ensuring that AR7 will be available to GST 2 may be:

2020	call for nominations of candidates for the IPCC Bureau  The candidates for Chairman and WG and TFI Co-chairs <u>have secured the financial means for supporting them for the entire cycle</u> , in particular WG Co-chairs have the financial means ready to establish the Technical Support Units (TSU) as soon as they are elected
2021	Election of the Bureau for the 7 <sup>th</sup> cycle in, before the adoption of the AR6 WG I and III reports  Immediate establishment of the TSU upon election of the WG Co-chairs  Incorporation of lessons learned from the Talanoa (facilitative) Dialogue in 2018, as well as requests from the UNFCCC (that will be preparing the GST 1 in 2023)  Completion of the list of the Special Reports for the 7 <sup>th</sup> cycle (one Special Report is already decided: Climate Change and Cities)
2022	Scoping of AR7 immediately after the adoption of the Synthesis Report of AR6  Nomination and selection of experts immediately after the scoping process  The elaboration of AR7 starts
2028	Adoption of AR7 before May 2028 in order to serve the technical phase of the GST 2 and the COP in 2028.

### Decisions that IPCC 47 should take on alignment and the task group on the alignment

- Alignment:
  - Prepare steps for the 7<sup>th</sup> cycle taking into account the need to be responsive to the GST and with the view to adopt AR7 before May 2028.
- Terms of reference of the task group on alignment:
  - Assess options for responding to the GST that ensure the quality and the integrity of the IPCC work
  - Assess implications for the IPCC of the various options, including procedural, financial and the 7<sup>th</sup> cycle

- Reflect on lessons learned from the 2018 Talanoa (facilitative) Dialogue and the involvement of the IPCC<sup>2</sup>
- Report to and be under the control of the plenary of the IPCC
- Modalities of work of the task group on alignment:
  - Be open to all Governments
  - Work in a transparent manner during the plenaries of the Panel
  - Take no decision during the intersessional period

-----

---

<sup>2</sup> Aware that in terms of rigor the UNFCCC Structured Expert Dialogue that informed the review of the long-term global goal is closer to the GST than the Talanoa Dialogue.



Country: TOGO

**A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:**

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

YES

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

NO

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

NO

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

NOTHING

**B - Terms of reference of the Task Group**

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group



Country: Turkey

**A - What is your point of view on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement:**

1. Reducing the assessment cycle to five years, including by conducting the assessment of the future IPCC products and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

We agree to reduce assessment cycle to five years and the elections for the next assessment cycle in parallel with the final part of the current assessment cycle.

2. Increasing the assessment cycle to ten years and producing an update of relevant information for the global stocktake in the middle of the assessment cycle.

10-year period is too long for the assessment cycle. Five years cycle is sufficient for the assessment and also in agreement with the global stocktake.

3. The IPCC would maintain the approximately seven-year assessment cycle as has been the case over the last few cycles. If the time of approval of the Assessment Report for a given cycle does not align with the timing of the immediate next global stocktake (GST), the IPCC would produce a targeted Special Report the scope and timing of which would be designed to address the needs of the UNFCCC global stocktake in a similar manner as the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5).

The Special Report would, inter alia, address topics such as most recent evolutions of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and updated observations and trends of key variables such as global temperature and precipitation, and their regional impacts.

As the current assessment cycle does not align with the timing of the global stocktake, it's better to align of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake.

4. Any other suggestions and proposals

No

**B - Terms of reference of the Task Group**

1. What should be the tasks of the Task Group

1. To work on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake
2. To suggest appropriate reporting time by taking into account the GST mechanism
3. To follow the COP's decisions on the global stocktake mechanism
4. To liaise with UNFCCC on global stocktake mechanism
5. To report works of the Task Group to the Sessions of the IPCC.

## UNITED KINGDOM



Department for  
Business, Energy  
& Industrial Strategy

To Abdalah Mokssit  
The Secretary  
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change  
c/o WMO  
7bis Avenue de la Paix  
CP 2100  
CH-1211 Geneva 2  
Switzerland

Department for Business, Energy &  
Industrial Strategy  
1 Victoria Street,  
London SW1H 0ET  
Email: [jolene.cook@beis.gov.uk](mailto:jolene.cook@beis.gov.uk)  
[www.gov.uk/beis](http://www.gov.uk/beis)

15 December 2017

By Email: [IPCC-Sec@wmo.int](mailto:IPCC-Sec@wmo.int)

Dear Abdalah,

**Re: Task Group on the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement**

Thank you for your letter and questionnaire dated 12 October and related message of 22 November.

The UK welcomes the decision taken at Plenary 46 to establish a Task Group to consider the alignment of the cycles of the IPCC and the UNFCCC's Global Stocktake. We are pleased to submit our views on the Terms of Reference of the proposed Task Group in response to Part B of the questionnaire. At this stage we prefer not to respond to Part A, as there is currently insufficient information on the options presented and there may be other options to be explored.

We feel that the purpose of the Task Group should be to consider, as a priority, the need for the IPCC to input to the Global Stocktake. It should also consider implications of different options for aligning the work of the IPCC to the Global Stocktake as well as future products of the IPCC in a broader context. The world has changed in the thirty years since the IPCC was established and it is timely to consider the IPCC's relevance to all stakeholders. Therefore we feel it is not possible to make any decision about the nature and timing of future products at Plenary 47.

An early part of the Task Group's work should be to seek views from all governments about this broader context and how to maximise the usefulness of the IPCC's products to its stakeholders including, but not limited to, the UNFCCC.

It is possible that any alignment of the IPCC and Global Stocktake cycles may require changes to the IPCC's processes and procedures, and it is important that the Task Group completes its work in sufficient time to allow the Panel to consider and implement these changes before the next cycle. At the same time, we recognise that the IPCC has a busy schedule over the next two years and that the UNFCCC is yet to decide the requirements for its Global Stocktake.

This leads us to conclude that the Panel should take a decision based on the Task Group's work by 2020. The IPCC should keep the UNFCCC updated on the work.

We provide more detailed thoughts on the work of the Task Group in the attached Annex.

We look forward to working with you at Plenary 47 to agree the Terms of Reference and to participating in the work of this very important Task Group.

Yours sincerely,



Jolene Cook

UK IPCC Focal Point

## **Annex: UK views on Terms of Reference of Task Group on Future of IPCC**

### **Composition and operation of the Task Group**

It is important that all governments should have an opportunity to contribute to the work of the Task Group, whilst allowing it to work as efficiently as possible, and minimising use of IPCC Trust Fund resources.

To minimize travel, the Task Group should meet in conjunction with plenary sessions; inter-sessional work should be primarily conducted by electronic means, when feasible, and facilitated by the Secretariat. Any travel expenses related to the work of the Task Group will be covered in accordance with IPCC practice.

### **Proposed Objectives**

To help the IPCC to maintain the relevance of its products and to continue to improve its operation, the Task Group (whose creation was agreed at Plenary 46, Montreal, September 2017) should develop options and recommendations for consideration by the Panel on:

- The nature and timing of future products of the IPCC, with new and/or revised procedures as necessary;
- The appropriate structure and modus operandi for the production of these IPCC products.

### **Inputs**

The Task Group should look at the wider implications of options for aligning the work of the IPCC to the Global Stocktake. It should therefore draw on multiple sources and stakeholders, including, but not limited to:

- The experience from those involved in the preparation of reports during the AR5 cycle;
- The questionnaire circulated on the future products of the IPCC, circulated towards the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> cycle, which may be a useful model for an updated questionnaire;
- The academic community, especially climate modellers and their funders;
- International science bodies;
- Users of IPCC products from its 5<sup>th</sup> Assessment Cycle;
- Views expressed by governments, including those provided in December 2017;
- Input from IPCC Observer Organizations and other relevant stakeholders;
- Global Stocktake requirements when they become clearer.

## **Outputs**

The Task Group should present options with their risks and advantages, including resource implications and the consequences for the IPCC's Principles and Procedures.

The Task Group should also:

- a) Prepare a first progress report for submission to the 48th Session of the IPCC (October 2018).
- b) Prepare a second progress report providing different options for discussion at the 49th Session of the IPCC, together with a process for how it proposes to conclude its work.

## **Timing**

The Terms of Reference should state the timescale for the Task Group's work, noting that lengthy discussion of its work is unlikely to be feasible in Plenary 48 as this is an approval session. In 2019 Plenary 49 may well be an opportunity for in-depth discussion on the Task Group's work, but Plenaries 50 and 51 are again approval sessions so 2020 would seem a realistic time to conclude the Task Group's work. We suggest the Panel takes a decision based upon the Task Group's work in 2020.